



Omnibus Appropriations Acts: Overview of Recent Practices

Jessica Tollestrup

Analyst on Congress and the Legislative Process

August 25, 2010

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

RL32473

Summary

Omnibus appropriations acts have become a significant feature of the legislative process in recent years as Congress and the President have used them more frequently to bring action on the regular appropriations cycle to a close. Following a discussion of pertinent background information, this report reviews the recent enactment of such measures and briefly addresses several issues raised by their use.

For nearly two centuries, regular appropriations acts were considered by the House and Senate as individual measures and enacted into law as freestanding laws. In 1950, the House and Senate undertook a one-time experiment in improving legislative efficiency by considering all of the regular appropriations acts for FY1951 in a single bill, the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1950. The following year, the House and Senate returned to the practice of considering the regular appropriations acts individually.

During the 25-year period covering FY1986-FY2010, a total of 318 regular appropriations acts were considered that were eventually enacted into law. Of these, 190 (58.5%) were enacted as freestanding measures and 128 (41.5%) were enacted in omnibus legislation. On average, each year nearly eight (7.6) regular appropriations acts were enacted into law as freestanding measures and about five (5.1) were enacted into law in omnibus legislation.

During this period, 17 different omnibus measures were enacted into law for 15 different fiscal years (two separate omnibus appropriations acts were enacted for both FY2001 and FY2009). Each of the measures funded between two and 13 regular appropriations acts, on average funding over seven (7.5) of them.

Twelve of the omnibus measures were bills or joint resolutions carrying the designation “omnibus,” “consolidated,” or “omnibus consolidated” appropriations in the title; four were continuing appropriations acts (FY1986, FY1987, FY1988, and FY2009); one was a continuing resolution (FY2007); and one was the VA-HUD Appropriations Act for FY2001, which also included the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for FY2001.

In addition to the customary concern—of sacrificing the opportunity for debate and amendment for greater legislative efficiency—that arises whenever complex legislation is considered under time constraints, the use of omnibus appropriations acts has generated controversy for other reasons. These include whether adequate consideration was given to regular appropriations acts prior to their incorporation into omnibus appropriations legislation, the use of across-the-board spending cuts, and the inclusion of significant legislative (rather than funding) provisions.

This report will be updated as warranted.

Contents

Background	1
Omnibus Appropriations Acts: FY1986-FY2010	2
Selected Issues in the Use of Omnibus Appropriations Acts	5
Prior Consideration of Regular Appropriations Acts	5
Across-the-Board Spending Cuts.....	6
Inclusion of Legislative Provisions	8

Tables

Table 1. Omnibus Appropriations Acts: FY1986-FY2010.....	3
Table 2. Prior Floor Consideration of Individual Appropriations Acts	6
Table 3. Detail on Omnibus Appropriations Acts: FY1986-FY2010.....	9

Contacts

Author Contact Information	11
Acknowledgments	11

Omnibus appropriations acts have become a significant feature of the legislative process in recent years as Congress and the President have resorted more frequently to their use to bring action on the regular appropriations cycle to a close. Following a discussion of pertinent background information, this report reviews the recent use of such measures and briefly addresses several issues that their use raises.

Background

Each year, Congress and the President enact discretionary spending¹ in the form of regular appropriations acts, as well as continuing and supplemental appropriations acts.² The number of regular appropriations acts had been fixed at 13 for several decades,³ but a realignment of the House and Senate Appropriations subcommittees at the beginning of the 109th Congress reduced the number of regular appropriations acts normally considered each year to 11 (starting with the FY2006 cycle).⁴ The number of regular appropriations acts was increased to 12 at the beginning of the 110th Congress (starting with the FY2008 cycle) due to further subcommittee realignment and has remained at that level for the 111th Congress.

If action is not completed on all of the regular appropriations acts toward the end of a congressional session, Congress sometimes will combine the unfinished appropriations acts into an omnibus measure. In some instances, action on the unfinished appropriations acts carries over into the following session. An omnibus act may set forth the full text of each of the regular appropriations acts included therein, or it may enact them individually by cross-reference. For omnibus bills that take the form of continuing resolutions, however, it is important to distinguish between those that provide spending authority for more than one designated area based on a rate, versus those that combine full appropriations bills (either in text or via cross-reference) into a single package. Only those in the later class are counted as omnibus appropriations acts.

