

S.C.R.T.D. LIBRARY

THE  
SURFACE  
TRANSPORTATION  
ASSISTANCE  
ACT  
OF  
1978

U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration

- *Program Coordination Division, Office of  
Program and Policy Planning*
- *Office of Public Affairs*

Urban Mass Transportation Administration

- *Office of Public Affairs*

03736

KF50  
95-599  
c.2

*Single copies of this publication may be obtained free of charge from the Offices of Public Affairs, Federal Highway Administration (HPA-1) or Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UPA-1), 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590.*

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
OVERVIEW . . . . .	7
TITLE I—HIGHWAY PROGRAMS . . . . .	9
Interstate Highway System . . . . .	9
Primary, Secondary, and Urban Systems . . . . .	12
Other Highway Programs . . . . .	13
Additional Provisions . . . . .	15
Studies and Demonstrations . . . . .	16
TITLE II—HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS . . . . .	19
Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program . . . . .	19
Hazard Elimination Program . . . . .	20
Rail-Highway Crossing Improvement . . . . .	20
Highway Safety Grants . . . . .	21
National Maximum Speed Limit Enforcement . . . . .	21
Other Categories and Studies . . . . .	22
TITLE III—PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION . . . . .	25
Discretionary Grant Program—Section 3 . . . . .	25
Urban Mass Transit Program—Section 5 . . . . .	26
Formula Grant Program, Non-Urbanized—Section 18 . . . . .	28
Intercity Bus Assistance . . . . .	28
Additional Provisions . . . . .	29
TITLE IV—BUY AMERICA . . . . .	31
TITLE V—HIGHWAY TRUST FUND . . . . .	33

### APPENDICES

- Appendix A—Authorizations Contained in the Surface Transportation Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-599)
- Appendix B—Apportionments of Certain Federal-Aid Highway Funds Authorized by P.L. 95-599 for FY 1979
- Appendix C—UMTA Section 5 FY 79 Formula Apportionment: Preliminary Estimate
- Appendix D—Small Urban and Rural Apportionments
- Appendix E—One-Time Studies and Reports
- Appendix F—Periodic Studies and Reports



# Overview

The Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-599), signed into law by President Carter on November 6, 1978, is a significant milestone in federal assistance for the nation's transportation needs. This is the first act, as such, which combines authorizations for highways, highway safety, and public transportation in one piece of legislation. It is the first of the acts related to federal-aid highways which authorizes funds for a 4-year period. Total funding provided in the act is \$51.4 billion to become available in fiscal years 1979 through 1982, with \$30.6 billion for highways, \$7.2 billion for highway safety, and \$13.6 billion for public transportation.

Among the most significant provisions are:

1. Extension of the Highway Trust Fund as the major source for highway and highway safety program funding is provided for 5 years—September 30, 1979, to September 30, 1984. Existing taxes are also extended.
2. Accelerated completion of the Interstate System is stimulated:
  - Available funds are concentrated on ready-to-go projects by changing the availability of a state's apportionments to 2 years. The unused balances become a discretionary fund to be allocated to other States for ready-to-go projects on a first-come, first-serve basis. The change from 4-year to 2-year availability gave the discretionary fund \$1.4 billion to start with in FY 1979.
  - Realistic deadlines are set with regard to certain actions, otherwise the route will be dropped from the system.
  - The redesignation of new routes from withdrawn mileage is no longer permitted.
  - The substitution of alternate facilities for Interstate routes also must meet certain deadlines and, further, the federal share is increased to 85 percent for all substitute projects to encourage decisionmaking based on need.
3. More effective safety and bridge programs are promoted:
  - Funding for bridges is significantly increased to about \$1 billion annually, including a \$200 million annual discretionary fund for use on high-cost bridges.

