

TRANSFER JURISDICTION OF PROPERTY FOR HOMELESS
SHELTER

JUNE 3, 1986.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the
Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on Government Operations,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

DISSENTING VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 4784]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Government Operations, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 4784) to require the transfer of jurisdiction to the District of Columbia over certain property to permit such property to be used as a shelter for the homeless, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

SEC. 2. Upon the transfer of jurisdiction pursuant to the first section of this Act, the Federal Government (1) shall not be liable for injuries or damages that occur while the property is under the jurisdiction of the municipal government of the District of Columbia and that arise out of the operation, maintenance, repair, renovation, reconstruction, or other capital improvement of that property by such municipal government; and (2) shall not be responsible for the operation, maintenance, repair, renovation, reconstruction, or other capital improvement of that property while the property is under the jurisdiction of such municipal government. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit the Federal Government from funding the renovation of the property.

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

SEC. 3. The property referred to in the first section is more fully described as follows:

All that parcel situate in the Northwest quadrant of the City of Washington, District of Columbia, and being a portion of District of Columbia Square Number 571, containing in their entirety former lots numbered 9 through 18, inclusive, and 22 through 26, inclusive, as recorded in Liber B, Folio 160 of the Records of the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia, and lots 45 through 51 inclusive, as recorded in Liber 19, Folio 118 of the Records of the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia; such land now known for purposes of assessments Lot 820, and containing 1.16 acres of land, more or less; and more particularly described in a deed between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the United States of America, dated July 30, 1947, and recorded in Liber 8761, Folio 79 of the Land Records of the District of Columbia.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

The amendments to H.R. 4784, which were added as sections 2 and 3 of the bill, are explained in the Section-by-Section Analysis of this report.

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

The purpose of the bill is to direct the Administrator of General Services (the Administrator) to transfer promptly to the Government of the District of Columbia (District) jurisdiction over the real property located at 425 Second Street, N.W. The transfer is for the purpose of providing shelter and related services to homeless individuals in the District and for other use in the protection of the public health.

This property, a 3-story building with 185,000 square feet of floor space, is now used as a shelter for about 1,000 homeless persons. Although the building is in the inventory of GSA's Public Buildings Service, the shelter operation is being conducted by an unincorporated association, the Community for Creative Non-Violence (CCNV), whose spokesman is Mr. Mitch Snyder.

The administration has agreed with the District and the CCNV to turn the property over to the District and make available to the District \$5 million, which could be used for rehabilitation of the property to improve its suitability as a shelter. The expedited transfer is to enable rehabilitation work to begin at an early date so that the building can be ready for next winter.

In making the transfer, under the bill, GSA is to follow a portion of existing law that authorizes transferring jurisdiction of lands in Washington between the District Government and the Federal Government for administration and maintenance. Thus the transfer would rely on previously declared Congressional policy with respect to such property. At the same time, the bill would also assure that the property is to be used for shelter and related public health purposes, since the District, lacking title, would be unable to make disposition of the property.

The bill as amended contains a provision to limit the Federal Government's liability and responsibility while the property is under the District's jurisdiction.

COMMITTEE ACTION AND VOTE

At a duly called meeting on May 22, 1986, the Committee on Government Operations amended H.R. 4784 and ordered it favorably reported by roll call vote (25 ayes and 11 noes).

HEARINGS

On May 15, 1986, the Government Activities and Transportation Subcommittee held a hearing on H.R. 4784. The witnesses were: Mr. Mitch Snyder, Community for Creative Non-Violence; Mr. Thomas M. Downs, City Manager/Deputy Mayor for Operations, District of Columbia Government; Mr. Robert A. Malson, Senior Policy Adviser, Commission on Social Services, District of Columbia Government; Mr. Clyde C. Pearce, Jr., General Counsel, General Services Administration; and Mr. William S. Madison, Regional Administrator, National Capital Region, General Services Administration.

Mr. Snyder testified as to the need for the shelter, the extensive volunteer efforts which enable it to provide for this need economically, the urgency to begin the renovation at a very early date, and support for any effort undertaken in good conscience to move the project expeditiously.

