

## 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 2014, gross outlays to the public were \$4,076 billion,<sup>1</sup> 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 2014, net outlays were \$3,506 billion or 20.3 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 2014, governmental receipts were \$3,021 billion, or 17.5 percent of GDP, and the deficit was \$485 billion, or 2.8 percent of GDP.

There are two sources of offsetting receipts and offsetting collections: from the public and from other budget accounts. In 2014, offsetting receipts and offsetting collections from the public were \$570.2 billion, while intragovernmental offsetting receipts and offsetting collections were \$1,010 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.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Gross outlays to the public are derived by subtracting intragovernmental outlays from gross outlays. For 2014, gross outlays were \$5,087 billion. Intragovernmental outlays are payments from one Government account to another Government account. For 2014, intragovernmental outlays totaled \$1,010 billion.

<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> These activities include the sale of postage stamps, land, timber, and electricity, and services provided to the public (e.g., admission to national parks); and premiums for health care benefits (e.g., Medicare Parts B and D).

A relatively small portion (\$5.1 billion in 2014) 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.<sup>4</sup>

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

<sup>3</sup> 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.”

<sup>4</sup> 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 2014	Estimate	
		2015	2016
<b>Offsetting collections (credited to expenditure accounts):</b>			
<b>User charges:</b>			
Postal Service stamps and other USPS fees (off-budget) .....	72.1	68.5	70.3
Defense Commissary Agency .....	5.7	6.1	6.0
Employee contributions for employees and retired employees health benefits funds .....	13.6	14.3	15.4
Sale of energy:			
Tennessee Valley Authority .....	47.6	48.4	48.0
Bonneville Power Administration .....	3.5	3.8	4.0
All other user charges .....	65.7	72.2	80.6
Subtotal, user charges .....	208.3	213.4	224.4
<b>Other collections credited to expenditure accounts:</b>			
Commodity Credit Corporation fund .....	3.9	7.4	8.0
Supplemental Security Income (collections from the States) .....	3.2	2.7	2.8
Other collections .....	21.1	8.0	8.8
Subtotal, other collections .....	28.1	18.1	19.6
Subtotal, offsetting collections .....	236.4	231.5	244.0
<b>Offsetting receipts (deposited in receipt accounts):</b>			
<b>User charges:</b>			
Medicare premiums .....	64.9	67.3	72.1
Outer Continental Shelf rents, bonuses, and royalties .....	6.4	5.4	6.4
All other user charges .....	39.2	84.1	50.0
Subtotal, user charges deposited in receipt accounts .....	110.5	156.8	128.5
<b>Other collections deposited in receipt accounts:</b>			
Military assistance program sales .....	29.3	29.7	27.1
Interest received from credit financing accounts .....	36.5	54.4	59.1
Proceeds, GSE equity related transactions .....	72.5	23.4	19.8
All other collections deposited in receipt accounts .....	85.1	52.3	46.4
Subtotal, other collections deposited in receipt accounts .....	223.3	159.8	152.4
Subtotal, offsetting receipts .....	333.8	316.6	280.9
<b>Total, offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public .....</b>	<b>570.2</b>	<b>548.1</b>	<b>524.9</b>
Total, offsetting collections and offsetting receipts excluding off-budget .....	497.9	479.5	454.5
<b>ADDENDUM:</b>			
User charges that are offsetting collections and offsetting receipts <sup>1</sup> .....	318.8	370.2	352.9
Other offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public .....	251.4	177.9	172.0

<sup>1</sup> 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 receipts is recorded in separate expenditure accounts. As

**Table 13–2. OFFSETTING RECEIPTS BY TYPE SUMMARY**  
(In millions of dollars)

Receipt Type	2014 Actual	Estimate					
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Intragovernmental .....	694,571	686,898	770,741	792,361	813,474	862,795	907,127
Receipts from non-Federal sources:							
Proprietary .....	323,036	270,369	259,216	262,996	278,554	290,459	304,142
Offsetting governmental .....	10,731	46,260	21,703	23,536	15,577	14,198	14,493
Total, receipts from non-Federal sources .....	333,767	316,629	280,919	286,532	294,131	304,657	318,635
Total Offsetting receipts .....	1,028,338	1,003,527	1,051,660	1,078,893	1,107,605	1,167,452	1,225,762