- The bridge program is expanded to include rehabilitation as well as replacement, funding for off-system as well as on-system bridges, and the federal contribution is increased to 80 percent.
  - Compliance criteria are established for enforcement of the national 55 mph speed limit, along with graduated penalties for non-compliance and bonuses for exceptional achievements.
  - Safety construction emphasis is consolidated through the establishment of a hazard elimination program that includes existing roadside obstacle and high hazard programs, with the pavement marking program to be incorporated by 1982.
4. Transit assistance is restructured and refocused:
- Discretionary and formula grants are restructured, transferring routine bus capital and commuter rail needs to the formula program.
  - The discretionary program is focused on major investment projects and incorporates provisions for urban initiatives and intermodal coordination.
  - A new formula grant program is established for transit capital and operating assistance to rural and small urban areas.
  - Funding for formula grants to urbanized areas is significantly increased.
5. Program changes have been made to promote greater flexibility:
- Transferability provisions between Federal-Aid Primary, Secondary, and Urban System highway funds have been increased to 50 percent.
  - Recognition of off-system needs is continued in the provisions of the safer off-system roads, bridge, and rail-highway crossing programs.
  - Non-Interstate highway system federal shares are raised to a 75 percent minimum.
  - Maintenance-of-effort requirements in the transit formula grant program are eased. Formula grant funds for transit in urbanized areas and discretionary grant funds have broader eligibilities.

# TITLE I

## HIGHWAY PROGRAMS

The federal-aid highway program provides financial assistance to the states to assist in the construction and improvement of roads and streets and to assist in a large number of activities related to the construction and management of major highway systems. The assistance is provided through a number of categorical programs, each designed either to improve designated systems or to encourage particular types of highway improvements. The 1978 Act makes several changes in the structure within which federal assistance is given, with special emphasis on accelerating completion of the Interstate System and increasing the flexibility with which states can utilize available federal-aid highway funds.

### Interstate Highway System

Accelerated completion of the Interstate System is one of the major goals of the 1978 Act. Since 1956, about \$63 billion has been obligated on the system, with 92 percent of it now open to traffic. The remaining 8 percent includes both projects ready to go and some long-term, high-cost projects that may not reach completion until the 1990's, if at all. The sooner the remainder can be completed, the less expensive the total cost of the system will be. The 1978 Act includes provisions to speed up construction of those projects that are ready to go, accelerate the decisionmaking on those still under study, and keep down the cost.

**Authorizations.** Interstate construction authorization are increased slightly by the 1978 Act to \$3.5 billion for fiscal years 1981-1982 (from \$3.25 billion in fiscal years 1979-1980), and then reduced to \$3.2 billion in fiscal year 1983. (These authorizations represent the fiscal year for which authorized, but are apportioned one year in advance. For example, for FY 1983, \$3.2 billion is authorized, although the date of apportionment will be the beginning of FY 1982.) Authorizations are also set at \$3.625 billion for each of the FY's 1984 through 1990, the current "target" completion date.

Separate authorizations for 3R work (Resurfacing, Restoration, and Rehabilitation) on Interstate routes in service over 5 years are held at the existing level of \$175 million in FY's 1980-1981 and then increased to \$275 million in FY's 1982-1983.

The act also authorizes \$125 million for each FY 1980 through 1983 to ensure that each state receives at least one-half of 1 per-

cent of the total apportionment for the Interstate System in each of those years, or approximately \$15.8 million annually.

**Interstate 3R.** The Interstate 3R Program, first authorized in the 1976 Highway Act, is made a continuing program and is incorporated as a new section in Title 23 of the United States Code. As the Interstate System draws nearer to completion, the emphasis is beginning to shift from initial construction to one which pays increased attention to resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation of the existing system. Normal periodic maintenance activities will remain a state responsibility and will not be eligible for federal financial assistance.

The act provides a total of \$900 million for FY's 1980-1983 for the resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation of Interstate lanes which have been in use for more than 5 years. For the first time, lanes in use more than 5 years on Interstate toll roads are eligible if an agreement is reached that the toll road will become free to the public when enough tolls have been collected to liquidate its bonded indebtedness.