Mr. Downs testified as to the origins of the Second Street Shelter, the history of efforts to make it a model shelter, the attempts to close the shelter, CCNV activists' efforts to galvanize action toward getting a model shelter, and the discussions resulting in the oral agreement of March 17, 1986, among the administration, the District, and the CCNV. Mr. Downs also discussed the District's reservations about the bill restrictions on future use or disposition, which are not part of the March 17 agreement.

Mr. Pearce testified that H.R. 4784 would not implement the policy agreement of March 17 because it would place limitations on other use of the property and impair the District's ability to discharge its local responsibility. However, he stated that if the bill were enacted, GSA "would respond accordingly and transfer the property", although it would not construe that as a precedent.

Mr. Madison testified on the property's history as a Federal building since its transfer to the United States in 1947. He concentrated on GSA's activity since 1982, when the building was declared surplus and offered for sale, and afterwards during the period of its current use and occupancy by the CCNV as a homeless shelter.

BACKGROUND

MATTERS LEADING TO LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The property is a World War II-era Federal building that was built by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and occupies a 1.16-acre site at 425 2nd Street, N.W., in Washington, D.C. For about 12 years prior to 1983, the property was used by the Federal

City College (later the University of the District of Columbia) under a permit arrangement with GSA.

Various estimates place the current value of the property with two adjacent parking lots, which are excluded from the proposed transfer, at about \$18,000,000. (Virtually the entire value is in the land.) The value of the property to be jurisdictionally transferred under the bill would, of course, be somewhat less. Precise estimates are not available.

In September 1983, the property was vacated by the District of Columbia. GSA, declaring it surplus property, offered it, together with the two adjacent parking lots, for sale by public auction. The auction was held, but the sale was not consummated.

In December 1983, through efforts of the Federal Government, the building was offered to the CCNV as a shelter until April 1984, although the District's Mayor advised against it, among other reasons, because of the need for repairs in the interest of health and safety. Since April 1984, the CCNV has operated the shelter without any formal permit from the Federal or District Governments.

In November 1984, the administration indicated a willingness to renovate the building and make it a model shelter for the homeless. Between that time and May 1985, negotiations were conducted with CCNV; but no agreement could be reached on the scope of the work and how to proceed. In May 1985, the District entered the negotiations, but they broke down over specifics and a budget for the renovation.

The Federal Government sought to close the shelter. Judicial intervention prevented that, pending reasonable alternatives to meet the needs of the shelter's residents. The Federal Government contracted with the private Coalition for the Homeless to operate shelters in the city to replace the Second Street shelter. The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia then granted permission to close the Second Street shelter. Mr. Snyder, however, announced that his organization would not leave the shelter. No eviction resulted.

In the absence, however, of new negotiations between CCNV and the Federal Government, Mr. Snyder and others of the CCNV began another fast. The fast apparently brought about a number of communications involving White House, Department of Health and Human Services, and certain Congressional personnel, as well as persons involved in providing shelter.

The March 17, 1986, oral agreement resulted. According to the testimony of the District's witness, Thomas Downs, the agreement consisted of four points:

1. The United States would immediately transfer \$5 million to the District of Columbia.
2. The United States would transfer title to the property to the District of Columbia.
3. The District of Columbia could decide whether it wished to use the money of rehabilitate the building at Second and D Streets, or not.
4. The District could decide upon the use or disposition of the property.

Also, according to Mr. Downs, there was an agreement between the District and CCNV that when the Federal Government had

provided the building and the \$5 million for rehabilitation, the District would join with CCNV in trying to raise \$2.5 million, required to complete the rehabilitation project. The \$5 million was declared to be already available.

On March 21, 1986, GSA, acting on behalf of the administration, sent proposed legislation to Congress. The submitted bill would simply direct GSA to transfer, at no cost, full title of the property to the District without any conditions.

Asked by Chairwoman Collins at the hearing why the GSA letter transmitting the proposed bill did not at least mention the anticipated use of the property, GSA's General Counsel responded:

Mr. PEARCE. It was drafted in response to the agreement arrived at between the Administration, the District and CCNV that it be transferred without any strings attached, without any discussion or explanation, but simply in fee simple.