The House and Senate consider annual appropriations acts, and other budgetary legislation, within constraints established in a yearly budget resolution required by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. Budget resolution policies are enforced by points of order that may be raised during House and Senate consideration of spending, revenue, and debt-limit legislation.⁵ On occasion, budget policies may be modified by agreements reached between congressional leaders and the President; such modifications may be accommodated during legislative action through the use of waivers of points of order, emergency spending designations, and other budgetary or procedural devices.

¹ *Discretionary spending*, which accounts for roughly one-third of total federal spending, is spending that is under the control of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. For the most part, discretionary spending funds the routine operations of the federal government. It is distinguished from *direct spending*, which is controlled by the legislative committees in substantive law and funds such mandatory programs as Social Security and Medicare. Discretionary spending and direct spending together make up total federal spending.

² For background on the appropriations process, see CRS Report 97-684, *The Congressional Appropriations Process: An Introduction*, by Sandy Streeter.

³ For information on changes in the number of regular appropriations acts over the years, see CRS Report RL31572, *Appropriations Subcommittee Structure: History of Changes from 1920-2007*, by James V. Saturno.

⁴ The Senate Appropriations Committee reported a twelfth regular appropriations act, for the District of Columbia, but in final legislative action it was incorporated into another bill.

⁵ For a general discussion of budget enforcement procedures, see CRS Report 98-721, *Introduction to the Federal Budget Process*, by Robert Keith.

During the period covering FY1991-FY2002, legislative action on annual appropriations acts also was subject to limits on discretionary spending established by the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA) of 1990, as amended. Under this statutory mechanism, separate discretionary spending limits were applied to two different measurements of spending—budget authority and outlays. The discretionary spending limits were enforced by the sequestration process, which involved automatic, largely across-the-board reductions in discretionary spending in order to eliminate any breach of the limits.⁶

For nearly two centuries, regular appropriations acts were considered by the House and Senate as individual measures and enacted into law by the President as freestanding laws. In 1950, the House and Senate undertook a one-time experiment in improving legislative efficiency by considering all of the regular appropriations acts for FY1951 in a single bill, the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1950 (81st Congress, P.L. 759, September 6, 1950).⁷ The following year, the House and Senate returned to the practice of considering the regular appropriations acts individually.

Beginning in the late 1970s, continuing appropriations acts sometimes have taken the form of omnibus legislation, generally incorporating the full text of multiple regular appropriations acts for full-year funding instead of providing short-term funding by formula.⁸ In recent years, the House and Senate on several occasions have combined multiple regular appropriations acts into “consolidated” appropriations measures, sometimes enacting individual bills by cross-reference.

Omnibus Appropriations Acts: FY1986-FY2010

During the 25-year period covering FY1986-FY2010, 17 different omnibus measures were enacted into law for 15 different fiscal years (two separate omnibus appropriations acts were enacted for both FY2001 and FY2009). The 17 omnibus appropriations acts covered a total of 128 regular appropriations acts. Each of the measures funded between two and 13 regular appropriations acts, on average funding over seven (7.5) of them.

Twelve of the omnibus measures were bills or joint resolutions carrying the designation “omnibus,” “consolidated,” or “omnibus consolidated” appropriations in the title; four were continuing appropriations acts (FY1986, FY1987, FY1988, and FY2009); one was a continuing resolution (FY2007); and one was the VA-HUD Appropriations Act for FY2001, which also included the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for FY2001 (see **Table 1**, and, at the end of the report, **Table 3**).

P.L. 110-5, the Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution for FY2007, did not include the text of the regular appropriations acts that it covered; however, in addition to its formulaic funding provisions, it included many adjustments in appropriated levels and other provisions (amounting to more than 50 pages in length as a slip law), so it is counted as an omnibus appropriations act for purposes of this report.

⁶ The sequestration process is discussed in detail in CRS Report RL31137, *Sequestration Procedures Under the 1985 Balanced Budget Act*, by Robert Keith.

⁷ See “The Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1950,” by Dalmus H. Nelson, *Journal of Politics*, vol. 15, no. 2, May 1953.

⁸ For more information on practices relating to the use of continuing appropriations acts, see CRS Report RL32614, *Duration of Continuing Resolutions in Recent Years*, by Jessica Tollestrup.