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 2016, the table shows that total offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public are estimated to be \$524.9 billion or 3.0 percent of GDP. Of these, an estimated \$244.0 billion are offsetting collections and an estimated \$280.9 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 Medicare Part B premiums, proceeds from military assistance program sales, rents and royalties from Outer Continental Shelf oil extraction, 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](http://www.budget.gov/budget/Analytical_Perspectives) and on the Budget CD-ROM. In total, offsetting receipts are estimated to be \$1,051.7 billion in 2016; \$770.7 billion are from intragovernmental transactions and \$280.9 billion are from the public. The offsetting receipts from the public consist of proprietary receipts (\$259.2 billion) and those classified as offsetting receipts by law or long-standing practice (\$21.7 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 fees<sup>5</sup> 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 2016, only an estimated 1.3 percent of user charges are classified as governmental receipts. As summarized in Table 13–3, total user charges for 2016 are estimated to be \$357.6 billion with \$352.9 billion being offsetting collections or offsetting receipts, and accounting for more than half of all offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public.

**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

<sup>5</sup> 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.

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.<sup>6</sup>

**What is the purpose of user charges?** User charges are intended to improve the efficiency and equity of fi-

nanancing 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 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

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

(In billions of dollars)

	Actual 2014	Estimate	
		2015	2016
Gross outlays to the public .....	4,076.3	4,306.7	4,524.4
Offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public:			
User charges <sup>1</sup> .....	318.8	370.2	352.9
Other .....	251.4	177.9	172.0
Subtotal, offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public .....	570.2	548.1	524.9
Net outlays .....	3,506.1	3,758.6	3,999.5

<sup>1</sup> \$5.1 billion of the total user charges for 2014 were classified as governmental receipts, and the remainder were classified as offsetting collections and offsetting receipts. \$4.3 billion and \$4.7 billion of the total user charges for 2015 and 2016 are classified as governmental receipts, respectively.



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.<sup>7</sup> If the Government is

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

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 \$4.7 billion in 2016 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 \$352.9 billion in 2016, 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.

### III. USER CHARGE PROPOSALS

As shown in Table 13-1, an estimated \$244.0 billion of user charges for 2016 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 \$280.9 billion of user charges for 2016 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 \$1.8 billion in 2016 and an average of \$14.6 billion per year from 2017-25. 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, 2016, and in each subsequent year through February 28, 2019, 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 in-

cludes 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 fee for revisits of health care facilities in the Survey and Certification program 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 of 2013 (BBA), 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 \$4.3 billion in additional discretionary offsetting collections and \$12.6 billion for deficit reduction.

The 2016 Budget proposes to increase the \$5.60 fee established by the BBA to \$6.00 for 2016 and by an additional 50 cents annually from 2017 to 2019, resulting in a fee of \$7.50 in 2019 that will capture 52 percent of

the costs of aviation security in 2019 and 70 percent by 2025. Under this proposal, all additional collections in 2016 will be deposited in the general fund for deficit reduction. Starting in 2017, additional collections would be allocated between general fund deposits and discretionary offsetting collections. In total, this proposal will increase receipts by an estimated \$11.5 billion from 2016 through 2025. Of that amount, \$6.1 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 repealed the Aviation Security Infrastructure Fee, effective October 1, 2014, causing offsetting collections to decrease by \$4.2 billion over ten years. The 2016 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 \$3.8 billion from 2017 through 2025.

## 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, with a focus on 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. According to agency data, BLM currently spends more than \$40 million on managing the compliance inspection program. Inspection costs include, among other things, the salaries and travel expenses of inspectors. In 2016, the Budget proposes a \$10 million increase in funding to strengthen the BLM inspections and enforcement program, with these costs to be offset by higher fees on industry users. In addition, in 2016, the Budget proposes to charge industry users fees to offset \$38 million in existing inspection and enforcement program costs, resulting in a \$38 million reduction in general fund appropriations for BLM. The proposed fees will generate approximately \$48 million in 2016, thereby re-

quiring energy developers on Federal lands to fund the majority of 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.

**Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS): Non-toxic shot review and approval fees.** The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, as amended, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to regulate the take of migratory birds. As part of that responsibility, FWS currently approves non-toxic shot under 50 CFR 10.134. The Budget proposes to allow for the spending of a new fee for the review of non-toxic shot that FWS recently established pursuant to regulation at 50 CFR Part 20. The new fee is \$20,000 per application, and will be collected pursuant to the general fee authority found in 31 U.S.C. 9701. No fees have yet been collected, but the anticipated fee collection over 10 years is less than \$400,000.