Interstate 3R projects are now funded with a 75-percent federal share, a reduction from the previous 90-percent share.

The states are required to certify on October 1 of each year that they have a program for maintaining the Interstate System in accordance with guidelines that are to be issued by the Secretary of Transportation no later than October 1, 1979. If the maintenance program in a state, as determined on October 1 of each year, is not to the Secretary's satisfaction, that state will have its Interstate apportionment for the fiscal year reduced by 10 percent. Another new feature of the 1978 Act allows a state which receives more Interstate 3R apportionment than it needs to transfer the excess, upon Secretarial approval, for work on the Primary System.

**Apportionment.** Interstate System construction authorizations for fiscal year 1980 will be apportioned using factors of revised Table 5 contained in Committee Print 95-49 of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives. Revised Table 5 essentially updates the January 1, 1976, estimate of the cost to complete the system to reflect the current expected costs in each state. Apportionments continue to be made 1 year in advance, based on each state's relative share of the cost to complete the system as computed from the most recent Interstate cost estimate. Additional cost estimates are scheduled every two years from 1979-1989 as a basis for apportioning future year funds.



A new formula is established for apportioning Interstate 3R authorizations. The formula is based 75 percent on the ratio of the number of lane miles each state has of the total lane miles in all states in use for more than 5 years, and 25 percent on the ratio each state has of the total vehicle miles traveled on those lanes.

The Act broadens a provision of the 1976 Highway Act that allows, under certain conditions, a transfer of all or part of the one-half percent minimum apportionment to other programs. A state which has received such an apportionment may use the amount that exceeds what the state needs to complete its part of the Interstate System, including what it needs for Interstate 3R work, for Primary, Secondary, Urban Systems, or Hazard Elimination Program.

**Interstate Completion and Eligibilities.** Several provisions of the act are designed and intended to speed completion of the Interstate System. A significant change was made in the availability of Interstate apportionments. They are now available only until the end of the fiscal year for which they are authorized. Since Interstate authorizations are apportioned 1 year in advance, this provision means that Interstate apportionments are now available to a state for 2 years before they are subject to lapse, as compared to the previous 4-year availability. If a state does allow funds to lapse, those funds will be made available to other states who have used up their own apportionments and have additional Interstate projects ready to go.

Under previous law, a state could replace one Interstate route with a substitute Interstate route, of increased mileage but at no increase in cost. This is no longer allowed as a result of the 1978 Act. However, the lid on the costs of the substitute routes already approved is lifted and full funding of those routes will be permitted.

Withdrawal of certain urban Interstate routes and the transfer of federal financial commitment to substitute public transportation or other highway projects in the same area under Section 103(e) (4) of Title 23 U.S. Code is still allowed until September 30, 1983. After that date, there can be no further transfer of Interstate credits except for routes under litigation on the deadline date. The federal share of the substitute projects is 85 percent. This is a change from previous law, which specified that the federal share would be whatever percentage was permitted for the particular substitute project, i.e., 80 percent for mass transit, 70 percent for primary, secondary, or urban highways.

The act requires that environmental impact statements for all routes or route sections to be constructed on the Interstate System must be submitted to the Secretary of Transportation by September 30, 1983. Further, all Interstate routes or substitute projects must be either under contract for construction or construction must be underway by September 30, 1986, if sufficient Federal funds are available. The consequences of not meeting these requirements will be removal of those routes from the Interstate System, or withdrawal of approval on substitute projects. Also under the law, states will be allowed to use abandoned Interstate rights-of-way on withdrawn routes for a wide variety of public purposes without the repayment of federal funds already received.

The act makes interest on bonds eligible for federal participation if they are used to advance Interstate completion. Use of this provision is conditioned on the state having exhausted its own Interstate funds and any lapsed funds of other states which were available. Further, eligible interest will only be for bonds issued after enactment of the 1978 act and for bonds issued for projects under construction on January 1, 1978.

