



Surface Transportation Reauthorization in the 112th Congress: Summary and Sources

Marc Levinson, Coordinator
Section Research Manager

February 10, 2012

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

R42350

CRS Report for Congress

Prepared for Members and Committees of Congress

R11173008

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Highways	2
Transportation Enhancement Program	3
Public Transit.....	3
Passenger Rail.....	6
Freight Transportation	7
Environmental Review of Transportation Projects.....	8
Highway Safety	10
Commercial Trucking Safety	11
Transportation Finance	12
Financial Provisions in Senate Bill.....	12
Financial Provisions in House bill.....	13
Offshore Oil and Gas Revenues	13
Alternative Transportation Account Revenues and Alternative Financing	14

Figures

Figure A-1. CBO Highway Trust Fund Projections.....	16
Figure A-2. MAP-21 Authorizations	17
Figure A-3. MAP-21 Apportionments	19
Figure A-4. H.R. 7 Apportionments.....	21
Figure A-5. Funding for Highway Safety Programs Proposed in Senate	23
Figure A-6. Funding for Commercial Vehicle Safety Programs Proposed in Senate	24

Tables

Table 1. Committee Involvement in Surface Transportation Reauthorization.....	2
Table 2. Proposed Annual Federal Transit Funding in Senate Bill	4
Table 3. Proposed Federal Transit Funding in H.R. 7.....	5
Table 4. Authorized Funding for Amtrak Operating Assistance	6
Table 5. Highway Safety Grants to States.....	11
Table 6. Truck Safety Grants to States.....	11

Appendixes

Appendix. Funding and Financial Data	15
--	----

Contacts

Author Contact Information.....	25
Key Policy Staff.....	25



Introduction

Legislation to reauthorize federal surface transportation programs is under consideration in both houses of Congress.¹ The previous transportation authorization, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA, P.L. 109-59), enacted in 2005, expired on September 30, 2009. Since that time, surface transportation programs and activities have been operated under a series of extensions. The most recent of these, P.L. 112-30, expires on March 31, 2012.

The main obstacle to enactment of a new multi-year bill during the past two years has been the disparity between projected spending and the much lower projections of the revenue flows to the Highway Trust Fund (HTF). Taxes on gasoline and diesel provide approximately 90% of the revenues for the HTF, which historically has funded the entire highway program and roughly 80% of the mass transit program. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has projected that the unexpended balance of the highway account of the HTF will reach zero during FY2013 and that the balance in the Mass Transit Account will reach zero in FY2014 (see Appendix **Figure A-1**).

Surface transportation reauthorization is one of the more legislatively complex issues before the Congress, because it addresses matters under the jurisdictions of many committees. Portions of the pending reauthorization bills, under various bill numbers, were marked up in seven different committees (see **Table 1**) before consolidation under a single bill number in each house.

The Senate reauthorization bill, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (S. 1813; MAP-21), would authorize surface transportation programs for two years, through FY2013. Fully funding the bill would require roughly \$10 billion in revenues or offsets beyond anticipated HTF revenues.² The House bill, the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act (H.R. 7) links the usual surface transportation reauthorization components with provisions designed to increase oil and gas production, the revenues from which would be provided for highway infrastructure. H.R. 7, counting the already appropriated FY2012, is a five-year bill providing for a total authorization of roughly \$260 billion.³ The bills differ significantly in programmatic content and treatment of the HTF. Both are free of program earmarking.

¹ For a detailed review of the underlying issues, see CRS Report R41512, *Surface Transportation Program Reauthorization Issues for the 112th Congress*, coordinated by Robert S. Kirk.

² For the CBO cost estimate for S. 1813, see <http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/127xx/doc12743/s1813feb7.pdf>.

³ For the CBO cost estimate for H.R. 7, see <http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/127xx/doc12751/hr3864.pdf>.

Table I. Committee Involvement in Surface Transportation Reauthorization

Committee	Date of Markup	Bill Number/Provisions
House Natural Resources	February 1, 2012	H.R. 3407, concerning oil and gas leasing in Alaska; H.R. 3408, on oil shale development; H.R. 3410, concerning offshore oil and gas leasing
House Transportation and Infrastructure	February 2, 2012	H.R. 7, including highway, transit, freight, and safety programs and environmental review provisions
House Ways and Means	February 3, 2012	H.R. 3864, revenues for Highway Trust Fund
Senate Environment and Public Works	November 9, 2011	S. 1813, highway programs
Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation	December 14, 2011	S. 1449, S. 1950, highway safety, truck safety, freight
Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs	February 2, 2012	Unnumbered, mass transit
Senate Finance	February 7, 2012	Unnumbered, revenues for Highway Trust Fund

Sources: CRS, *Congressional Quarterly*.

Highways⁴

The Senate bill, MAP-21, proposes a total federal-aid highway program authorization of \$85.3 billion over two years, FY2012 and FY2013 (see Appendix **Figure A-2**). The bill would reduce the total number of highway programs from roughly 90 to 30. While many existing highway programs would be discontinued as separate entities, states would be authorized—although not required—to spend their federal highway funds for many of the same purposes.

The overall federal-aid highway program would be structured around five large “core” programs. These would include the existing Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) and Highway Safety Improvement Programs; a new National Highway Performance Program that consolidates several existing highway programs; a new Transportation Mobility Program to fund a broad array of surface transportation projects; and a new National Freight Network Program. The existing Equity Bonus Program would be discontinued.

MAP-21 would make major changes in the allocation of funds among states and programs by eliminating the various formula factors now attached to individual programs. Instead, each state’s initial amount of the bill’s authorized contract authority would be calculated based on its share of total apportionments and allocations during FY2005-FY2009. These state shares would then be used to calculate the MAP-21 apportionments among the core programs (see Appendix **Figure A-3**). This means that the same allocation formula would apply to each of the five core programs.

The Senate bill also would increase the use of performance measures by requiring states and metropolitan planning organizations to set targets for highway condition and performance. It would expand the use of alternative financing mechanisms and private-sector investment to supplement traditional highway grant funding.

⁴ This section was written by Robert S. Kirk, Specialist in Transportation Policy.

The House bill, H.R. 7, proposes a total federal-aid highway program authorization of \$205 billion over five years. It would consolidate or eliminate many programs, but differently than proposed in MAP-21. H.R. 7 retains and expands both the National Highway System Program and the Surface Transportation Program to include the present Highway Bridge Program. The existing Interstate Maintenance program would be folded into the National Highway System Program, and the Highway Safety Improvement Program would be retained (see Appendix **Figure A-4**).

H.R. 7 includes an Equity Bonus Program with a guarantee that each state's total highway grants each year will equal at least 94% of the motor fuel taxes the state pays into the HTF. The program authorization is capped at \$3.9 billion per year.

In an important change in transportation financing, H.R. 7 would create a new alternative transportation account in the HTF. This account, financed by general fund appropriations, would fund mass transit projects that currently receive a share of the motor fuel tax receipts paid into the HTF. Several highway programs, including the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ), Ferry Boats and Terminals, Puerto Rico Highways, and Territorial Highway Program, would also be funded from the alternative transportation account.

The House bill would also allow expanded tolling of the Interstate system. Subject to certain restrictions, the federal government could participate in projects to add lanes to increase the capacity of a highway and its conversion to a toll facility, so long as the same number of free lanes as existed before the project remain toll free.

Transportation Enhancement Program

Current law requires states to spend about 1.5% of their federal highway funding on Transportation Enhancement projects, which can include constructing sidewalks and bikepaths, conversion of abandoned railway corridors to trails, archeological research on sites uncovered by highway construction, control of outdoor advertising, and mitigating the environmental effects of highway construction. Both bills would eliminate the requirement that states spend federal funds on Transportation Enhancement projects (allowing states to fund such projects if they so choose) and would amend the list of activities eligible for funding as transportation enhancements.

Public Transit⁵

The House provisions relating to the federal transit programs are found in Title II of H.R. 7 and the finance provisions are in H.R. 3864 (the finance provisions have been incorporated into H.R. 7 and, hereafter, are referred to as the finance provisions of H.R. 7). The Senate's transit program provisions are contained in the Federal Public Transportation Act of 2012 and the revenue provisions are in the Highway Investment, Job Creation and Economic Growth Act of 2012. Neither of the Senate's bills has been formally introduced and, hence, both are unnumbered.

The proposed Senate bill would authorize \$10.458 billion for federal transit programs annually for FY2012 and FY2013, the current funding level, with \$8.361 billion coming from the Mass

⁵ This section was written by William J. Mallett, Specialist in Transportation Policy.

Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund and \$2.098 billion from the general fund (see **Table 2**).⁶

Table 2. Proposed Annual Federal Transit Funding in Senate Bill
 Authorizations for FY2012 and FY2013

	Mass Transit Account	General Fund
Administration		\$108,350,000
Planning Programs	\$144,850,000	
Emergency Relief		
Urbanized Area Formula Program	\$4,756,161,500	
Clean Fuels Program	\$65,150,000	
Capital Investment Grants		\$1,955,000,000
Elderly and Disabled	\$248,600,000	
Nonurbanized Area Formula Program	\$591,190,000	
Research, Development, Demonstration, and Development Projects	\$34,000,000	
Transit Cooperative Research Program	\$6,500,000	
Technical Assistance and Standards Development	\$4,500,000	
National Transit Institute	\$5,000,000	
Paul S. Sarbanes Transit in Parks Program		\$26,900,000
Workforce Development and Human Resource Programs	\$2,000,000	
National Transit Database	\$3,850,000	
State of Good Repair	\$1,987,263,500	
Growing States and High Density Formula	\$11,500,000	
Total	\$8,360,565,000	\$2,097,713,000

Source: Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, "Federal Public Transportation Act of 2012, Bill Highlights," http://banking.senate.gov/public/_files/Transit_Bill_Summary_and_Funding_Chart.pdf.

The House bill would authorize the same amount for FY2012 and \$10.498 billion each year for FY2013 through FY2016, with \$8.4 billion from a newly named Alternative Transportation Account of the Highway Trust Fund (see below) and \$2.098 billion from the general fund (**Table 3**).

⁶ Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, "Federal Public Transportation Act of 2012, Bill Highlights," http://banking.senate.gov/public/_files/Transit_Bill_Summary_and_Funding_Chart.pdf.

Table 3. Proposed Federal Transit Funding in H.R. 7

Million Dollars

	FY2012	Annually FY2013-FY2016
Total	\$10,458.3	\$10,498.0
Alternative Transportation Account	8,360.6	8,400.0
Formula and Bus Grants	8,360.6	8,400.0
General Fund	2,097.7	2,098.0
Capital Investment Grants	1,955.0	1,955.0
Research, Training and Outreach, and Technical Assistance	44.0	45.0
Administration	98.7	98.0

Source: H.R. 7, American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act of 2012.

The revenue section of the House surface transportation reauthorization would rename the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund as the Alternative Transportation Account. The legislation would also eliminate the motor fuel taxes that currently go into the Mass Transit Account. Revenue in the Mass Transit Account collected in FY2012 would be transferred to the Highway Account. In place of revenue from the fuels tax, the bill would transfer \$40 billion from the general fund into the Alternative Transportation Account. The Senate Finance Committee's bill would leave the current structure of the Highway Trust Fund unchanged.

Although it eliminates some programs, the House bill largely maintains the current structure of the federal transit program. Among other things, the House bill eliminates the Clean Fuels Grant Program, the Transit in Parks Program, and the Growing and High Density State Formula. The House bill also combines into a single program the New Freedom Program, the Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities Program, and the Jobs Access and Reverse Commute Program. The House bill proposes to distribute funding for the Bus and Bus-Related Facilities Program by formula. In SAFETEA this program was a heavily earmarked discretionary program.

The Senate bill contains some significant restructuring of the federal transit program. The Bus and Bus-Related Facilities Program is eliminated. The existing Fixed Guideway (Rail) Modernization Program would be replaced with a new State of Good Repair (SGR) Grant Program with three elements. First, the new SGR program would still mainly provide funds by formula for the maintenance, repair, and replacement of fixed guideway public transit, but the formula by which these funds are distributed is changed. Second, the new SGR program provides funding by formula for the maintenance, repair, and replacement of bus rapid transit systems. This is called the High Intensity Bus State of Good Repair Program. Third, the SGR program contains a small discretionary grant element for fixed guideway rail systems.

As with the House bill, the Senate bill combines the New Freedom Program and the Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities Program into a single program. This new program in the Senate bill is named the Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program. By contrast with the House bill, the current Jobs Access and Reverse Commute program is shifted to be part of the Urbanized and Non-Urbanized Area Formula programs. The renamed Access to Jobs program requires that recipients spend at least 3% of their Urbanized Area apportionments on projects that are designed to help low income individuals travel to and from jobs. Under the Non-Urbanized Area program, Access to Jobs is an eligible expense.

The Senate bill also creates two new programs that mirror existing highway programs. These are the Appalachian Development Public Transportation Assistance Program, with \$20 million set aside from the Non-Urbanized Area funds, and the Public Transportation Emergency Relief Program. This emergency relief program, akin to the existing Highway Emergency Relief Program, provides funding for capital and operating costs in the event of a natural or man-made disaster. The bill authorizes such sums as may be necessary to carry out this new program.

Program changes in the Senate bill include provisions to simplify the New Starts Program process. The New Starts Program provides funds for the construction of new fixed guideway transit systems and extensions to existing systems. Among the changes is the elimination of the alternatives analysis that is currently required in addition to the alternatives analysis required as part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. The House bill includes a provision on the development and use of special warrants to speed certain types of New Starts projects.

Passenger Rail⁷

The House bill repeals the congestion grant program, which authorizes grants to states or Amtrak to reduce congestion or facilitate ridership growth on high-priority rail corridors. This program was folded into Track 1 of the Federal Railroad Administration’s High-Speed and Intercity Passenger Rail Grant Program in 2009, and although the congestion grant program was authorized at \$100 million annually through FY2013, Congress provided no funding for this program—or any other intercity passenger rail grant program—in FY2011 or FY2012. H.R. 7 would also reduce the authorized funding level for Amtrak’s operating assistance grants (see Table 4).

Table 4. Authorized Funding for Amtrak Operating Assistance

Million Dollars

	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013
Current law	\$592	\$616	\$631
H.R. 7	—	466	473
Senate MAP-21	—	N/A	N/A

Source: P.L. 110-432, H.R. 7

Note: Congress appropriated \$562 million (FY2011) and \$466 million (FY2012) for Amtrak Operating Assistance grants.

The House bill would also amend the law covering food and beverage service on Amtrak trains. Currently Amtrak is prohibited from providing food and beverage service on any train unless the revenues at least equal the costs. Nonetheless, Amtrak has continued to provide food and beverage service, although the service is not self-supporting (as is the practice of most airlines), contending that such service is an expectation, if not a requirement, on the part of many passengers. The House bill would repeal the self-supporting requirement, would require that the Federal Railroad Administration put the provision of food and beverage service on Amtrak’s

⁷ This section was written by D. Randy Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy.

trains out to competitive bidding, and would allow the service to be subsidized only to the extent that a net loss on the service was foreseen in the bid selected.

The Senate version of surface transportation reauthorization does not contain intercity passenger rail provisions.

Freight Transportation⁸

Whether the federal government should make a more focused effort towards funding freight improvements has been one of the policy questions leading up to the reauthorization debate.⁹ The Senate bill (S. 1813) creates a new dedicated funding program for freight transport. While the House bill (H.R. 7) does not create a similar program, it does contain a number of provisions that significantly affect freight transport.

The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee-reported bill (section 1115) establishes a new \$2 billion-a-year program for roads and highways that are particularly critical to freight movement. The Secretary of Transportation would designate these roadways based primarily on freight volume and in consultation with shippers and carriers as the “Primary Freight Network” (PFN), consisting of 27,000 centerline miles of existing roadways. (For comparison, the existing Interstate Highway System consists of approximately 47,000 centerline miles). Through a formula allocation, states would be guided to spend their freight program apportionment on the PFN first before spending funds on other freight related infrastructure. States could also spend up to a maximum of 10% of their freight program apportionment for public or private freight rail or maritime projects. Funds could be used for a rail or maritime project only if the Secretary of Transportation determines that the project would make significant improvement to freight flow, that the public benefit exceeds the federal cost, and that the project provides a better return than a highway project on the PFN.

The House bill (H.R. 7) also appears to concentrate funding for freight transport, but does so by reducing funding for programs not relevant to shippers rather than by creating a separate freight program. For example, the House bill either eliminates funding or terminates federal mandates related to non-motorized travel, historic preservation, transportation museums, roadway beautification, and university research. Terminating the transfer of federal gas taxes to the mass transit trust fund in the House bill also would leave additional funds for roadway maintenance and construction, potentially benefiting truck transportation. As introduced, H.R. 7 would have increased federal limits on truck size and weight but this was not approved in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee; instead, the committee approved an amendment calling for a Department of Transportation (DOT) study of the issue.¹⁰ The House bill seeks greater reliance on tolling to finance highway construction, an approach opposed by trucking organizations that prefer fuel tax increases over tolling to boost revenues.

⁸ This section was written by John Frittelli, Specialist in Transportation Policy.

⁹ See CRS Report R40629, *Freight Issues in Surface Transportation Reauthorization*, by John Frittelli and William J. Mallett.

¹⁰ A proposal for a four year pilot program to allow up to three states to increase truck weights to 126,000 pounds on 25-mile interstate segments, under certain conditions, was approved as amended. Also, a weight exemption for idle reduction equipment was increased from 400 pounds to 550 pounds.