Table I. Omnibus Appropriations Acts: FY1986-FY2010

- 1. Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 1986**
(P.L. 99-190; December 19, 1985)
- 2. Continuing Appropriations Act, 1987**
(P.L. 99-500; October 18, 1986)
- 3. Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 1988**
(P.L. 100-202; December 22, 1987)
- 4. Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996**
(P.L. 104-134; April 26, 1996)
- 5. Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, 1997**
(P.L. 104-208; September 30, 1996)
- 6. Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999**
(P.L. 105-277; October 21, 1998)
- 7. Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000**
(P.L. 106-113; November 29, 1999)
- 8. Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001**
(P.L. 106-554; December 21, 2000)
- 9. VA-HUD Appropriations Act, 2001**
(P.L. 106-377; October 27, 2000)
- 10. Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003**
(P.L. 108-7; February 20, 2003)
- 11. Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004**
(P.L. 108-199; January 23, 2004)
- 12. Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005**
(P.L. 108-447; December 8, 2004)
- 13. Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007**
(P.L. 110-5; February 15, 2007)
- 14. Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008**
(P.L. 110-161; December 26, 2007)
- 15. Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2009**
(P.L. 110-329; September 30, 2008)
- 16. Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009**
(P.L. 111-8; March 11, 2009)
- 17. Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010**
(P.L. 111-17; December 16, 2009)

Source: Prepared by the Congressional Research Service.

P.L. 106-553 was enacted as an omnibus measure, enacting the Commerce-Justice-State-Judiciary Appropriations Act for FY2001 and the District of Columbia Appropriations Act for FY2001 by cross-reference. However, the provision dealing with District of Columbia appropriations was repealed; therefore, P.L. 106-553 is not counted in this report as an omnibus measure.

During this period, a total of 319 regular appropriations acts were considered. All but one of these acts were enacted into law either individually or as part of an omnibus measure.⁹

Of the 318 measures enacted into law, 190 (58.5%) were enacted as freestanding measures and 128 (41.5%) were enacted in omnibus legislation. On average, each year nearly eight (7.6) regular appropriations acts were enacted into law as freestanding measures and about five (5.1) were enacted into law in omnibus legislation.

Fifty-six (17.6%) of the 318 regular appropriations acts were enacted into law before October 1, the start of the fiscal year. Nine of these measures were included in an omnibus measure (six in FY1997 and three in FY2009) and the rest were enacted as freestanding measures. On average, less than three (2.2) regular appropriations acts each year were enacted before the start of the fiscal year during this period.

Eight of the 12 omnibus appropriations acts bearing the designation “omnibus,” “consolidated,” or “omnibus consolidated” in their title originated in the House as a regular appropriations act and were expanded in coverage (and their titles redesignated) at the stage of resolving House-Senate differences. These included the appropriations acts for

- Defense (H.R. 3610) in FY1997;
- Transportation (H.R. 4238) in FY1999;
- District of Columbia (H.R. 3194) in FY2000;
- Labor-HHS-Education (H.R. 4577) in FY2001;
- Agriculture (H.R. 2673) in FY2004;
- Foreign Operations (H.R. 4818) in FY2005;
- State-Foreign Operations (H.R. 2764) in FY2008; and
- Transportation, Housing and Urban Development (H.R. 3288) in FY2010.

In the case of the FY1997, FY1999, FY2000, FY2001, FY2004, FY2005 and FY2010 omnibus appropriations acts, the transformation from a regular appropriations act into a consolidated appropriations act occurred as part of the conference proceedings between the House and Senate. In the case of the final act listed, for FY2008, conference procedures were not used and the transformation occurred in connection with an exchange of amendments between the two chambers.¹⁰

The acts for FY2000 and FY2001 enacted regular appropriations measures by cross-reference instead of including their full text (except for FY2000 appropriations for the District of Columbia).¹¹

⁹ The Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for FY1992 was not enacted into law. Funding for activities covered by this act was provided in a series of continuing resolutions, culminating with the enactment of P.L. 102-266 on April 1, 1992.

¹⁰ For a discussion of legislative action on the FY2008 measure, see CRS Report RL34298, *Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY2008: Brief Overview*, by Robert Keith.

¹¹ For additional information on the legislative history and structure of recent omnibus appropriations acts, see (1) CRS Report RS20403, *FY2000 Consolidated Appropriations Act: Reference Guide*, by Robert Keith; (2) CRS Report (continued...)

None of the other four omnibus appropriations acts bearing the designation involved the transformation of a regular appropriations act. Three of the acts (one for FY1996 and two for FY2009) originated as an omnibus measure and retained this status throughout its consideration. In FY2003, the omnibus measure originated in the House as a simple continuing resolution (H.J.Res. 2), but was expanded in coverage and redesignated during Senate floor action.