### **Primary, Secondary, and Urban Systems**

Funding levels for the core federal-aid highway programs (aside from the Interstate) gradually rise from \$2,850 million in FY 1979 to \$3,200 million in FY 1981 before dropping back to \$2,700 million in FY 1982.

The Primary System, consisting of about 270,000 miles of main roads important to interstate, regional, and statewide travel, gets a boost in funding from \$1,350 million to \$1,550 million in the first year. Most of this increase is earmarked for 3R work.

The Secondary System jumps 25 percent from \$400 million previously to \$500 million in FY 1979. Again, most of the additional \$100 million is earmarked for 3R work on the 400,000 miles of rural major collector routes which constitute the Secondary System.

Finally, funding for the Urban System for each of fiscal years 1979-1982 is \$800 million, the same amount as was authorized in FY 1978. No earmarking for 3R is made. The Urban System consists of about 133,000 miles of arterials and collectors in urban areas.

**Federal Share and Transferability.** The federal share for all the system-related programs is raised from 70 percent to 75 percent.

As in the past, this federal share may be increased by the percentage of land in states which is federally-owned.

The act increases the authority of a state to transfer funds from one system to another. The maximum amount that can be transferred between the Primary System and the Secondary System is raised from 40 percent to 50 percent. Similarly, the maximum transfer between the Primary and the Urban Systems is raised from 20 percent to 50 percent.

**Eligibility.** A new provision requires that at least 20 percent of a state's apportionment (from FY's 1979-1982) for Primary and Secondary Systems must be spent for 3R projects.

The act sets aside \$125 million per year from the Primary System authorization for priority routes. The \$125 million will be available for obligation at the discretion of the Secretary of Transportation only for projects of unusually high cost or which require long periods of time for their construction.

Arterial and collector routes in all urban areas over 5,000 (not included on any other Federal-aid System) continue to qualify for inclusion on the Urban System.

## **Other Highway Programs**

The act provides authorizations for a diverse set of other programs with varying objectives and purposes. Most of the programs are continued from previous highway acts, while others are new or have been expanded in scope. A few programs are funded for only FY 1979. Appendix A indicates the actual fiscal year authorizations for these programs. These include:

### ● **Forest Highways**

- Provides funds for roads in or adjacent to the national forests.
- Program expanded by 1978 Act to include roads off the Federal-Aid System.

### ● **Public Lands Highways**

- Provides funds for routes through public lands owned by the federal government.

### ● **Economic Growth Centers**

- Grants for improving Federal-Aid System highways which encourage balanced population patterns, development of natural resources and the revitalization and diversification of the economy of rural areas.

- **Territorial Highways**

- Provides funds for the improvement of highways in Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and (as a result of this act) the Northern Mariana Islands.
- This act raised the federal share from 70 percent to 100 percent.

- **Great River Road**

- Provides funds for the construction or reconstruction by the 10 states bordering the Mississippi River of a scenic and recreational highway along the river.
- Roads which connect the Great River Road to bridges that provide access to sites across the river are now eligible, as a result of the act.

- **Control of Outdoor Advertising**

- Controls the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices adjacent to Interstate and Primary roads, and provides funds for the removal of non-conforming signs.
- The act requires that compensation shall be paid for removal of any signs lawfully erected under state laws, but not meeting federal standards, regardless of the reason for removal. It also allows the use of “electronic” signs (information displays changed at reasonable intervals by electronic or other remote means) on the premises of adjacent businesses.

- **Safer Off-System Roads**

- Provides funds for improvement of any road not on a federal-aid system, including, but not limited to, work such as correction of safety hazards, removal of roadside obstacles, pavement construction and reconstruction, and installing traffic control devices.
- The act requires that at least 50 percent of each State’s off-system funds be spent on specific types of safety improvements (eliminating high hazard locations or roadside obstacles, improving highway signing or pavement marking, or installing traffic control or warning devices).