The House bill contains provisions related to maritime and rail freight infrastructure.¹¹ The bill states that it is the “sense of Congress” that revenues in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund should be fully spent by the Army Corps of Engineers for maintenance of waterside infrastructure (such as channel dredging and maintenance of jetties and breakwaters). Currently, Congress appropriates just over half of the cargo tax collected for this purpose.¹² The bill seeks to facilitate access to a federal loan program for railroad infrastructure (the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing program). The bill extends the deadline for railroad plans implementing positive train control (PTC, an advanced anti-collision system) from 2016 to 2021 for routes with passenger traffic and essentially eliminates the deadline for routes carrying certain toxic chemicals. The bill allows railroads the option of implementing equivalent safety measures and adjusting the routes over which the technology would be installed. Congress mandated PTC in 2008¹³ in response to a deadly collision between a commuter and freight train in the Los Angeles area and releases of poisonous chemicals from rail tank cars after derailments in other parts of the country. Railroads and others have objected to positive train control as a high-cost remedy for relatively rare types of train accidents.

Both the Senate and House bills require the U.S. Department of Transportation to prepare and update a national freight transport plan, in consultation with stakeholders, that is intended to articulate the nation’s priorities with respect to freight improvements. Also, provisions in both bills seeking to increase private-sector participation in financing transportation improvements, such as expanding the TIFIA program,¹⁴ could enhance freight carriers and shippers’ roles in project planning and development.

Environmental Review of Transportation Projects¹⁵

Both the House and Senate proposals include provisions intended to expedite project delivery by changing elements of the environmental review process. For individual highway and transit projects, activities included within that process may begin during the planning stage of project development and are generally concluded during the preliminary engineering and design stage. The process involves preparing documentation and analysis necessary to demonstrate that all potential project-related impacts to the human, natural, or cultural environment are identified; the affects of those impacts are taken into consideration among other factors considered during the decision-making process (e.g., economic or community benefits); and compliance with all state, tribal, or federal requirements, applicable as a result of those impacts, are met.

Depending on project-specific impacts, various environmental requirements may apply to a given transportation project. Those requirements may involve activities such as obtaining necessary permits from the Army Corps of Engineers or the U.S. Coast Guard for a bridge reconstruction

¹¹ In the Senate, railroads are the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation which has not reported a bill related to rail infrastructure.

¹² For further discussion of this issue, see CRS Report R41042, *Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund Expenditures*, by John Frittelli.

¹³ The Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-432), see section 104.

¹⁴ TIFIA stands for the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act, legislation that was enacted in 1998 as part of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) as amended (P.L. 105-178; P.L. 105-206)

¹⁵ This section was written by Linda Luther, Analyst in Environmental Policy.

project; determining activities necessary to mitigate project effects on a historic site in consultation with a State Historic Preservation Office; or identifying a project alternative that avoids adverse impacts to parks, recreation areas, wildlife refuges or historic sites or structures. For all proposed federal-aid highway or transit projects, some level of documentation, analysis, and review will be required pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA, 42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.). Under NEPA, among other requirements, federal agencies must identify and consider the environmental impacts of a proposed action before proceeding with it.¹⁶

Before final design activities, property acquisition, or project construction can proceed, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or Federal Transit Administration (FTA) must approve the NEPA documentation. Further, it is DOT policy that all environmental investigations, reviews, and consultations be coordinated as a single process, and compliance with all applicable environmental requirements be reflected in the necessary NEPA document.¹⁷

Under this umbrella compliance process, the distinction between what is required by NEPA and requirements *identified* during the NEPA compliance process may be blurred. Recognizing that distinction is relevant in identifying root causes of project delay associated with, or effective solutions that may expedite, the environmental review process. Recent legislative efforts that intended to expedite environmental reviews (enacted under SAFETEA and TEA-21) focused primarily on elements of NEPA compliance, particularly requirements applicable to major, new highway and transit projects.

Provisions applicable to the environmental review process in H.R. 7 and MAP-21 also focus primarily on the NEPA compliance process, but include provisions that extend beyond NEPA.¹⁸ Generally, the House proposal would involve more sweeping changes to the existing process compared to those in MAP-21. Provisions in both bills are broadly intended to expedite highway and transit project delivery by changing existing environmental compliance requirements. A complex range of factors would affect the degree to which the proposed changes may accelerate the environmental review process, and ultimately project delivery, or may result in changes to the process that may actually slow project delivery (e.g., by removing mechanisms to coordinate the potentially complex environmental compliance process or by adding requirements to that process).¹⁹

In MAP-21, proposed changes to the environmental review process are largely included under Subtitle C, “Acceleration of Project Delivery.” Efforts to expedite overall project delivery in MAP-21 focus on elements of the NEPA process. They include provisions applicable to projects

¹⁶ See CRS Report RL33152, *The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA): Background and Implementation*, by Linda Luther, and CRS Report RS20621, *Overview of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Requirements*, by Kristina Alexander.

¹⁷ See the FHWA Environmental Review Toolkit website, regarding “NEPA and Project Development,” <http://environment.fhwa.dot.gov/projdev/index.asp>. This website also has information applicable to transit projects. On project streamlining, see <http://environment.fhwa.dot.gov/strmlng/index.asp>, especially the information included under “Program Overview” and “SAFETEA.”

¹⁸ The summary of provisions included in this report is not intended to be an exhaustive list of those applicable to the environmental review process or to identify key policy issues associated with those provisions. For analysis of those issues, contact Linda Luther, Analyst in Environmental Policy (7-6852), or Kristina Alexander, Legislative Attorney in the American Law Division (7-8597).

¹⁹ See CRS Report R41947, *Accelerating Highway and Transit Project Delivery: Issues and Options for Congress*, by William J. Mallett and Linda Luther.

likely to involve repair or maintenance to existing facilities and would expand upon or continue certain requirements established under SAFETEA. Some provisions also include statements of congressional priorities or reinforce the continued need for activities currently being implemented by DOT or that are already included in DOT's NEPA regulations. In addition to NEPA-specific requirements, MAP-21 would establish requirements applicable to agencies that may be required to provide some level of input or approval during NEPA document preparation.

In the House bill, provisions applicable to the environmental review process are largely included under Title III, "Environmental Streamlining" (these provisions would generally amend Federal-Aid Highways requirements, but may also apply to transit projects), and Subtitle C, "Project Development and Review," under Title VIII, Railroads (which would amend Title 49 requirements applicable to "Rail programs"). Provisions included under these titles would extensively change the NEPA requirements applicable to federal highway and transit projects. As proposed, NEPA would no longer apply to highway or transit projects that cost less than \$10 million or for which federal funding constitutes 15% or less of total project costs. For projects still subject to NEPA, H.R. 7 would significantly change the NEPA compliance process by, among other requirements, changing: the range of potential project alternatives that must be considered; the format of and analysis required in certain NEPA documents; and the level of evaluation required to determine cumulative project impacts. The House bill would also require agencies outside DOT to adhere to specific timeframes to provide necessary permits or approvals; establish a 270 day deadline for completing the overall environmental review process; and establish limits to judicial review and to legal sufficiency standards applicable to environmental documents. Provisions in the House proposal would also significantly amend requirements applicable to parks, wildlife refuges, recreation areas, and historic sites or properties.

Highway Safety²⁰

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) currently has 10 programs making grants to states—one formula program and nine incentive grant programs—plus several other programs promoting highway safety. The House bill, H.R. 7, would consolidate all these programs into one general highway safety grant program, at a reduced level of funding. The House bill would prohibit the use of federal funding to measure the rate of motorcycle helmet usage or to create checkpoints for motorcyclists.

The Senate highway safety provisions were marked up in S. 1449. As approved by the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, the bill would retain most of NHTSA's existing incentive grant programs and would create another: an incentive grant program to encourage states to make texting while driving and the use of a cell phone by drivers under age 18 primary traffic offenses. The Senate bill would authorize significantly higher highway safety grants in FY2012 and FY2013 than the House bill (see Table 5). The Commerce Committee has marked up but not yet reported out the bill; the authorizations shown in **Table 5** and in Appendix **Figure A-5** are taken from the bill as introduced.

²⁰ This section was written by D. Randy Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy.

Table 5. Highway Safety Grants to States

Million Dollars

	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	Annually, FY2014-FY2016
Current	\$620	\$550	—	—
H.R. 7	—	—	493	493
Senate MAP-21	—	682	691	—

Source: Current law: figures taken from DOT budget table in H.Rept. 112-284; H.R. 7 §5002; Map-21: S. 1449 §101.

Commercial Trucking Safety²¹

Both the House and Senate bills would create a clearinghouse of drug and alcohol test results by commercial drivers in order to prevent drivers who have failed a test from avoiding penalties by switching employers. Both bills would also strengthen DOT’s ability to act against “reincarnated carriers”—carriers whose operations have been suspended due to safety violations which then resume operations under a new name. The two bills provide similar levels of funding for truck safety grants to states (see **Table 6**).

The Senate bill (currently S. 1950) would require that electronic on-board recorders be used on all trucks and buses (in interstate commerce) to improve compliance with hours-of-service regulations. The Commerce Committee has marked up but not yet reported out the bill; the authorizations shown in **Table 6** and in Appendix **Figure A-6** are taken from the bill as introduced.

Table 6. Truck Safety Grants to States

Million dollars

	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	Annually, FY2014-FY2016
Current	\$310	\$307	—	—
H.R. 7	—	—	307	307
Senate MAP-21	—	310	315	—

Source: Current law: figures taken from DOT budget table in H.Rept. 112-284; H.R. 7 §6101 & §6102; MAP-21: S. 1950 §606.