Selected Issues in the Use of Omnibus Appropriations Acts

Several issues pertaining to the use of omnibus appropriations have been the focus of debate in recent years, including the extent to which the regular appropriations acts have received consideration prior to being incorporated into omnibus legislation, the use of across-the-board spending cuts, and the inclusion of legislative provisions.

Prior Consideration of Regular Appropriations Acts

One of the chief concerns regarding the use of omnibus appropriations acts is that it reduces the opportunities Members have to debate and amend the regular appropriations acts that are incorporated therein. This concern may be lessened if the regular appropriations acts eventually incorporated into omnibus legislation are first considered individually on the House and Senate floor.

During the FY1986-FY2010 period, the House was more likely than the Senate to have given prior floor consideration to regular appropriations acts eventually incorporated into omnibus legislation, with the House considering 93 out of the 128 regular appropriations acts while the Senate considered 66 (see **Table 2**). For both the House and the Senate, between FY1986-FY1999, the majority of appropriations acts that were ultimately incorporated into omnibus legislation received floor consideration each year. However, starting in FY2000, both chambers display a greater tendency to incorporate acts into omnibus legislation that did not receive prior floor consideration. Between FY2000-FY2010, the House failed to consider the majority of legislation that was eventually included in the omnibus package in three of the fiscal years. During this same period, the Senate failed to consider the majority of legislation eventually included in the omnibus six of the years

FY2009 was particularly notable in this regard. For the first omnibus (composed of the Defense, Homeland Security, and Military Construction/Veteran's Affairs appropriations acts), while the Senate failed to separately consider the Military Construction/Veteran's Affairs act (H.R. 6599), the House considered on the floor all three acts contained within the legislation. For the second

(...continued)

RS20756, *FY2001 Consolidated Appropriations Act: Reference Guide*, by Robert Keith; (3) CRS Report RS21433, *FY2003 Consolidated Appropriations Resolution: Reference Guide*, by Robert Keith; (4) CRS Report RS21684, *FY2004 Consolidated Appropriations Act: Reference Guide*, by Robert Keith; (5) CRS Report RS21983, *FY2005 Consolidated Appropriations Act: Reference Guide*, by Robert Keith; (6) CRS Report RL34298, *Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY2008: Brief Overview*, by Robert Keith; and (7) CRS Report RL34711, *Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY2009 (P.L. 110-329): An Overview*, by Robert Keith.

omnibus, both the House and the Senate failed to separately consider all nine pieces of appropriations legislation that were eventually included in the final package.

Table 2. Prior Floor Consideration of Individual Appropriations Acts

Fiscal Year	House		Senate	
	Considered	Not Considered	Considered	Not Considered
1986	5	2	5	2
1987	13	0	8	5
1988	10	3	10	3
1996	5	0	5	0
1997	6	0	4	2
1999	7	1	6	2
2000	1	4	4	1
2001	0	6	2	4
2003	4	7	2	9
2004	7	0	6	1
2005	8	1	2	7
2007	8	1	2	7
2008	11	0	6	5
2009	3	9	2	10
2010	6	0	3	3
Total:	93	34	66	61

Source: Prepared by the Congressional Research Service.

Across-the-Board Spending Cuts

To adhere to restraints imposed by congressional budget resolutions, the discretionary spending limits, and ad hoc budget agreements between congressional leaders and the President, or to meet other purposes, Congress and the President from time to time incorporate across-the-board cuts in discretionary budget authority into annual appropriations acts.¹² During the six fiscal years covering FY2000-FY2010, five government-wide, across-the-board spending cuts were included in omnibus appropriations acts. In addition, an across-the-board cut was included in the Defense Appropriations Act for FY2006, a year in which all of the regular appropriations acts were enacted separately.¹³

¹² This topic is discussed in more detail in CRS Report RL32153, *Across-the-Board Spending Cuts in End-of-Session Appropriations Acts*, by Robert Keith.

¹³ The act, which became P.L. 109-148 on December 30, 2005, included in Division B, Section 3801(a), a government-wide spending cut of 1% (118 Stat. 2791-2792). Emergency requirements and spending for the Veterans Administration were exempted from the cut, which was expected to reduce total budget authority by about \$8.5 billion. For additional information, see OMB Bulletin 06-02, *Guidance on Implementing the Government-wide Across-the-* (continued...)