- **Urban High Density**

- Provides funds to complete three special highway projects which connect to the Interstate System through areas of high traffic density.

### ● **Railroad-Highway Demonstration**

- Funding is continued for relocation demonstration projects to eliminate or reduce railroad-highway crossing conflicts in several cities.
- The 1978 act sets the federal share for these projects at a uniform 95 percent.

### ● **Overseas Highway**

- Increases the maximum amount of special funds available for the reconstruction and replacement of bridges connecting the Florida Keys.

In addition, authorizations of \$308 million annually are provided for road improvements on federal lands that are administered by agencies other than the Department of Transportation. These are programs for Forest Development Roads and Trails, Public Lands Roads and Trails, Park Roads and Trails, Parkways, and Indian Reservation Roads and Bridges.

## **Additional Provisions**

A number of continuing programs are modified by new provisions. Some of the more significant of the provisions are described below.

**Carpools and Vanpools.**—This program is made permanent through codification in Title 23, U.S.C. It permits the use of Primary, Secondary, and Urban System apportionments for projects designed to encourage carpooling. A new special Carpool-Vanpool Program authorizes \$3 million in FY 1979 and \$9 million in FY 1980 for grants and demonstration purposes. Also authorized is \$1 million for each of FY 79-81 for the promotion of carpooling by the Secretary. These special funds will not be available, however, until appropriated by Congress.

**Special Bicycle Program.**—In a similar fashion, \$20 million per year for FY's 1979-82 is authorized for special bicycle projects, subject to appropriation action. However, Primary, Secondary, and Urban System funds may also be used for such projects.

**Traffic Control Signalization.**— Up to 10 percent of federal-aid system apportionments could be used in the past to pay the full amount of constructing rail highway crossing projects. Now traffic control signalization projects are also eligible under this provision.

**Vehicle Weight Enforcement.**—The vehicle weight enforcement program is strengthened by several provisions of the new law. First, there is continuation of the now-required annual certification by each state that it is enforcing all of its law concerning maximum vehicle size and weights. But in addition, the states are required to annually inventory the existing system of state penalties for violation of weight laws and also inventory the existing system for issuing special permits.

Second, the Secretary of Transportation will be required to withhold 10 percent of a state's Interstate, Primary, Secondary, and Urban System funds if the state fails to certify annually that it is enforcing its weight laws or if the Secretary determines that the state is not adequately enforcing its weight laws. The penalty previously was denial of all project approvals and was reduced to give the Secretary a more realistic sanction.

Finally, the Secretary is directed to make a study of the need for uniformity in maximum truck sizes and weights, and their probable effect on the construction and maintenance of roads, the general economy, and the trucking industry.

**Obligation Limitation.**—The total of all obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 1979 must not exceed \$8.5 billion. This supercedes a provision in the 1979 Appropriations Act (signed August 4, 1978) which had set the obligation limitation at \$7.95 billion.

## **Studies and Demonstrations**

Title I of the act requires 13 one-time studies, 4 periodic studies and reports, and 6 reports on specific demonstration projects. A complete list, along with their due dates, is included in the appendix. Of these, some of the more significant are listed below.

- **Vehicle Weights**—To study the desirability of uniform maximum truck weights and means to bring about such uniformity with recommendations by the Secretary of Transportation.
- **Bonded Indebtedness**—To determine the extent of outstanding bonded indebtedness in each state as of January 1, 1979, for toll roads incorporated in the Interstate System, with findings and recommendations by the Secretary of Transportation on alternative methods for making those toll roads free to public travel.