²¹ This section was written by D. Randy Peterman, Analyst in Transportation Policy.

Transportation Finance²²

In the House, extending the authorities for the Highway Trust Fund and providing revenues to support the surface transportation bills fall under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. On February 3, 2012, the committee marked-up and reported favorably, H.R. 3864, the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Financing Act of 2012, and, as noted earlier, has been incorporated into H.R. 7.

In the Senate, the Finance Committee considered the financial title of S. 1813, marking it up and reporting it favorably on February 7, 2012.²³ Both the Senate and House committees worked to find additional revenues or budget offsets to bridge the gap between anticipated HTF revenues and the authorization levels in MAP-21 and H.R. 7.

Financial Provisions in Senate Bill

The finance title of the Senate bill, S. 1813, would extend highway-related taxes at current levels through FY2015 and would extend Highway Trust Fund expenditure authority through FY2013.²⁴

The Senate Finance Committee's bill as reported included a variety of revenue proposals aimed at raising revenue or providing offsets equal to \$10.5 billion over the life of MAP-21. The proposals included transferring \$3 billion from the balance of the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Trust Fund; transfer of the Gas Guzzler Tax; transfer of certain import tariffs; change in the treatment of inherited Individual Retirement Accounts (IRAs), and other changes.

The LUST Trust Fund, established by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, receives revenues primarily from a 0.1 cent per gallon excise tax on gasoline and diesel fuels. Annual discretionary appropriations from the LUST Trust Fund support the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the states in administering the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) corrective action program and the underground storage tank (UST) leak prevention program, authorized under the Solid Waste Disposal Act.²⁵

²² This section was written by Robert S. Kirk, Specialist in Transportation Policy; Mary Tiemann, Specialist in Environmental Policy; and Curry Hagerty, Specialist in Energy and Natural Resources Policy.

²³ For details on the committee's action, see <http://finance.senate.gov/newsroom/chairman/release/?id=d22e89ff-f03c-4652-a114-c1337cda3e95>. Also link to JCT table of estimated revenue effects <http://www.jct.gov/publications.html?func=startdown&id=4398>.

²⁴ The Senate Finance Committee bill would extend the LUST Tank Trust Fund financing rate of 0.1 cent per gallon through September 30, 2015.

²⁵ Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA; P.L. 99-499) amended the Solid Waste Disposal Act, Subtitle I (42 U.S.C. § 6991 -6991i) and authorized EPA and states to respond to spills and leaks from petroleum underground storage tanks (USTs). SARA also amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. § 9508) to create the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Trust Fund to help EPA and states cover the costs of responding to leaking petroleum USTs in cases where UST owners or operators do not clean up a site. Historically, EPA and the states used the annual LUST Trust Fund appropriation mainly to oversee and enforce corrective actions performed by responsible parties, and also to conduct corrective actions where no responsible party has been identified, where a responsible party fails to comply with a cleanup order, in the event of an emergency, and to take cost recovery actions. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 expanded state and EPA responsibilities and authorized the use of trust fund monies for the federal UST leak prevention and detection program as well as the LUST cleanup program.

The fund had an unobligated balance of \$3.392 billion at the beginning of FY2012. In FY2012, absent legislative changes, the fund is estimated to receive \$117 million in interest payments on its unobligated balance and \$181 million in tax receipts. For each of the past several fiscal years, Congress has appropriated approximately \$113 million from the trust fund. States receive, as grants, a minimum of 80% of the annual appropriation. EPA uses the remainder to carry out its responsibilities, including implementing the program on Indian lands.

The Senate Finance Committee's bill would deposit \$3.7 billion in balance transfers and future receipt transfers from the LUST trust fund into the Highway Trust Fund. Of this, \$3.0 billion would be an immediate transfer of existing balances, and the other \$0.7 billion would come from one-third of the future receipts of the 0.1 cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline and diesel fuel over the next 10 years.

Financial Provisions in House bill

The finance provisions of H.R. 7 reconfigure the Highway Trust Fund. Within this context, there are two gaps the bill needs to fill with revenue increases or offsets. One gap is the difference between the highway account revenues and balances and the authorized levels in the bill. The other is the \$40 billion of general fund resources for the new alternative transportation account created by the bill.

Offshore Oil and Gas Revenues

The House bill²⁶ extends highway-related taxes through FY2018 (Sec. 15003) and Highway Trust Fund expenditure authority through FY2016 (Sec. 15002). Unlike the Senate bill, it would not allocate balances or revenues from the LUST trust fund to the Highway Trust Fund.²⁷ Instead, Sec. 15004 directs increases in federal revenues from onshore and offshore domestic energy leasing and production generated by reason of the enactment of Title XVII of H.R. 7 into the highway account of the Highway Trust Fund. This would establish a new allocation of government receipts from newly authorized offshore drilling activities.

The statutory basis for offshore energy development is the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act,²⁸ which is administered primarily by the Department of the Interior. The basic structure of the offshore program allows the Department of the Interior to lease the right to develop oil and gas resources in federal ocean areas in exchange for upfront payments, rental payments, and royalties. According to the department's Office of Natural Resources Revenue, federal receipts from offshore oil and gas came to \$6.5 billion in FY2011.

Under current law, receipts from existing offshore lease programs are allocated to a variety of programs by statute. The Land and Water Conservation Fund (established under P.L. 90-401) receives a \$900 million annual allocation, and the National Historic Preservation Fund (established under P.L. 94-422) receives a \$150 million allocation annually. In addition, portions of federal receipts from certain submerged acreage are permanently appropriated to the states,

²⁶ <http://docs.house.gov/billssthisweek/20120213/CPRT-112-HPRT-RU00-HR7RCP.pdf>.

²⁷ H.R. 7, sec. 15002(c) would amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend the LUST Trust Fund tax from April 1, 2012 until October 1, 2016.

²⁸ 43 U.S.C. §§ 1331.

with the Gulf Coast states (Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas) receiving additional funds from specified leases.

Alternative Transportation Account Revenues and Alternative Financing

Sec. 15005 of the H.R. 7 renames the Mass Transit Account of the HTF the alternative transportation account, provides the account with a one-time appropriation of \$40 billion, and moves existing balances of the Mass Transit Account at the time of enactment to the highway account of the HTF. Title XVI, Federal Employee Retirement, appears to be included to provide offsetting revenues for the \$40 billion in general fund revenues provided to the alternative transportation account over the life of the bill.

An existing federal program providing credit assistance (secured loans, loan guarantees, and lines of credit) to large transportation infrastructure projects is the TIFIA program. MAP-21 proposes several significant changes to the TIFIA program. Perhaps most importantly, the bill proposes to greatly enlarge the program by authorizing \$1 billion annually, up from the \$122 million annually in SAFETEA. Similarly, H.R. 7 authorizes \$1 billion annually for TIFIA. These funds will be available to pay the administrative and subsidy costs²⁹ of the program. Administrative costs are capped at 1% of this amount in MAP-21 and \$3.250 million in H.R. 7. Assuming \$990 million of the annual authorization is used to pay loan subsidy costs and the average subsidy cost is 10%, this may provide DOT with the capacity to make loans totaling \$9.9 billion per year.

In addition to enlarging the TIFIA program, H.R. 7 also proposes to authorize \$750 million per year specifically for capitalizing state infrastructure banks (SIBs). Currently, each state is allowed to use a portion of its federal surface transportation funds to capitalize a SIB if it so chooses.

²⁹ The subsidy cost is “the estimated long-term cost to the government of a direct loan or a loan guarantee, calculated on a net present value basis, excluding administrative costs,” Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA), Section 502 (5A).

Appendix. Funding and Financial Data

This Appendix contains six figures.



