



## COMMITTEE FOR A RESPONSIBLE FEDERAL BUDGET

### CHAIRMEN

BILL FRENZEL  
JIM NUSSLE  
TIM PENNY  
CHARLIE STENHOLM

### PRESIDENT

MAYA MACGUINEAS

### DIRECTORS

BARRY ANDERSON  
ERSKINE BOWLES  
CHARLES BOWSHER  
KENT CONRAD  
DAN CRIPPEN  
VIC FAZIO  
WILLIS GRADISON  
WILLIAM HOAGLAND  
JIM JONES  
LOU KERR  
JIM KOLBE  
JAMES MCINTYRE, JR.  
DAVID MINGE  
MARNE OBERNAUER, JR.  
JUNE O'NEILL  
PAUL O'NEILL  
BOB PACKWOOD  
LEON PANETTA  
RUDOLPH PENNER  
PETER PETERSON  
ROBERT REISCHAUER  
ALICE RIVLIN  
CHARLES ROBB  
MARTIN SABO  
ALAN K. SIMPSON  
JOHN SPRATT  
GENE STEUERLE  
DAVID STOCKMAN  
JOHN TANNER  
LAURA TYSON  
GEORGE VOINOVICH  
PAUL VOLCKER  
CAROL COX WAIT  
DAVID M. WALKER  
JOSEPH WRIGHT, JR.

### SENIOR ADVISOR

ROBERT STRAUSS

January 13, 2014

The Honorable Reid Ribble  
United States House of Representatives  
1513 Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Ribble,

I would like to express my appreciation for the bipartisan approach you have taken to address budgetary problems. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget is happy to express our support for a two-year budget cycle, which is the primary objective of the Biennial Budgeting and Enhanced Oversight Act (H.R. 1869), co-sponsored by you and many bipartisan House Members.

The primary benefit of a biennial budget cycle is the extra time it permits Congress and the White House to take a more careful look at our budget and federal programs, particularly those currently on auto-pilot. In order to fix our pressing fiscal problems, we must go through our spending and tax policies with a fine-toothed comb and determine what works, what needs fixing, and what doesn't work. If given additional time, Congress would have more authority to conduct this type of needed oversight. In addition, executive branch agencies will be able to devote more time and attention to ensuring appropriated funds are spent wisely and effectively instead of the time consuming process of producing budget requests and justifications every year.

In addition to increased oversight and exploration of federal programs, the tax code, and possible waste and inefficiencies related to the budget, Congress could use the additional year normally taken up by budget process to undertake a review of broader budgetary issues. These could include reviewing budget concepts, a more careful review of national priorities compared to our national needs, and broader strategic planning. It could also include an examination of the implications of current policies over a longer time horizon.

All of these ideas would help to improve the budget process and our fiscal performance, and would be possible with biennial budgeting. Further, biennial budgeting would provide agencies with funding stability and allow for better long term planning, while also preventing agencies from incurring un-needed payments for fear of reductions in the following year's budget.



While switching to a biennial budget cycle would have many benefits, it is important for policymakers to ensure a biennial system allows flexibility to respond to unforeseen events that occur over the longer budget timespan. For example, policymakers would be wise to consider allowing a process for amending or modifying the budget resolution in the second year in response to changing circumstances, such as an increase in the deficit or economic downturn.

I'd like to stress that while budget process reforms are important, they are still no replacement for the tough budget policy choices that need to be made to address our long term fiscal challenges. However, moving to a biennial system could provide the time needed to focus on important fiscal policy decisions. I greatly appreciate your bipartisan efforts to focus on important budget issues.

Sincerely,

Maya MacGuineas