- **Alaska-Puerto Rico Interstate Study**—To determine the feasibility of designating Interstate routes in these two localities.
- **Urban Blight**—To study the potential for reducing urban blight near primary and Interstate highways in central business districts.
- **Unit Train Impacts**—To study techniques to relieve the impacts on communities along rail corridors of the increased unit train traffic to meet national energy requirements.
- **National Alcohol Fuels Commission**—Sets up a commission to study the potential of alcohol fuels to contribute to the nation's energy needs.

Several demonstration projects were authorized, some with special funding, some not. These include:

- **Bridge Acceleration Projects**—\$54 million of the FY 1979 bridge replacement money is earmarked to construct two bridges to demonstrate the feasibility of various methods for reducing the time required to complete a bridge project.
- **Vending Machines**—Authorizes the installation of vending machines, as a demonstration project only, in rest areas along the Interstate System to ascertain the need of the traveling public for food, drink, and other items.
- **Access Control Demonstrations**—Authorizes \$10 million for FY 1979 and \$20 million for FY 1980 for three demonstration projects (in different states) to determine whether imposing access control on existing highways is a cost effective alternative to building additional highways.
- **Bypass Highway Demonstration**—A total of \$50 million is authorized from FY's 1979-81 at a 90-percent federal share for the construction of a highway to bypass Prairie Creek Redwood State Park in California.
- **Motorist Information System Demonstration**—A total of \$30 million at a 90-percent federal share is authorized during fiscal years 1979-1981 for a project demonstrating the use of roadway management technology to coordinate traffic flows on major roads in a high-density traffic corridor without building new lanes.





## **TITLE II**

### **HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS**

Existing highway safety programs, including both the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) administered programs, are continued in the 1978 Highway Safety Act. However, there are significant changes in the structure and requirements of several programs. Authorizations overall are higher for the 4 fiscal years covered by the Act. Most of the increase can be attributed to a large increase in funding for the Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program, although several new safety activities (Safety Education, Innovative Safety Grants, and 55 MPH Enforcement) are authorized.

#### **Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program**

The Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation program, subject of much debate during the history of this act, began at a \$2 billion a year level in the House and a \$450 million level in the Senate. The final conference figure was \$900 million a year for FY 1979 building up to \$1.3 billion in FY 1981.

Although the funding increase held the spotlight, there were other changes made in the bridge program. The federal share is raised from 75 percent to 80 percent, 5 percent higher than other major federal-aid categories. Major rehabilitation of unsafe bridges is permitted for the first time, in addition to replacement. Eligible for funding is the rehabilitation or replacement of highway bridges over waterways, topographical barriers, other highways and railroads. Off-system bridges are eligible for the first time—at least 15 percent and up to 35 percent of a state's bridge funds must be spent for off-system projects unless the Secretary grants a waiver in the case of a state that does not have sufficient needs off-system to justify such expenditures.

Of the amount authorized, \$200 million is set aside each year to be available at the discretion of the Secretary of Transportation for replacement or rehabilitation bridge projects costing over \$10 million.

Instead of all bridge funds being allocated at the Secretary's discretion as in the past, the majority of the funds are apportioned on the basis of inventoried bridge needs. The formula ensures that each state receives at least one-fourth of one percent and not more than 8 percent of the total apportioned. These funds are available for 4 years, after which unobligated amounts will be reapportioned to the other states. Existing provisions for the inventory of bridges is broadened to include off-system as well as on-system bridges and to include rehabilitation needs when classifying bridges and assigning priorities for their improvement.

### **Hazard Elimination Program**

The 1978 Act consolidates safety construction programs by establishing a Hazard Elimination Program that combines roadside obstacles and high hazard programs.

There will continue to be two categories of funding—Hazard Elimination and Pavement Marking—until 1982 when Pavement Marking projects will be carried out under the Hazard Elimination Program.

The federal share for the Hazard Elimination Program is 90 percent. The funds will be apportioned as were the High Hazard/Roadside Obstacle funds—75 percent on population and 25 percent on public road mileage.