### 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 2017, and it is estimated that in 2017 HSR fees would total \$340 million (\$170 million for each of Federal Trade Commission and DOJ Antitrust Division), an increase of \$128 million per year (\$64 million for each of Federal Trade Commission and DOJ Antitrust Division).

### 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, 2016. 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 fee increase.** The Budget includes a proposal to increase certain Border Crossing Card (BCC) fees. The proposal would allow the fee charged for BCC minor applicants to be set administratively rather than

statutorily. Administrative fee setting will allow the fee charged BCC applicants to better reflect the associated cost of service, similar to other fees charged for consular services. The proposal would set the BCC fee for minors equal to one-half the fee for adults by amending current law, which sets the fee at \$13. Annual BCC fee collections are projected to increase by \$17 million (from \$4 million to \$21 million) beginning in 2016 as a result of this change.

### Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC)

**CFTC fee.** The Budget proposes an amendment to the Commodity Exchange Act, effective in 2016, authorizing the CFTC to collect fees from its regulated community equal to the agency's annual appropriation. This will make CFTC funding more consistent with the funding mechanisms in place for other Federal financial regulators.

### Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC)

**Import surveillance user fee.** The fee, effective in 2017, will support a new CPSC initiative to keep dangerous products out of the hands of U.S. consumers. CPSC will proactively detect and stop hazardous products that do not meet safety standards from entering U.S. ports, while expediting compliant trade. The program will use 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 Transportation

**Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA): 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 pipeline 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.

**PHMSA: Hazardous materials special permits and approvals fees.** The Generating Renewal, Opportunity, and Work with Accelerated Mobility, Efficiency, and Rebuilding of Infrastructure and Communities throughout America (GROW AMERICA) Act proposal includes language to collect new fees from companies and individuals involved in the transport of hazardous materials who seek waivers from the Hazardous Materials Regulations.



The fees will provide a discretionary offset and fund some of PHMSA's costs associated with special permit and approvals processes.

## 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 2016 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 2018 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. This proposal is estimated to save \$19 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 2016.

*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 2016.

*Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS): 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 that may allow APHIS to issue permits that acknowledge that regulated entities are providing sufficient safeguards in the testing of biotechnologically derived products.

*Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS): Conservation user fee.* The BBA 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 2019, this proposal would restructure income-related premiums by increasing the lowest income-related premium 5 percentage points and creating new tiers every 12.5 percentage points until the highest tier is capped at 90 percent. The proposal also maintains the income thresholds associated with 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 Part B premium surcharge.** Medigap policies are private insurance policies that provide supplemental coverage for certain costs not covered by Medicare such as co-pays and deductibles. Medigap policies with low cost-sharing requirements, those that provide nearly first-dollar Medigap coverage, reduce the effectiveness of Medicare cost-sharing provisions intended to promote efficient health care choices. The Budget proposes a Part B premium surcharge on new Medicare beneficiaries beginning in 2019 who purchase Medigap policies with particularly low cost-sharing requirements. The surcharge would be equal to approximately 15 percent of the average Medigap premium or 30 percent of the Part B premium.

**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 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 these fee increases will allow CBP to recover more costs associated with customs related inspections, and reduce waiting times by supporting the hiring of 900 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 1,400 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 2016-2019. The fee would be \$7.50 per one-way trip beginning in 2019 and would generate \$5.4 billion in mandatory receipts 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, elimination of interest accruals on company overpayments of royalties, and permanent repeal of DOI's authority to accept in-kind royalty payments. Collectively, these reforms will generate roughly \$2.5 billion in net receipts to the Treasury over 10 years, of which about \$1.7 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.