Figure A-I. CBO Highway Trust Fund Projections

<u>Highway Trust Fund Projections</u>												
CBO Winter FY 2012 Baseline 2011-2022 (In Billions of dollars) January 31, 2012												
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Highway Account												
<u>Resources</u>												
Contract Authority (FHWA)	39.9	39.9	39.9	39.9	39.9	39.9	39.9	39.9	39.9	39.9	39.9	39.9
Contract Authority -- flexed to transit	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0
Contract Authority (Safety)	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Obligation Limitation (FHWA)	41.1	39.1	39.7	40.3	40.9	41.5	42.3	43.1	43.9	44.8	45.7	46.6
Obligation Limitation (flexed to transit)	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0
Obligation Limitation (Safety)	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5
<u>Cash Flow</u>												
Beginning of Year Balance or Shortfall**	20.7	14.3	6.3	-3.2	-13.6	-23.4	-32.5	-41.2	-51.0	-60.4	-69.9	-79.5
Est. Flexing -- Transfer of Cash	-1.1	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0
Revenues & Interest^^	32.0	33.2	32.7	33.2	34.2	35.1	35.8	36.1	36.3	36.5	36.8	37.4
Outlays	37.3	40.2	41.2	42.5	43.1	43.2	43.5	44.8	44.7	45.0	45.4	45.9
End of Year Balance or Shortfall**	14.3	6.3	-3.2	-13.6	-23.4	-32.5	-41.2	-51.0	-60.4	-69.9	-79.5	-89.0
Transit Account												
<u>Resources</u>												
Contract Authority (FTA)	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4
Contract Authority -- flexed from Highways	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Obligation Limitation (FTA includes flexing)	9.3	9.4	9.5	9.6	9.7	9.9	10.0	10.2	10.4	10.6	10.7	10.9
<u>Cash Flow</u>												
Beginning of Year Balance or Shortfall**	8.5	7.3	5.7	2.8	-0.6	-4.7	-9.3	-13.9	-18.4	-22.3	-26.4	-30.6
Est. Flexing -- Transfer of Cash	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Revenues & Interest^^	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	5.1	5.1	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.3
Outlays	7.2	7.6	8.8	9.4	10.0	10.6	10.8	10.7	10.1	10.2	10.4	10.6
End of Year Balance or Shortfall**	7.3	5.7	2.8	-0.6	-4.7	-9.3	-13.9	-18.4	-22.3	-26.4	-30.6	-35.0

** Under current law, the Highway Trust Fund cannot incur negative balances. The shortfalls shown in the above table illustrate the projected inability of the fund to pay obligations as they are incurred by the states. If the Highway Trust Fund's resources became exhausted, spending on programs financed by the fund could continue at a slower pace as motor fuel taxes are collected. The Department of Transportation has stated that if the fund faced a shortfall, it would ration the amounts it reimburses states in order to maintain a positive balance in the fund.

^^The non-permanent portions of the taxes that are deposited in the Highway Trust Fund scheduled are scheduled to expire on March 31, 2012. Those include taxes on certain heavy vehicles and tires and all but 4.3 cents of federal taxes levied on fuels. However, under the baseline construction rules, CBO's baseline projections assume that all of the expiring taxes credited to the fund continue.

Estimates of trust fund balances or shortfalls reflect CBO's best estimate of likely outcomes under current law. Actual balances could be higher or lower, depending on the accuracy of revenue and spending estimates.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Figure A-2. MAP-21 Authorizations

		FY 2012	FY 2013	Total	Average	Source	CA or STA	CA Citation
Authorizations: Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) as Reported								
S. 1813 As Reported								
<i>(Contract Authority From Highway Account of Highway Trust Fund Unless Otherwise Indicated)</i>								
DRAFT								
Title I - Federal-aid Highways								
1101(a)(1)	Federal-aid Highway Program 1/ <i>Estimated Split among Programs (based on RTA-034)</i>	39,143,000,000	39,806,000,000	78,949,000,000	39,474,500,000	HTF-HA	CA	23 USC 118
	National Highway Performance Program (§1106 & 23 USC 119)	[20,623,059,095]	[20,972,370,292]	[41,595,429,387]	[20,797,714,694]			
	State Planning and Research (2% setaside) (§2205 & 23 USC 505) 2/	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
	Exempt from Obligation Limitation	[639,000,000]	[639,000,000]	[1,278,000,000]	[639,000,000]			
	Transportation Mobility Program (§1108 & 23 USC 133)	[10,418,200,543]	[10,594,662,923]	[21,012,863,466]	[10,506,431,733]			
	State Planning and Research (2% setaside) (§2205 & 23 USC 505) 2/	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
	Subject to Suballocation Based on Population (50% after SPR setaside)	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
	Highway Safety Improvement Program (§1112 & 23 USC 148)	[2,488,589,891]	[2,531,148,139]	[5,020,138,030]	[2,510,069,015]			
	State Planning and Research (2% setaside) (§2205 & 23 USC 505) 2/	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
1112	Safety Data Improvement Activities (8% setaside 2012-2013, 4% thereafter)(23 USC 148(g)(2)	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
	Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Improvement Program (§1113 & 23 USC 149)	[3,252,418,730]	[3,307,507,855]	[6,559,926,585]	[3,279,963,293]			
	State Planning and Research (2% setaside) (§2205 & 23 USC 505) 2/	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
	Additional Activities (setaside) 3/	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
	Subject to Suballocation Based on Population (50% after SPR setaside & Additional Activities setaside) 4/	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
	National Freight Program (§1115 & 23 USC 167)	[2,026,748,911]	[2,061,077,770]	[4,087,826,681]	[2,043,913,341]			
	State Planning and Research (2% setaside) (§2205 & 23 USC 505) 2/	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
2205	Primary Freight Network (setaside) 5/	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
	Metropolitan Transportation Planning (§1201 & 23 USC 134)	[333,582,831]	[339,233,022]	[672,815,853]	[336,407,927]			
1101(a)(2)	Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Program (§3002 & 23 USC Ch. 6)	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	23 USC 608(b)(2)
3002	Rural Infrastructure Projects (10% setaside) (§3002 & 23 USC 608(a)(3))	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
3002	Administrative Costs of Program (up to 1% setaside) (§3002 & 23 USC 608(a)(6))	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
1101(a)(3)(A)	Tribal Transportation Program (§1116 & 23 USC 202)	450,000,000	450,000,000	900,000,000	450,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	23 USC 201(b)
1116	Program Management and Oversight and Project-related Administrative Expenses (up to 6% setaside) (23 USC 202(a)(6))	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
1116	Transportation Planning for Tribal Governments under ISDEA (up to 2% setaside) (23 USC 202(c))	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
1116	National Priority Program for Tribal Transportation Facility Bridges (up to 2% setaside) (23 USC 202(d))	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
1116	Safety Projects (up to 2% setaside) (23 USC 202(e))	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
1101(a)(3)(B)	Federal Lands Transportation Program (§1116 & 23 USC 203)	300,000,000	300,000,000	600,000,000	300,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	23 USC 201(b)
1101(a)(3)(B)	Setaside for National Park service and Fish and Wildlife Service	[260,000,000]	[260,000,000]	[520,000,000]	[260,000,000]			
1116	Transportation Planning, Asset Management Systems, Data Collection (up to 5% setaside) (23 USC 201(c)(7))	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
1101(a)(3)(C)	Federal Lands Access Program (§1116 & 23 USC 204)	250,000,000	250,000,000	500,000,000	250,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	23 USC 201(b)
1116	Transportation Planning, Asset Management Systems, Data Collection (up to 5% setaside) (23 USC 201(c)(7))	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]			
1101(a)(4)	Territorial and Puerto Rico Highway Program (§1114 & 23 USC 165)	180,000,000	180,000,000	360,000,000	180,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	23 USC 118
1114(a)	Puerto Rico Highway Program (75% setaside) (§1114 & 23 USC 165(b))	[135,000,000]	[135,000,000]	[270,000,000]	[135,000,000]			
1114(b)	For purposes eligible under National Highway Performance Program (50% further setaside)	[67,500,000]	[67,500,000]	[135,000,000]	[67,500,000]			
1114(b)	For purposes eligible under Highway Safety Improvement Program (25% further setaside)	[33,750,000]	[33,750,000]	[67,500,000]	[33,750,000]			
1114(b)	For purposes eligible under chapter 1 of 23 USC (remainder)	[33,750,000]	[33,750,000]	[67,500,000]	[33,750,000]			
1114(a)	Territorial Highway Program (25% setaside) (§1114 & 23 USC 165(c))	[45,000,000]	[45,000,000]	[90,000,000]	[45,000,000]			
1105(a)	FHWA Administrative Expenses	480,000,000	480,000,000	960,000,000	480,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	23 USC 118
1109(a)	On-the-Job Training Supportive Services (setaside) (§1109 & 23 USC 140(b))	[10,000,000]	[10,000,000]	[20,000,000]	[10,000,000]			
1109(b)	Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Supportive Services (setaside) (§1109 & 23 USC 140(c))	[10,000,000]	[10,000,000]	[20,000,000]	[10,000,000]			
1110	Highway Use Tax Evasion Projects (setaside) (§1110 & 23 USC 143)	[10,000,000]	[10,000,000]	[20,000,000]	[10,000,000]			
1120	Intergovernmental Enforcement Efforts, Including Research and Training (Further setaside) (§1109 & 23 USC 143)	[2,000,000]	[2,000,000]	[4,000,000]	[2,000,000]			
1516(a)	Operation Lifesaver, National Work Zone Safety Clearinghouse, Public Road Safety Clearinghouse, Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Clearinghouse, National Safe Routes to School Clearinghouse, Work Zone Safety Grants, and Grants to Prohibit Racial Profiling (takedown)	[15,000,000]	[15,000,000]	[30,000,000]	[15,000,000]			
1118(i)	Projects of National and Regional Significance (§1118) General Fund	-	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	500,000,000	GF	STA	N/A
1517	Rescission of funds earmarked for projects and funds apportioned under chapter 1 of 23 USC	(2,391,000,000)	(3,054,000,000)	(5,445,000,000)	(2,722,500,000)			
Total -- Title I		39,412,000,000	40,412,000,000	79,824,000,000	39,912,000,000			
<i>Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund - Contract Authority</i>		<i>41,803,000,000</i>	<i>42,466,000,000</i>	<i>84,269,000,000</i>	<i>42,134,500,000</i>			
<i>General Fund - Subject to Appropriation</i>		<i>0</i>	<i>1,000,000,000</i>	<i>1,000,000,000</i>	<i>500,000,000</i>			
<i>Rescission</i>		<i>(2,391,000,000)</i>	<i>(3,054,000,000)</i>	<i>(5,445,000,000)</i>	<i>(2,722,500,000)</i>			
		39,412,000,000	40,412,000,000	79,824,000,000	39,912,000,000			
1102	Federal-Aid Highway Program Obligation Limitation	41,564,000,000	42,227,000,000	83,791,000,000	41,895,500,000			