Although the agreement involved both the functions of GSA and the disposal of property in GSA's inventory, representatives of GSA had virtually no input into the agreement or the formulation of the proposed legislation. GSA's General Counsel testified:

Mr. DELAY. Did you make a recommendation to those parties that were involved in the agreement to what your position would be, or what your recommendations are in regard to this situation?

Mr. PEARCE. No, sir.

DEVELOPMENTS FOLLOWING THE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL

The administration's proposed bill was introduced in the Senate on March 27, 1986, as S. 2251. There was no action by the committee of referral. On April 17, the Senate passed S. 2251 without amendment.¹

On the House side, the administration's proposal was referred to the Committee on Government Operations. On April 15, 1986, Chairman Brooks wrote to GSA. Although favoring the general objective of the bill, he noted the absence of any conditions to assure the expected use of the property. He recommended GSA consider administratively transferring the property under existing law.

Government Activities Subcommittee Chairwoman Collins, together with the Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources Subcommittee Chairman Weiss, wrote GSA on April 17 urging the use of existing law so as to expedite transfer and assure the property's use as a shelter. Details were offered concerning the availability of existing law.

Two provisions of existing law appear available to allow the administrative transfer of the property at no cost to the District:

¹ On May 12, 1986, the Senate Committee on Appropriations reported H.R. 4515, Supplemental Appropriations for FY 1986, with an amendment to Chapter VIII, Department of Health and Human Services. The amendment contains as a legislative provision the exact language of S. 2251. That amendment also includes appropriations language to make available to the Department's Office of Community Services, \$5 million for the repair and renovation of the Second Street property for use as a shelter for the homeless. (Senate Report No. 99-301.)

1. Section 203(k) of the Federal Property Act and Administrative Services (40 U.S.C. 484(k)) permits transfer of surplus real property to local governments without cost for use in the protection of the public health. Pursuant to regulations, use for this purpose must continue for 30 years, after which the use condition lapses. Release from use conditions, however, is permitted in certain circumstances if the interest of the United States in accomplishing the public purpose for which the property was transferred can be protected.

2. Section 1 of the Act of May 20, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 122) authorizes transfer of jurisdiction over U.S.-owned lands in the District of Columbia to the District Government for purposes of administration and maintenance, subject to terms and conditions to be agreed upon. Title, however, remains in the United States. The current availability of this transfer authority is noted in GSA's Federal Property Management Regulations (41 CFR 101-47.4905). It was used in 1984, for example, to transfer to the District certain land for the use of the Metropolitan Police Boys and Girls Club.

Section 122 of title 40 gives the Federal and District Governments power to transfer between themselves jurisdiction over lands of which they have charge, "whenever it appears to be in the best interest of administration and maintenance." (House Report No. 679, 72nd Congress).

Use of 40 U.S.C. 122 as the basis for the transfer would enable the action to be done with little delay. It would also emphasize that the relationship of the Federal Government to the Seat of Government is a special one. Moreover, since title would remain in the United States, the District would not have freedom to dispose of this valuable property in the future.

GSA responded to those letters suggesting that provisions of existing law are not available, or, if available, would not achieve the objectives and satisfy the administration's needs as to this project.

INTRODUCTION OF HOUSE BILL H.R. 4784

It became clear that the administration would not seek, at this time at least, to utilize existing legislative authority to make the transfer. Yet the administration's legislative proposal with its directive to GSA to convey the full title at no cost provides no positive assurance of the property's use for shelter purposes. Accordingly, H.R. 4784 was introduced by Representatives Collins and Weiss on May 8, 1986. It directs GSA to follow some of the provisions of 40 U.S.C. 122 and transfer jurisdiction of the property to the District Government "for providing shelter and related services to homeless individuals in the District of Columbia and for other use in the protection of the public health." Transfer is to be accomplished within 5 days after the bill's enactment date.

DISCUSSION

H.R. 4784 is designed to accomplish these objectives:

- a. Achieving a prompt transfer;

b. Avoiding the creation of a legislative precedent by relying on previously declared Congressional policy and authority with respect to property in the District; and

c. Assuring that the District will use the property for shelter and related public health purposes and will not obtain the right to use the property for unrelated purposes or to sell it at any time and retain the proceeds.