### Executive Office of the President (EOP)

*Spectrum Relocation Fund flexibility.* The Spectrum Relocation Fund (SRF) was created by the Commercial Spectrum Enhancement Act of 2004 (CSEA) to compensate Federal agencies for the costs of relocating operations from spectrum bands repurposed for commercial use via auction. The Office of Management and Budget in consultation with the Department of Commerce's National Telecommunications and Information Administration administers the SRF and determines the appropriate payment to agencies. The Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 amended the CSEA to enable the SRF to make payments for additional types of expenses, such as those associated with pre-auction costs and spectrum sharing arrangements, as long as those payments could enhance the value of future spectrum auctions and met other criteria spelled out in the CSEA. The Administration proposes expanding eligible uses of the SRF by amending or eliminating certain existing restrictions to facilitate more efficient spectrum usage and telecommunications investment by Federal agencies, as well as make more Federal spectrum available for commercial applications such as mobile broadband. The proposal is expected to enable productive use of an additional \$500 million in balances from prior auctions in the SRF for high return-on-investment activities that are conservatively expected to increase the value of future auctions or sharing arrangements of Federal spectrum by \$1.5 billion. In addition to generating \$1 billion in net deficit reduction for taxpayers, the proposal will also support the President's goal of making available an additional 500 megahertz of spectrum for commercial use by 2020.

### 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 2016–2025. 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 wireless broadband use by 2017, subject to sharing arrangements with Federal weather satellites. Currently, the spectrum is being used for radiosondes (weather balloons) and is slated for use by a new weather satellite that is scheduled for launch in 2016. Before 2016, NOAA plans to alter the radiosondes operations to not interfere with weather satellite transmissions. If this proposal is enacted, NOAA would move the radiosondes to another frequency, allowing the spectrum to be repurposed for commercial use with limited protection zones for the remaining weather satellite downlinks. 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 and incur \$70 million in relocation costs, leaving net savings of \$230 million 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 reauthorize

the special assessment on domestic utilities for deposit into the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund. Established in 1992, the Fund pays, subject to appropriations, the decontamination and decommissioning costs of the Department of Energy's gaseous diffusion plants in Tennessee, Ohio, and Kentucky. Additional resources, from the proposed special assessment, are required due to higher-than-expected cleanup costs.

#### **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 sufficiently to meet their share of the costs of activities financed from this fund. The additional revenue would help finance future capital investments in these waterways to support economic growth. 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 current excise tax on diesel fuel used in inland waterways commerce, which the Congress recently increased to 29 cents per gallon, will not produce the revenue needed to cover the required 50 percent of these costs.



**Table 13-4. USER CHARGE PROPOSALS IN THE 2016 BUDGET <sup>1</sup>**

(Estimated collections in millions of dollars)

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2016-2020	2016-2025
<b>OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS AND OFFSETTING RECEIPTS</b>													
<b>DISCRETIONARY:</b>													
<i>Offsetting collections</i>													
<b>Department of Agriculture</b>													
Forest Service: Grazing administrative processing fee .....	.....	15	15	15	15	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	60	60
<b>Department of Commerce</b>													
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration permitting fee .....	.....	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<b>Department of Health and Human Services</b>													
Food and Drug Administration (FDA): Food facilities registration, inspection, and import fees .....	.....	163	166	169	171	173	177	180	184	187	191	842	1,761
FDA: International courier fees .....	.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	30	64
FDA: Cosmetic facility registration fees .....	.....	20	20	21	21	21	22	22	23	23	23	103	216
FDA: Food contact substances notification fee .....	.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	25	54
FDA: Export certification user fee cap increase .....	.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	20	43
Health Resources and Services Administration: 340B Pharmacy Affairs fee .....	.....	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	40	80
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services: Survey and certification revisit fee .....	.....	*	5	10	10	20	25	25	25	25	25	45	170
<b>Department of Homeland Security</b>													
Transportation Security Administration (TSA): Aviation passenger security fee increase .....	.....	.....	395	595	708	709	711	713	735	754	773	2,407	6,093
TSA: Aviation security infrastructure fee .....	.....	.....	420	420	420	420	420	420	420	420	420	1,680	3,780
<b>Department of Housing and Urban Development</b>													
Federal Housing Administration: Administrative support fee .....	.....	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	150	300
<b>Department of the Interior</b>													
Bureau of Land Management (BLM): Public lands oil and gas lease inspection fees .....	.....	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	240	480
BLM: Grazing administrative processing fee .....	.....	17	17	17	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	51	51
Fish and Wildlife Service: Non-toxic shot review and approval fees .....	.....	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<b>Department of Justice</b>													
Antitrust Division: Increase Hart-Scott-Rodino fees .....	.....	.....	64	65	67	68	69	71	72	73	75	264	624
<b>Department of State</b>													
Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative surcharge extension .....	.....	316	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	316	316
Border Crossing Card fee increase .....	.....	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	85	170
<b>Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC)</b>													
CFTC fee .....	.....	.....	328	335	338	341	348	355	362	369	377	1,342	3,153
<b>Consumer Product Safety Commission</b>													
Import surveillance user fee .....	.....	.....	19	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	127	307
<b>Federal Trade Commission</b>													
Increase Hart-Scott-Rodino fees .....	.....	.....	64	65	67	68	69	71	72	73	75	264	624
<i>Offsetting receipts</i>													
<b>Department of Transportation</b>													
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA): Pipeline design review fees .....	.....	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	10	25
PHMSA: Hazardous materials special permits and approvals fees .....	.....	12	12	12	12	12	13	13	13	13	13	60	125
Subtotal, discretionary user charge proposals .....	.....	663	1,645	1,880	1,985	1,988	2,011	2,029	2,066	2,097	2,132	8,161	18,496
<b>MANDATORY:</b>													
<i>Offsetting collections</i>													
<b>Department of Agriculture</b>													
Biobased labeling fee .....	.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	10
Rural Housing Service: Guaranteed Underwriting System fee .....	.....	.....	.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	12	32