Authorizations: Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) as Reported						
S. 1813 As Reported						
<i>(Contract Authority From Highway Account of Highway Trust Fund Unless Otherwise Indicated)</i>						
DRAFT		FY 2012	FY 2013	Total	Average	Source CA or STA CA Citation
Title II - Research and Education						
2101(a)(1)	Highway Research and Development Program (23 USC 503(b), 503(d) & 509)	90,000,000	90,000,000	180,000,000	90,000,000	HTF-HA CA MAP-21 2101(b)(1)
2203(a)	Policy and System Financing Alternatives Research under 23 USC 503(b)(2)(E)(iii) (setaside of NLT 50%) (23 USC 503(b)(2)(E)(iv))	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	
2203(d)(5)	Air Quality and Congestion Mitigation Measure Outcomes Assessment Research (23 USC 503(d))	[1,000,000]	[1,000,000]	[2,000,000]	[1,000,000]	
2101(a)(2)	Technology and Innovation Deployment Program (23 USC 503(c))	90,000,000	90,000,000	180,000,000	90,000,000	HTF-HA CA MAP-21 2101(b)(1)
2101(a)(3)	Training and Education (23 USC 504)	24,000,000	24,000,000	48,000,000	24,000,000	HTF-HA CA MAP-21 2101(b)(1)
2101(a)(4)	Intelligent Transportation Systems Program (23 USC 512-518)	100,000,000	100,000,000	200,000,000	100,000,000	HTF-HA CA MAP-21 2101(b)(1)
2101(a)(5)	University Transportation Centers (49 USC 5505)	70,000,000	70,000,000	140,000,000	70,000,000	HTF-HA CA MAP-21 2101(b)(1)
2101(a)(6)	Bureau of Transportation Statistics (49 USC chapter 65)	26,000,000	26,000,000	52,000,000	26,000,000	HTF-HA CA MAP-21 2101(b)(1)
Total -- Title II		400,000,000	400,000,000	800,000,000	400,000,000	
	<i>Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund - Contract Authority</i>	<i>400,000,000</i>	<i>400,000,000</i>	<i>800,000,000</i>	<i>400,000,000</i>	
	<i>General Fund - Subject to Appropriation</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>1,000,000,000</i>	<i>1,000,000,000</i>	<i>500,000,000</i>	
	<i>Rescission</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>	
		<i>400,000,000</i>	<i>1,400,000,000</i>	<i>1,800,000,000</i>	<i>900,000,000</i>	
GRAND TOTAL						
Total Authorizations		39,812,000,000	40,812,000,000	80,624,000,000	40,312,000,000	
Recap:						
Federal-aid Highway Program						
	Contract Authority from Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund	42,203,000,000	42,866,000,000	85,069,000,000	42,534,500,000	
	Exempt from Obligation Limitation	639,000,000	639,000,000	1,278,000,000	639,000,000	
	Subject to Obligation Limitation	41,564,000,000	42,227,000,000	83,791,000,000	41,895,500,000	
	General Fund - Subject to Appropriation	-	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	
	Rescission	(2,391,000,000)	(3,054,000,000)	(5,445,000,000)	(2,722,500,000)	
		39,812,000,000	41,812,000,000	81,624,000,000	40,812,000,000	
1/ Combined amount authorized for:						
National Highway Performance Program (§1106 & 23 USC 119)						
Transportation Mobility Program (§1108 & 23 USC 133)						
Highway Safety Improvement Program (§1112 & 23 USC 148)						
Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Improvement Program (§1113 & 23 USC 149)						
National Freight Program (§1115 & 23 USC 167)						
Metropolitan Transportation Planning (§1201 & 23 USC 134)						
2/ 2% of each State's apportionments from the National Highway Performance Program, Transportation Mobility Program, Highway Safety Improvement Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, and National Freight Program are set aside and combined into a single pool for State Planning and Research. Of this amount, 70% is for planning, 24% for research, and 6% is to be made available to the Secretary of Transportation for implementation of the Future Strategic Highway Research Program findings and results.						
3/ Amount to be setaside is computed as the amount of funds attributable to the inclusion of the 10 percent of STP funds apportioned to the State for fiscal year 2009 in the formula for CMAQ. Funds from this setaside may be used for Transportation Enhancements, Recreational Trails Program, Safe Routes to School Program, planning, designing or constructing boulevards, main streets and other roadways largely in the ROW of former Interstate System routes or of the divided highways.						
4/ After making the setaside for State Planning and Research and Additional Activities, suballocation to areas based on population takes place, unless the State has never had a nonattainment area under the Clear Air Act for ozone, carbon monoxide, or small particulate matter (PM 2.5).						
5/ Setaside begins with fiscal year after the Secretary of Transportation has designated the primary freight network. Amount set aside is the lesser of the State's total National Freight Program apportionment for the year or the product of 110% of the State's National Freight Program apportionment times the ratio of the State's primary freight network mileage to the sum of primary freight network mileage plus any Interstate System mileage not included on the primary freight network.						

Source: MAP-21.

Figure A-3. MAP-21 Apportionments

FHWA, HCFB-1 TA		U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION						7-Nov-11 10:30 AM
SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED FY 2012 APPORTIONMENTS UNDER SENATE EPW BILL MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY ACT (MAP-21)								
State	National Highway Performance Program	Transportation Mobility Program	Highway Safety Improvement Program	CMAQ Program	National Freight Program	Metropolitan Planning	Total	
Alabama	427,164,322	215,791,632	51,554,315	28,466,400	41,979,942	3,125,650	768,082,260	
Alaska	271,216,516	137,011,102	32,733,029	38,358,824	26,654,037	2,307,943	508,281,449	
Arizona	369,551,320	186,687,132	44,601,021	67,958,597	36,317,975	5,708,443	710,824,487	
Arkansas	287,352,128	145,162,368	34,680,429	25,254,809	28,239,778	1,740,815	522,430,327	
California	1,825,985,963	922,437,736	220,377,616	565,608,532	179,450,345	51,541,330	3,765,401,521	
Colorado	268,045,294	135,409,088	32,350,294	54,769,162	26,342,382	5,185,160	522,101,380	
Connecticut	268,250,545	135,512,775	32,375,066	56,097,253	26,362,554	4,820,421	522,418,614	
Delaware	88,656,003	44,786,567	10,699,862	16,354,245	8,712,745	1,808,926	171,018,349	
Dist. of Col.	78,350,848	39,580,687	9,456,137	13,182,040	7,699,997	1,674,809	149,944,517	
Florida	1,101,010,541	556,200,153	132,880,583	68,946,624	108,202,760	21,826,125	1,989,066,785	
Georgia	687,665,697	347,389,740	82,994,136	102,639,061	67,580,939	7,831,137	1,296,100,711	
Hawaii	94,150,625	47,562,299	11,363,006	15,271,264	9,252,734	1,863,439	179,463,366	
Idaho	154,073,778	77,833,823	18,595,111	18,989,904	15,141,733	1,627,119	286,261,469	
Illinois	704,597,926	355,943,435	85,037,681	140,597,082	69,244,969	16,533,501	1,371,954,594	
Indiana	491,191,313	248,136,301	59,281,710	68,679,724	48,272,250	5,077,996	920,639,293	
Iowa	253,278,882	127,949,504	30,568,141	22,468,976	24,891,201	1,868,382	461,025,085	
Kansas	216,530,116	109,385,041	26,132,945	21,541,504	21,279,684	2,054,461	396,923,752	
Kentucky	370,190,963	187,010,262	44,678,220	28,375,497	36,380,836	2,561,961	669,197,739	
Louisiana	385,287,312	194,636,521	46,500,193	24,991,800	37,864,443	4,265,879	693,546,149	
Maine	103,150,990	52,109,034	12,449,257	15,108,318	10,137,252	1,948,364	194,903,216	
Maryland	312,431,638	157,831,845	37,707,267	68,241,273	30,704,489	7,114,857	614,031,368	
Massachusetts	315,216,616	159,238,739	38,043,385	78,327,231	30,978,185	9,381,080	631,185,235	
Michigan	568,857,619	287,371,176	68,655,230	106,806,282	55,904,373	10,848,948	1,098,444,228	
Minnesota	372,372,001	188,112,063	44,941,448	55,678,759	36,595,179	4,947,226	702,646,677	
Mississippi	284,271,441	143,606,090	34,308,622	25,133,481	27,937,021	1,825,558	517,082,213	
Missouri	518,323,179	261,842,571	62,556,246	46,098,783	50,938,657	5,209,805	944,969,241	
Montana	214,711,197	108,466,174	25,913,420	21,296,372	21,100,928	1,730,097	393,218,188	
Nebraska	156,920,518	79,271,917	18,938,683	18,057,492	15,421,499	1,671,377	290,281,487	
Nevada	160,436,843	81,048,267	19,363,067	35,882,865	15,767,069	2,862,715	315,360,846	
New Hampshire	91,133,520	46,038,141	10,998,873	15,112,292	8,956,225	1,670,332	173,909,383	
New Jersey	494,153,459	249,632,696	59,639,211	123,596,524	48,563,357	12,369,013	987,954,260	
New Mexico	202,317,194	102,205,060	24,417,591	19,655,334	19,882,896	1,628,886	370,106,951	
New York	866,691,558	437,828,667	104,600,705	223,099,600	85,174,860	26,047,255	1,743,442,645	
North Carolina	562,567,931	284,193,799	67,896,130	77,117,496	55,286,848	5,896,852	1,052,959,055	
North Dakota	141,238,237	71,349,661	17,045,994	16,306,989	13,880,309	1,776,421	261,597,611	
Ohio	723,959,337	365,724,286	87,374,403	132,031,995	71,147,728	12,082,360	1,392,320,108	
Oklahoma	355,345,902	179,510,947	42,886,574	29,079,336	34,921,925	2,637,925	644,382,609	
Oregon	271,143,742	136,974,339	32,724,245	31,091,299	26,646,885	3,652,250	502,232,760	
Pennsylvania	889,107,873	449,152,770	107,306,123	135,819,241	87,377,843	13,353,756	1,682,117,605	
Rhode Island	121,098,491	61,175,617	14,615,335	14,923,214	11,901,059	1,923,883	225,637,600	
South Carolina	339,425,470	171,468,384	40,965,143	28,774,578	33,357,331	2,913,833	616,904,739	
South Dakota	152,096,144	76,834,776	18,356,431	18,824,445	14,947,380	1,779,620	282,838,795	
Tennessee	458,001,327	231,369,636	55,276,022	58,252,431	45,010,475	4,871,287	852,781,177	
Texas	1,612,421,628	814,550,926	194,602,610	223,803,882	158,462,126	21,540,600	3,025,381,772	
Utah	166,306,871	84,013,643	20,071,519	18,893,216	16,343,951	2,891,063	308,520,263	
Vermont	106,768,282	53,936,391	12,885,827	16,405,851	10,492,745	2,101,190	202,590,286	
Virginia	538,290,451	271,929,487	64,966,089	79,261,835	52,900,958	7,571,329	1,014,920,149	
Washington	389,270,914	196,648,927	46,980,972	56,271,446	38,255,935	7,975,978	735,404,172	
West Virginia	249,994,098	126,290,122	30,171,701	23,456,734	24,568,385	1,784,542	456,265,582	
Wisconsin	399,710,931	201,922,936	48,240,974	47,658,983	39,281,936	4,523,150	741,338,911	
Wyoming	142,773,614	72,125,291	17,231,298	14,799,837	14,031,200	1,627,181	262,588,422	
Apportioned Total	20,623,059,095	10,418,200,543	2,488,989,891	3,252,418,730	2,026,748,911	333,582,831	39,143,000,000	