The government-wide across-the-board spending cuts included in omnibus appropriations acts ranged in size from 0.22% to 0.80% of covered appropriations, and an estimated \$1.1 billion to \$3.5 billion in savings:

- the 0.38% cut for FY2000 in P.L. 106-113 saved an estimated \$2.4 billion in budget authority;
- the 0.22% cut for FY2001 in P.L. 106-554 saved an estimated \$1.1 billion in budget authority;
- the 0.65% cut for FY2003 in P.L. 108-7 saved an estimated \$2.6 billion in budget authority;
- the 0.59% cut for FY2004 in P.L. 108-199 saved an estimated \$2.8 billion in budget authority; and
- the 0.80% cut for FY2005 in P.L. 108-447 saved an estimated \$3.5 billion in budget authority.

The 0.59% across-the-board cut in nondefense programs for FY2004 in P.L. 108-199 was accompanied by a requirement that defense appropriations, which were exempt from the 0.59% cut, be reduced by a fixed amount (\$1.8 billion). This requirement was repealed by Section 9003(c) of the Defense Appropriations Act for FY2005, which President Bush signed into law on August 5, 2004, as P.L. 108-287 (118 Stat. 951 et. seq.).

Omnibus appropriations acts sometimes include other across-the-board spending cuts that apply to individual appropriations acts, as set forth in separate divisions of the omnibus legislation. P.L. 108-199, for example, included two other requirements for much smaller uniform spending cuts in nondefense programs: (1) a 0.465% cut in funding in the Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations division, estimated to yield \$188.7 million in savings; and (2) a cut of \$50 million in administrative expenses for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Further, P.L. 108-447 included three other provisions requiring across-the-board spending cuts focused on particular divisions of the act: (1) a 0.54% cut in the Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations division, estimated to save \$229 million; (2) a 0.594% cut in the Interior Appropriations division, estimated to save \$120 million; and (3) a cut of \$18 million in the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations division, applicable to administrative and related expenses for departmental management (except for the Food and Drug Administration and the Indian Health Service).

The Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY2008 also employed across-the-board spending cuts, but they were not government wide. Instead, they applied to six of the divisions of the act, ranging in size from 0.25% (legislative branch) to 1.747% (Labor-HHS-Education). The Office of Management and Budget estimated total savings from the cuts (excluding cuts affecting the legislative branch) at \$3.357 billion in discretionary budget authority.

(...continued)

Board Reduction in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, FY2006 (H.R. 2863), January 5, 2006, available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/omb/bulletins/fy2006/b06-02.pdf>

The significance of the spending cuts differed with regard to budget enforcement. The FY2000 cut was an integral component of the plan that successfully avoided a sequester at the end of the session. The FY2001 cut contributed to overall discretionary spending being below the statutory limits, but the across-the-board cut proved to be unnecessary in avoiding a sequester. With regard to the FY2003 cut, the House and Senate did not reach agreement on a budget resolution and the statutory discretionary limits had expired the fiscal year before; nonetheless, the across-the-board cut was necessary in adhering to an informal limit reached between congressional leaders and President Bush and avoiding a veto of the omnibus appropriations act. Similarly, the FY2004, FY2005, and FY2008 cuts were necessary to keep the costs of the measures under overall limits acceptable to the President.

Although the across-the-board spending cuts were viewed as essential elements in meeting budget enforcement goals, some Members criticized them as involving a formulaic approach that undermined the process of making deliberate, informed choices regarding appropriate funding levels.

Inclusion of Legislative Provisions

Although House and Senate rules and practices over the decades have promoted the separate consideration of legislation and appropriations, the separation has not been ironclad. In many instances, during the routine operation of the annual appropriations process, minor provisions are included in appropriations acts that technically may be regarded under the rules as legislative in nature, but do not significantly undermine the dichotomy between legislation and appropriations. At other times, however, the legislative provisions included in annual appropriations acts—especially omnibus appropriations acts—have been much more substantial and have represented a deliberate suspension of the usual procedural boundaries.