Table 13-4. USER CHARGE PROPOSALS IN THE 2016 BUDGET <sup>1</sup>—Continued

(Estimated collections in millions of dollars)

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2016-2020	2016-2025
<b>Department of Labor</b>													
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation: Premium increases .....		-179	-179	1,194	1,460	1,823	2,139	2,589	3,025	3,402	3,731	4,119	19,005
Foreign Labor Certification fees .....		38	78	81	85	88	92	96	100	104	109	370	871
<b>Environmental Protection Agency</b>													
Confidential Business Information management fee .....			2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	14	34
<i>Offsetting receipts</i>													
<b>Department of Agriculture</b>													
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 user fee .....			4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	16	36
<b>Department of Health and Human Services</b>													
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS): Income-related premium increase under Medicare Parts B and D .....					2,090	5,790	7,870	9,450	11,350	13,600	16,260	7,880	66,410
CMS: Medicare Part B premium surcharge .....					90	220	370	530	710	910	1,140	310	3,970
CMS: Allow collection of application fees from individual providers .....		9	9	9	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	46	96
CMS: Establish registration process for clearinghouses and billing agents .....		14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	80	186
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
<b>Department of Homeland Security</b>													
Customs and Border Protection: COBRA fee .....		130	180	187	193	198	203	207	212	216		888	1,726
CBP: Express Consignment Courier Facilities fee .....		8	11	12	12	12	13	13	13	14		55	108
CBP: Increase immigration inspection user fee (IUF) and lift IUF limitation .....		214	296	307	314	322	329	337	345	353	361	1,453	3,178
TSA: Aviation passenger security fee increase .....		195	200	350	600	625	650	675	680	690	700	1,970	5,365
<b>Department of the Interior</b>													
Federal oil and gas management reforms .....		50	120	125	150	170	185	200	215	225	240	615	1,680
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	6	10	12	3						36	36
<b>Environmental Protection Agency</b>													
Pre-manufacture notice fee .....		4	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	36	76
<b>Executive Office of the President</b>													
Spectrum Relocation Fund flexibility .....			125	175	200	250	250	250	200	50		750	1,500
<b>Federal Communications Commission</b>													
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 .....		777	1,504	3,268	6,020	10,327	12,938	15,191	17,706	20,428	23,420	21,896	111,579
Subtotal, user charge proposals that are offsetting collections and offsetting receipts .....		1,440	3,149	5,148	8,005	12,315	14,949	17,220	19,772	22,525	25,552	30,057	130,075
<b>GOVERNMENTAL RECEIPTS</b>													
<b>Department of Energy</b>													
Reauthorize special assessment on domestic nuclear facilities .....		204	208	213	218	223	228	233	238	244	249	1,066	2,258
<b>Corps of Engineers - Civil Works</b>													
Reform inland waterways funding .....		113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	565	1,130
Subtotal, governmental receipts user charge proposals .....		317	321	326	331	336	341	346	351	357	362	1,631	3,388
<b>Total, user charge proposals</b> .....		<b>1,757</b>	<b>3,470</b>	<b>5,474</b>	<b>8,336</b>	<b>12,651</b>	<b>15,290</b>	<b>17,566</b>	<b>20,123</b>	<b>22,882</b>	<b>25,914</b>	<b>31,688</b>	<b>133,463</b>

\* \$500,000 or less.

<sup>1</sup> A positive sign indicates an increase in collections.