FHWA, HC/FB-1 TA		U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION						7-Nov-11 10:30 AM
SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED FY 2013 APPORTIONMENTS UNDER SENATE EPW BILL MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY ACT (MAP-21)								
State	National Highway Performance Program	Transportation Mobility Program	Highway Safety Improvement Program	CMAQ Program	National Freight Program	Metropolitan Planning	Total	
Alabama	434,399,586	219,446,687	52,427,536	28,948,561	42,690,994	3,178,592	781,091,956	
Alaska	275,810,352	139,331,781	33,287,456	39,008,542	27,105,500	2,347,035	516,890,666	
Arizona	375,810,741	189,849,219	45,356,469	69,109,673	36,933,125	5,805,132	722,864,357	
Arkansas	292,219,268	147,621,113	35,267,843	25,682,572	28,718,100	1,770,300	531,279,196	
California	1,856,914,320	938,061,889	224,110,349	575,188,749	182,489,856	52,414,332	3,829,179,495	
Colorado	272,585,417	137,702,633	32,898,240	55,696,836	26,788,567	5,272,986	530,944,678	
Connecticut	272,794,145	137,808,076	32,923,431	56,030,485	26,809,080	4,902,069	531,267,285	
Delaware	90,157,649	45,545,157	10,881,096	16,631,252	8,860,321	1,839,565	173,915,040	
Dist. of Col.	79,677,946	40,251,100	9,616,304	13,405,316	7,830,419	1,703,177	152,484,262	
Florida	1,119,659,341	565,621,012	135,131,300	70,114,435	110,035,487	22,195,814	2,022,757,388	
Georgia	699,313,306	353,273,791	84,399,882	104,377,551	68,725,618	7,963,780	1,318,053,927	
Hawaii	95,745,338	48,367,904	11,555,472	15,529,927	9,409,456	1,895,001	182,503,098	
Idaho	156,683,464	79,152,164	18,910,073	19,311,553	15,398,202	1,654,679	291,110,135	
Illinois	716,532,332	361,972,367	86,478,040	142,978,500	70,417,833	16,813,544	1,395,192,616	
Indiana	499,511,059	252,339,208	60,285,817	69,843,013	49,089,880	5,164,007	936,232,984	
Iowa	257,568,893	130,116,700	31,085,901	22,849,553	25,312,805	1,900,028	468,833,880	
Kansas	220,197,680	111,237,794	26,575,582	21,906,372	21,640,117	2,089,259	403,646,804	
Kentucky	376,461,218	190,177,822	45,434,975	28,856,118	36,997,051	2,605,355	680,532,539	
Louisiana	391,813,268	197,933,254	47,287,808	25,415,109	38,505,787	4,338,134	705,293,360	
Maine	104,898,150	52,991,652	12,660,122	15,364,221	10,308,956	1,981,363	198,204,466	
Maryland	317,723,572	160,505,164	38,345,948	69,397,136	31,224,558	7,235,368	624,431,767	
Massachusetts	320,555,722	161,935,908	38,687,760	79,653,929	31,502,890	9,539,976	641,876,184	
Michigan	578,492,869	292,238,639	69,818,105	108,615,355	56,851,885	11,032,706	1,111,049,560	
Minnesota	378,679,199	191,298,285	45,702,622	56,621,840	37,215,025	5,031,021	714,548,032	
Mississippi	289,086,400	146,038,475	34,889,738	25,559,189	28,410,215	1,856,480	525,840,497	
Missouri	527,102,482	266,277,633	63,615,817	46,879,599	51,801,451	5,298,048	960,975,030	
Montana	218,347,952	110,303,362	26,352,339	21,657,088	21,458,333	1,759,401	399,878,476	
Nebraska	159,578,421	80,614,616	19,259,465	18,363,348	15,682,707	1,699,687	295,198,244	
Nevada	163,154,305	82,421,054	19,691,037	36,490,665	16,034,130	2,911,204	320,702,395	
New Hampshire	92,677,130	46,817,930	11,185,171	15,368,262	9,107,925	1,699,234	176,855,652	
New Jersey	502,523,378	253,860,948	60,649,373	125,689,989	49,385,918	12,578,518	1,004,688,125	
New Mexico	205,744,011	103,936,199	24,831,174	19,988,254	20,219,670	1,656,476	376,375,783	
New York	881,371,488	445,244,562	106,372,421	226,878,437	86,617,543	26,488,440	1,772,972,892	
North Carolina	572,096,647	289,007,444	69,046,147	78,423,704	56,223,291	5,996,732	1,070,793,965	
North Dakota	143,830,515	72,558,174	17,334,717	16,583,195	14,115,413	1,806,510	266,028,524	
Ohio	736,221,683	371,918,885	88,854,341	134,268,339	72,352,821	12,287,010	1,415,903,079	
Oklahoma	361,364,713	182,551,484	43,612,983	29,571,879	35,513,429	2,682,606	655,297,094	
Oregon	275,736,346	139,294,396	33,278,525	31,617,920	27,098,227	3,714,112	510,739,525	
Pennsylvania	904,167,488	456,760,472	109,123,662	138,119,733	88,857,839	13,579,940	1,710,609,136	
Rhode Island	123,149,645	62,211,803	14,862,888	15,175,982	12,102,638	1,956,470	229,459,426	
South Carolina	345,174,623	174,372,697	41,659,006	29,261,958	33,922,334	2,963,188	627,353,806	
South Dakota	154,672,332	78,136,195	18,667,350	19,143,291	15,200,557	1,809,763	287,629,488	
Tennessee	465,758,905	235,288,550	56,212,282	59,239,104	45,772,858	4,953,796	867,225,495	
Texas	1,639,732,655	828,347,703	197,898,769	227,594,648	161,146,140	21,905,453	3,076,625,369	
Utah	169,123,759	85,436,657	20,411,488	19,213,227	16,620,783	2,940,032	313,745,947	
Vermont	108,576,712	54,849,960	13,104,066	16,683,732	10,670,470	2,136,780	206,021,739	
Virginia	547,407,958	276,535,400	66,066,478	80,604,363	53,796,989	7,699,571	1,032,110,759	
Washington	395,864,344	199,979,746	47,776,731	57,224,566	38,903,910	8,111,074	747,860,371	
West Virginia	254,228,471	128,429,210	30,682,747	23,854,041	24,984,522	1,814,768	463,993,760	
Wisconsin	406,481,193	205,343,085	49,058,075	48,466,226	39,947,290	4,599,762	753,895,632	
Wyoming	145,191,898	73,346,942	17,523,160	15,050,515	14,268,859	1,654,742	267,036,117	
Apportioned Total	20,972,370,292	10,594,662,923	2,531,148,139	3,307,507,855	2,061,077,770	339,233,022	39,806,000,000	

Source: Federal Highway Administration.