The act also requires each state to inventory all hazards to motorists and pedestrians on public roads, set up a priority list and implement a schedule of projects. Also required of each state is an evaluation of the projects carried out under this program.

### **Rail-Highway Crossing Improvements**

The act consolidates existing categories of assistance for elimination of rail-highway crossing hazards, both on and off system, and authorizes a total of \$190 million per year. Eligible items include protective devices, grade separations, highway relocation, and—when the least expensive alternative—relocation of a segment of rail line. At least half of the funds must be spent for the installation of protective devices at railway-highway crossings.

The funds will be apportioned by a new formula—25 percent on the Secondary System formula, 25 percent on the Urban System formula, and 50 percent on the ratio that the total number of grade crossings in the state bears to the total crossings in all states. The federal share remains at 90 percent.

### **Highway Safety Grants**

The Section 402 Highway Safety Grants Program, administered by both FHWA and NHTSA, was modified slightly by the 1978 Act. The objectives of the program are to implement highway safety standards, including driver performance, vehicle operation, highway safety, and accident analysis; and to conduct safety research relating to highway driver and highway characteristics, accident investigations, emergency medical care, adjudication of traffic infractions, etc.

The funds will continue to be apportioned on the formula based 75 percent on population and 25 percent on public road mileage. The federal share is raised from 70 percent to 75 percent, reflecting the change in the matching ratio for the federal-aid systems.

At least 2 percent of the funds made available to the states through NHTSA for highway safety (excluding safety research) are to be spent on programs encouraging the use of safety belts by drivers and passengers in motor vehicles. The act amends Title 23 to make it clear that the Highway Safety Program should be administered through a state highway safety agency. This is effective January 1, 1979.

### **National Maximum Speed Limit Enforcement**

Funds have been authorized for the state's program to aid in achieving greater compliance with the 55 mph national speed limit—\$50 million for FY 1979 and \$67.5 million for each of FY's 1980-1982. These funds, when appropriated, are to strengthen the state's law enforcement efforts.

The states will be required to submit data to support the certifications to the Secretary on January 1 of each year. The submittal must include data on the percentage of vehicles exceeding the 55 mph limit. Criteria will be established by the Secretary and will consider such things as speedometer variability and sampling accuracy.

The act establishes a sliding scale of minimum standards to be met before a penalty is imposed:

<i>Maximum Percent of Vehicles Exceeding 55 m.p.h.</i>	<i>By End of FY</i>	<i>Penalty: Reduction of FAP, FAS, &amp; FAU Apport.</i>
70	1979	5% of FY 1981 Funds
60	1980	5% of FY 1982 Funds
50	1981	5% of FY 1983 Funds
40	1982	10% of FY 1984 Funds
30	1983 and beyond	10% of FY 1985 Funds and later years`

Any apportionment withheld would be restored to the state when speed on its public roads have fallen to the level specified for the year for which the apportionment was withheld. The Secretary is given the authority to postpone the imposition of sanctions for one year in situations where a State is faced with an unusually difficult compliance problem.

On the other hand, the states can receive incentive grants if the percentage exceeding 55 mph is below:

- 60 percent by end of FY 1979
- 50 percent by end of FY 1980
- 40 percent by end of FY 1981
- 30 percent by end of FY 1982
- 20 percent by end of FY 1983

The incentive grant will equal 10 percent of a state's apportionment for its 402 safety activities and can be used for any of those activities.

### **Other Activities and Studies**

Title II also authorizes other activities and a number of studies.

The activities include:

1. **National Accident Data System.** This provision authorizes a total of \$20 million to advance the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's accident data system for the acquisition, storage, and retrieval of highway accident statistics, and to advance an accident sampling procedure for the reporting of highway accidents nationwide.