The bill would provide assurance of appropriate use because title to the property would remain in the Federal Government. This would effectively prevent the District Government from any later disposal of the property. Failure to use the property for the purposes specified for the jurisdictional transfer could lead to the Federal Government's resumption of jurisdiction.

The basic reason given in support of the administration's "no-strings" bill is that it corresponds to the terms of the March 17, 1986, oral agreement among the administration, the District, and the CCNV. On the basis of the District representatives' hearing testimony, it is apparent that these terms lack the most essential element of any agreement: mutuality of obligation. An irrevocable commitment of the Federal Government in giving up the property and making \$5 million available for renovation is met by a fragile and uncertain commitment on the part of the District. The extreme flexibility accorded to the District under the agreement regarding the property is indicated in the testimony of its witnesses.

Deputy Mayor Downs declared in his prepared statement:

Our reservations with the House bill stem not from using it as a shelter but with the restrictions on future use or disposition. In the earlier portions of my testimony I discussed not only how the parties arrived at the point of resolution but our understanding of the various states of mind of the negotiators.

To the City, the White House decision to transfer title without conditions amounted to a Federal contribution to the citizens of the District to be used as the elected representatives of the people determined. We believe that the best use of the facility for now and for the foreseeable future is to use it as a shelter. If, on the other hand, circumstances should change, the people of this city are in the best position to evaluate the changes required.

For example, most of the published articles written on shelters favor smaller scattered shelters over larger ones. However, moving from the theoretical to the actual requires more staff, more services, more money and community acceptance of sufficient numbers of shelters to house the hundreds of people currently residing at 425 2nd Street.

This community may, at some point, wish to move in that direction. If so, the ability to sell the building and land and to use the proceeds would enable us to apply the proceeds of the sale to that purpose. The Administration can speak for itself on that point, but that is my understanding of our agreement and I strongly urge that the original agreement be enacted by legislation.

Under questioning, the District's witnesses indicated that the shelter project was imposed on them and that the arrangement was only made acceptable on the basis of the District's having in fact full flexibility to do what it wanted with respect to dealing with the shelter project and the opportunity to recoup any investment it might make.

During the hearing, Chairwoman Collins expressed concern to Mr. Downs, the Deputy Mayor, that the District could discontinue using the building as a shelter, sell it, and make money from the sale. Mr. Downs responded:

Mr. Downs. Madam Chair, we did not ask for the building, we did not raise the issue of the transfer without title. We were told that that was the answer, we were told that that decision had been made with the concurrence of the House and the Senate, and we were told this was the only reasonable outcome.

Now, if that is not the case, maybe we all need to go back to the bargaining table and start all over again. If the words of the leadership of the House and Senate and White House are not adequate to make a deal, we can go back and try again. If we were misunderstood in our concerns, we did not again create this problem. We did not create this situation. We were left with a solution on our doorstep. We said "You had better give us enough flexibility to make this thing come out right or assume responsibility at the national level."

This is clearly a case of the Federal Government having asserted itself into an area it is not capable of managing nor knew how to get out of and is interested in cutting and running and dropping this on us. We have said we will do what we can, because it is both a local and national problem.

One of the things we wanted was flexibility—getting this responsibility for another 600 to 800 beds of homeless care when we already provide approximately 1,000 beds for homeless care in the District. If we have that responsibility, we need flexibility after a period of time to make rational decisions on behalf of the 635,000 people who live in the District of Columbia about the ultimate disposition of that responsibility. Frankly, we are getting a building that is not amenable to the type of use we plan; and, over the long term, a number of people agree that we need a series of smaller shelters throughout Washington.

I would like to say throughout the Metropolitan Area, but I know the opportunity for placing these in Maryland and Virginia are next to none.

Mrs. COLLINS. To repeat myself, I certainly understand the position of the District. They would like to have the building without any kind of strings attached to it. However, I think the taxpayers, who actually own this building, have a right to know whether this building is going to remain for the purposes it is intended, and that is to house homeless people in the District. Without that kind of reser-

vation, it would seem to me it would not be the kind of thing that Congress or anybody else ought to do.