Figure A-5. Funding for Highway Safety Programs Proposed in Senate

Authorizations: Motor Vehicle and Highway Safety Improvement Act of 2011 (Mariah's Act) as Introduced S. 1449 As Introduced (Contract Authority From Highway Account of Highway Trust Fund Unless Otherwise Indicated)									
DRAFT									
		FY 2012	FY 2013	Total	Average	Source	CA or STA	CA Citation	
Title I - Highway Safety									
101(a)(1)	Highway Safety Programs (23 USC 402)	243,000,000	243,000,000	486,000,000	243,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	§101(c)	
102(g)	Cooperative research an evaluation program for priority highway safety countermeasures (23 402(i))	[2,500,000]	[2,500,000]	[5,000,000]	[2,500,000]				
101(a)(2)	Highway Safety Research and Development (23 USC 403)	130,000,000	139,000,000	269,000,000	134,500,000	HTF-HA	CA	§101(c)	
103	Driver Licensing and Fitness to Drive Clearinghouse (23 USC 403(f))	[amount is for 2 years]		[1,280,000]	[640,000]				
101(a)(3)	Combined Occupant Protection Grants (23 USC 405)	44,000,000	44,000,000	88,000,000	44,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	§101(c)	
101(a)(4)	State Traffic Safety Information System Improvements (23 USC 408)	44,000,000	44,000,000	88,000,000	44,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	§101(c)	
101(a)(5)	Impaired Driving Countermeasures (23 USC 410)	139,000,000	139,000,000	278,000,000	139,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	§101(c)	
101(a)(6)	Distracted Driving Grants (23 USC 411)	39,000,000	39,000,000	78,000,000	39,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	§101(c)	
101(a)(7)	National Driver Register (49 USC chapter 303)	5,000,000	5,000,000	10,000,000	5,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	§101(c)	
101(i)	Development & placement of broadcast media to support enforcement of State distracted driving laws (limiting amount)	[5,000,000]	[5,000,000]	[10,000,000]	[5,000,000]				
101(a)(8)	High Visibility Enforcement Program (§2009 of SAFETEA-LU)	37,000,000	37,000,000	74,000,000	37,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	§101(c)	
101(a)(9)	Motorcyclist Safety (§2010 of SAFETEA-LU)	6,000,000	6,000,000	12,000,000	6,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	§101(c)	
101(a)(10)	Administrative Expenses of NHTSA for 23 USC chapter 4)	25,581,280	25,862,674	51,443,954	25,721,977	HTF-HA	CA	§101(c)	
101(a)(11)	Driver Alcohol Detection System for Safety Research (23 USC 413)	12,000,000	12,000,000	24,000,000	12,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	§101(c)	
101(a)(12)	State Graduated Driver Licensing Laws (23 USC 414)	22,000,000	22,000,000	44,000,000	22,000,000	HTF-HA	CA	§101(c)	
Total -- Title IV		746,581,280	755,862,674	1,502,443,954	751,221,977				
	Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund - Contract Authority	746,581,280	755,862,674	1,502,443,954	751,221,977				
	General Fund - Subject to Appropriation	-	-	-	-				
	Rescission	-	-	-	-				
		746,581,280	755,862,674	1,502,443,954	751,221,977				

Source: S. 1449.



Figure A-6. Funding for Commercial Vehicle Safety Programs Proposed in Senate

Authorizations: Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Enhancement Act of 2011 as Introduced S. 1950 As Introduced <i>(Contract Authority From Highway Account of Highway Trust Fund Unless Otherwise Indicated)</i>						
DRAFT						
		FY 2012	FY 2013	Total	Average	Source CA or STA CA Citation
Title IV - Compliance, Safety, and Accountability						
606	Compliance, Safety, and Accountability 49 USC 31102	249,717,000	253,814,000	503,531,000	251,765,500	HTF-HA CA 49 USC 31104(i)(2)
	Administrative expenses under 49 USC 31102 (NTE 1.5% setaside) 49 USC 31104(d)(1)(A)	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	
	Training of non-Government employees development of training materials for §§31102, 31311 & 31313 (limiting amount???) 49 USC 31104(d)(2)	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	
	Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (setaside NLT) 49 USC 31102(b)	[168,388,000]	[171,813,000]	[340,201,000]	[170,100,500]	
606	Data and Technology Grants (49 USC 31109)	30,000,000	30,000,000	60,000,000	30,000,000	HTF-HA CA 49 USC 31104(i)(2)
	Administrative expenses under 49 USC 31109 (NTE 1.4% setaside) 49 USC 31104(d)(1)(B)	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	
303(d)(1)	Development of IT for capture/storage of medical certificates under 49 USC 31311(a)(24) (setaside)	[1,000,000]	[1,000,000]	[2,000,000]	[1,000,000]	
606	Driver Safety Grants (49 USC 3313)	31,000,000	31,000,000	62,000,000	31,000,000	HTF-HA CA 49 USC 31104(i)(2)
	Administrative expenses under 49 USC 3313 (NTE 1.4% setaside) 49 USC 31104(d)(1)(C)	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	
	Training of non-Government employees development of training materials for §§31102, 31311 & 31313 (limiting amount???) 49 USC 31104(d)(2)	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	[computed]	
606	Administrative Expenses of FMCSA (§31104(h)(1))	250,819,000	248,523,000	499,342,000	249,671,000	HTF-HA CA 49 USC 31104(i)(2)
404	Development, design, and implementation of national clearinghouse controlled substance and alcohol test results of commercial motor vehicle operators (§402 of Act)	[5,000,000]	[5,000,000]	[10,000,000]	[5,000,000]	
Total -- Title IV		561,536,000	563,337,000	1,124,873,000	562,436,500	
<i>Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund - Contract Authority</i>		<i>561,536,000</i>	<i>563,337,000</i>	<i>1,124,873,000</i>	<i>562,436,500</i>	
<i>General Fund - Subject to Appropriation</i>		-	-	-	-	
<i>Rescission</i>		-	-	-	-	
		<i>561,536,000</i>	<i>563,337,000</i>	<i>1,124,873,000</i>	<i>562,436,500</i>	

Source: S. 1950.



Author Contact Information

Marc Levinson, Coordinator
Section Research Manager
mlevinson@crs.loc.gov, 7-7240

Robert S. Kirk
Specialist in Transportation Policy
rkirk@crs.loc.gov, 7-7769

John Frittelli
Specialist in Transportation Policy
jfrittelli@crs.loc.gov, 7-7033

Curry L. Hagerty
Specialist in Energy and Natural Resources Policy
chagerty@crs.loc.gov, 7-7738

Linda Luther
Analyst in Environmental Policy
lluther@crs.loc.gov, 7-6852

William J. Mallett
Specialist in Transportation Policy
wmallett@crs.loc.gov, 7-2216

David Randall Peterman
Analyst in Transportation Policy
dpeterman@crs.loc.gov, 7-3267

Mary Tiemann
Specialist in Environmental Policy
mtiemann@crs.loc.gov, 7-5937

John Williamson
Information Research Specialist
jwilliamson@crs.loc.gov, 7-7725

Key Policy Staff

Area of Expertise	Name	Phone	E-mail
Legal analysis of environmental review issues	Kristina Alexander	7-8579	kalexander@crs.loc.gov
Freight, trucking, railroads, intermodal transportation	John Frittelli	7-7033	jfrittelli@crs.loc.gov
Outer continental shelf oil and gas exploration	Curry Hagerty	7-7738	chagerty@crs.loc.gov
Transportation finance, highway programs, motor fuels taxes	Robert S. Kirk	7-7769	rkirk@crs.loc.gov
Environmental review of transportation projects	Linda Luther	7-6852	lluther@crs.loc.gov
Mass transit, metropolitan planning, private financing of infrastructure	William J. Mallett	7-2216	wmallett@crs.loc.gov
Highway safety, motor carrier safety, passenger rail, appropriations	D. Randy Peterman	7-3267	dpeterman@crs.loc.gov
Leaking Underground Storage Tank fund	Mary Tiemann	7-5937	mtiemann@crs.loc.gov
Transportation statistics, history of federal transportation programs	John Williamson	7-7725	jwilliamson@crs.loc.gov