Both House and Senate rules contain prohibitions against the inclusion of legislation in appropriations bills. Clauses 2(b) and 2(c) of House Rule XXI prohibit the inclusion of legislative provisions on regular appropriations bills reported by the committee or added during the floor process. However, continuing resolutions are not considered by House rules to be regular appropriations bills and thus do not fall under the purview of these restrictions. In the Senate, Rule XVI prohibits the inclusion of legislative provisions in general appropriations legislation, but allows exceptions in specified circumstances. As the rules in the House and Senate barring the inclusion of legislation in appropriations are not self-enforcing, can be waived, and allow some exceptions, omnibus appropriations acts have sometimes been used as vehicles to address substantive legislative concerns.

In recent years, there are many examples of the incorporation of significant legislative provisions within omnibus appropriations acts. The Consolidated Appropriations Resolution for FY2003 (P.L. 108-7) included the Agricultural Assistance Act of 2003, amendments to the Price-Anderson Act and the Homeland Security Act, and provisions dealing with the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, among other legislative matters. The Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY2008 (P.L. 110-161) included such items as the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Act of 1999 Amendments, the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998 Amendments, the ED 1.0 Act, and the Kids in Disasters Well-being, Safety, and Health Act of 2007. Although the inclusion of significant legislative matters may represent an efficient way to conclude legislative business as a congressional session comes to an end, it can also raise concerns as to whether this context provides Members with an adequate opportunity to debate and amend them.

Table 3. Detail on Omnibus Appropriations Acts: FY1986-FY2010

Fiscal Year	Congress/ Session ^a	Number of Regular Appropriations Acts:			Omnibus Appropriations Act
		Enacted by Start of Fiscal Year	Enacted as Freestanding Legislation	Enacted in Omnibus Legislation	
1986	99/1	0	6	7	Further Continuing Appropriations Act, FY1986 (P.L. 99-190, December 19, 1985)
1987	99/2	0	0	13	Continuing Appropriations Act, FY1987 (P.L. 99-591, October 18, 1986)
1988	100/1	0	0	13	Further Continuing Appropriations Act, FY1988 (P.L. 100-202, December 22, 1987)
1989	100/2	7	13	0	[none]
1990	101/1	1	13	0	[none]
1991	101/2	0	13	0	[none]
1992	102/1	3	12	0	[none]
1993	102/2	1	13	0	[none]
1994	103/1	2	13	0	[none]
1995	103/2	13	13	0	[none]
1996	104/1	0	8	5	Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-134, April 26, 1996)
1997	104/2	13	7	6	Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, 1997 (P.L. 104-208, September 30, 1996)
1998	105/1	0	13	0	[none]
1999	105/2	1	5	8	Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (P.L. 105-277; October 21, 1998)
2000	106/1	4	8	5	Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000 (P.L. 106-113, November 29, 1999)

Fiscal Year	Congress/ Session ^a	Number of Regular Appropriations Acts:			Omnibus Appropriations Act
		Enacted by Start of Fiscal Year	Enacted as Freestanding Legislation	Enacted in Omnibus Legislation	
2001	106/2	2	7	6	Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001 [3 acts] (P.L. 106-554, December 21, 2000) and VA-HUD Appropriations Act, 2001 [2 acts] (P.L. 106-377, October 27, 2000)
2002	107/1	0	13	0	[none]
2003	107/2	0	2	11	Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003 (P.L. 108-7, February 20, 2003)
2004	108/1	2	6	7	Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L. 108-199; January 23, 2004)
2005	108/2	1	4	9	Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (P.L. 108-447; December 8, 2004)
2006	109/1	2	12	0	[none]
2007	109/2	1	2	9	Revised Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2007 (P.L. 110-5; February 15, 2007)
2008	110/1	0	1	11	Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (P.L. 110-161; December 26, 2007)
2009	110/2	3	0	12	Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2009 (P.L. 110-329; September 30, 2008) and Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 (P.L. 111-8; March 11, 2009)
2010	111/1	0	6	6	Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 (P.L. 111-17; December 16, 2009)
	Total	56	190	128	—
	Annual Average	2.2	7.6	5.1	—

Source: Calendars of the United States House of Representatives, 99th-111th Congresses, Legislative Information System.

a. In five instances, covering FY1996, FY2003, FY2004, FY2007, and FY2009, omnibus appropriations legislation was not enacted into law until the following session.

Author Contact Information

Jessica Tollestrup
Analyst on Congress and the Legislative Process
jtollestrup@crs.loc.gov, 7-0941

Acknowledgments

The original version of this report was written by Robert Keith, formerly a Specialist in American National Government at CRS. The listed author has revised and updated this report and is available to respond to inquiries on the subject.