However, the administration does have the power, if it wants to, to give the building for public health purposes, but instead of doing that, they have asked something be done legislatively. It seems to me the intent is to have some kind of conditions. There can be at least a hope this building is going to be used for this purpose for a pretty long period of time.

Mr. DOWNS. Again, Madam Chairman, it is the Fed's responsibility. If there is an interest in the long term regarding Federal operation and control of the building, with all due respect, the Federal Government should keep the facility and operate it.

Mrs. COLLINS. Perhaps it should. But Mr. Snyder has just told us his group will be able to do that very thing with the monies that are coming in for renovation and so forth and the money they have been able to raise, or they will be able to raise and have raised for the past 16 years or so.

Mr. DOWNS. Madam Chairman, Mr. Snyder claims he provides about \$8 million of in-kind services a year, and he is accurate on that estimate. If the Federal Government, which has made the initial decision for the use of this facility to house 600 or more human beings, is now interested in getting out from under the responsibility for that decision, then the Federal Government ought to take some accountability for the initial decision and the implementation steps.

If the ultimate decision is that there need to be a number of strings attached to that, I think everybody ought to go back to the table and seriously consider renegotiating the agreement. Maybe there isn't an agreement.

Mrs. COLLINS. On page 15 of your statement you say you believe the best use of the facility for now and for the foreseeable future is for use as a shelter. If, on the other hand, circumstances should change, the people at this site are in the best position to evaluate the changes required. It would seem to me this is an indication somewhere down the road you feel this building will not be used for the purpose in which it is being given or offered.

Mr. DOWNS. As the Pension Building itself demonstrates, nothing is forever in Washington, D.C. Even the largest of monuments that have been constructed by the national government in Washington have changed use over a number of years. We are suggesting if we are going to take responsibility ultimately for the decisions, for the care of an additional 600 homeless, in a facility on a site that is ill suited, that we have no participation in making the decision about, we would like the ability ourselves, as locally elected officials with a city council and elected mayor, for making the decisions regarding the ultimate service needs and the ultimate configuration for providing those services.

If that is unacceptable to the national government, again I would respectfully suggest the national government do it itself.

The Committee believes that the legitimate concerns of the Congress, which the administration chooses to make a full partner in this project, must be addressed in any legislation to facilitate the objectives of the project. The Committee believes that H.R. 4784 will meet these concerns and that the means to achieve the objectives will be available under the bill. What remains is the application of good faith, willingness, and determination to proceed. There is ample flexibility both in the bill and in existing statutory and regulatory procedures to make the project work. For example, the Committee understands and expects that GSA will be able to furnish essential steam to the District for use in the shelter building, for example, by selling it, at fair value, as excess from the Public Buildings Service's heating operations. Furthermore, the District will have at its disposal the resources of Federal excess and surplus personal property that under the law can be used by or donated to those voluntary organizations that provide shelter services. In short, the Congress has built much into the existing property utilization and disposal system for Federal and non-Federal managers who will accept it and use it.

What is now in existence as an active shelter for as many as 1,000 homeless people represents an irreplaceable human service. The potential in real property and other resources is there to make major improvements in the scope and quality of that service. The outlines of what is possible were presented by Mr. Snyder, testifying on behalf of the CCNV, as he urged prompt action:

* * * We want to see the work done quickly. We want to see other people act as if it were they, themselves, that were waiting for a roof to be placed over their head that doesn't have holes in it and for walls not falling down around them, for eating facilities, and, most importantly, for the kind of social services and programs that will be contained within the building once it is renovated.

It is not possible to do any more than we are doing now, which is to provide rudimentary care. We have a psychiatrist and social worker that come in with regularity and we have VA counseling. But compared to what we could have and will have once the work is done, we now have close to nothing.

CONCLUSION

The Committee concludes that the Federal Government's contribution through making this property available for continued and enhanced use as a shelter for homeless people is wholly justified.

The Committee also concludes that the bill as amended will adequately protect the interests of all parties concerned, including the Federal taxpayer, doing so in a way, within the framework of an existing system, that will provide needed flexibility and also remain consistent with the protection of those interests.

It remains only for the concerned Federal agencies, the District of Columbia Government, and the CCNV to engage in prompt and intensive cooperation to realize their vitally important goal.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 directs the Administrator of General Services within five days of the date of enactment, to transfer jurisdiction over the subject property to the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and to do so in accordance with section 1 of the Act of May 20, 1932 (40 U.S.C. section 122). A modification in that section's procedure is authorized by eliminating the need for action of the National Capital Planning Commission. This change will enable the transfer to be accomplished promptly.

Section 1 specifies that the administration and maintenance of the transferred property be only for furnishing shelter and related services for the homeless in the District. It also provides the opportunity for other use of the property in the protection of the public health. For instance, circumstances might arise when, consistently with the conduct of the shelter activity, the District of Columbia government might be able to perform some functions not actually part of the shelter operation but connected with public health protection. This language would facilitate the District's making such additional and compatible use of the property. Existing law (section 203(k) of the Federal Property Act) already authorizes the transfer to a public agency (including the District) of surplus real property for the protection of the public health. Use of this specific language in section 1 is consistent with the fact that by declaring this property to be surplus, GSA, acting under the existing law could assign it to the Department of HHS, which would then transfer it to the District for use in the protection of the public health.

Section 2 consists of a full Committee amendment in lieu of an amendment adopted by the subcommittee. It declares that the Federal Government shall not be liable for injuries or damages that occur while the property in question is under the District's jurisdiction and that arise from the operation, maintenance, repair, renovation, reconstruction, or other capital improvement of that property by the District. The section also declares that the Federal Government shall not be responsible for the named activities while the property is under the District's jurisdiction. Further, in the last sentence, the Committee makes clear its intention that authority for the Federal Government to make funding available for the renovation of the property is not intended to be impaired by this section.

In setting forth these declarations, the Committee does not imply that, absent the declarations, such Federal liability and responsibility necessarily would attach.

Section 3, which was added by the subcommittee and later adopted by the full Committee, represents a detailed land description to give further specificity to the street-address designation of the property in section 1. It provides definitive evidence, for example, that two parking lots adjacent to the building site are not intended to be included in the transfer.

COST ESTIMATE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

The cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) under section 308(a) and 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is contained in the following letter from the Director:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1986.

Hon. JACK BROOKS,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, 2157 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed H.R. 4784, a bill to require the transfer of jurisdiction to the District of Columbia over certain property to permit such property to be used as a shelter for the homeless, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Government Operations, May 22, 1986.

The bill would direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration (GSA) to transfer jurisdiction, but not ownership, over a portion of the property at 425 Second Street, Northwest, in the District of Columbia, to the city government for purposes of administering a shelter for the homeless. The portion of the property affected, with a value estimated to range between \$11 million and \$16 million, is not currently available for sale because it is no longer in GSA's inventory of surplus property. It is not in the inventory of GSA's Public Buildings Service, although it is being used as a shelter administered by the Community for Creative Non-Violence (CCNV). Because it appears that the Administration does not presently plan to sell the property or use it for other purposes, we estimate that the bill would have no significant direct impact on the federal budget.

As part of its agreement with the CCNV, the Administration has indicated its intent to provide \$5 million for renovating the building. This bill does not authorize any federal funds for rehabilitation, nor does it specify the source or amount of such funds. Nevertheless, it appears likely that transfer of jurisdiction would be accompanied by some federal expenditures for renovation.

If the District government accepts the transfer, it would likely incur some additional operations and maintenance costs. While we are unable at this time to estimate such costs, they are not expected to be substantial.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

JAMES BLUM
(For Rudolph G. Penner, Director.)

COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

The Committee agrees with the cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office.

INFLATIONARY IMPACT

In compliance with Clause 2(1)(4) of Rule XI, it is the opinion of the Committee that the provisions of this bill will have no significant inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

The Committee, through its Subcommittee on Government Activities and Transportation, has maintained legislative and investigative oversight over the use and disposal of Federal property. In addition, the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources has held investigations and hearings on the Federal response to the homeless crisis. This resulted in a Committee report (H. Rept. 99-7).

REVIEW OF EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subdivision A of Clause 2(1)(3) of House Rule XI, the Committee reviewed the provisions of existing law relating to transfer of property to the District of Columbia in preparation of this legislation.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

None.