2. **Innovative Project Grants.** The act authorizes the Secretary to make grants to states, agencies of local government, and non-profit organizations for the development of innovative and imaginative approaches to highway safety problems. A total of \$30 million is authorized for this purpose.
3. **Highway Safety Education and Information Campaign.** A total of \$16 million is authorized to promote highway safety through the use of mass media, specifically through radio and television. The effort, to be conducted by FHWA, is to include six pilot projects and lead eventually to a national highway safety campaign.

Appropriation action by Congress is required before any of the above authorizations can be used.

The studies include:

- **National Driver Register.** To study the need for and the ways to establish an automated national driver register to assist states in electronically exchanging information regarding motor vehicle driver records of problem drivers.
- **Motorcycle Helmet Usage.** Study the effect of the provision of the 1976 Highway Act relating to the wearing of safety helmets by operators and passengers on motorcycles.
- **Outsized Vehicles.** Study vehicles which are larger than standardized vehicles. The double-bottom tanker is one example of the type of vehicle Congress is concerned about and would like more information on.
- **Marijuana and Other Drug Usage.** Study the efforts to detect and prevent marijuana usage by motor vehicle operators.
- **Seat Belt Usage.** The Secretary is required to work through the National Academy of Science in developing ways to encourage use of safety belts, including financial incentives.



# **TITLE III**

## **PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**

Title III, also known as the 1978 Federal Public Transportation Act, extends the basic features of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 and provides authorizations for public transportation through FY 1982. The total 4-year funding is authorized at \$13.58 billion, plus \$1.58 billion which is authorized for the discretionary capital grant program for FY 1983 and an unspecified amount to be made available for substitute mass transit projects in lieu of Interstate highway projects. Yearly authorizations are significantly higher than the FY 1978 levels. This is mostly attributable to a large increase in the Urban Mass Transit Program (the formula program for urbanized areas under Section 5 of the UMT Act) and establishment of three new programs—Small Urban-Rural Assistance, Terminal Development, and Inter-City Bus Service. The changes in the law basically restructure and refocus the transit capital and operating assistance programs.

### **Discretionary Capital Grant Program – Section 3**

The act clarifies the eligible items for the discretionary, capital grants under this section. These are now specifically identified as: construction of new fixed guideways and extensions of existing ones, modernization of existing mass transit facilities and equipment and construction of new facilities and equipment, introduction of new technology into public transportation services, joint development and urban initiatives projects, and commuter rail projects that will mitigate adverse effects of the Northeast Corridor rail service project. The first two of these categories are continuations of existing provisions, while the other three types of projects are new provisions. The costs of detailed alternative analysis are now eligible as part of new fixed guideway systems. Routine bus purchases will be funded by Section 5 apportionments, where possible, rather than Section 3 funds, as has been the case. The federal share of net project cost remains at 80 percent, except for the Northeast Corridor projects which can be 100 percent.

The authorizations provided for activities in this section have certain conditions and mandates placed on their use. They require that:

1. At least \$350 million each year must be spent for modernization of existing public transportation systems,

2. \$200 million annually is available for transit related urban development projects and intermodal facilities,
3. Up to \$45 million is available for modifying equipment and facilities because of the Northeast Corridor projects,
4. Two percent of the authorizations for Section 3 may be used exclusively for mass transportation services for the elderly and handicapped.
5. Up to five and one-half percent of the Section 3 authorization is available annually for planning grants or grants for projects with innovative techniques and methods in the management and operation of public transportation services (however, grants to any one state in a fiscal year cannot exceed 12 and one-half percent of the total funds available for these innovative projects).

Existing contract authority that has not already been obligated by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration is cancelled. Thus, while retaining its discretionary nature, Section 3 programs are subject to the appropriations process. The appropriated funds will be available for 4 years, with the appropriations made 1 year in advance of availability. The act also formalizes a "letter of intent" procedure under which the Secretary may make long-range promises of Federal funds for major transit projects. This procedure will aid state and local agencies in developing major transit systems.

### **Urban Mass Transit Program – Section 5**

The structure of the existing capital and operating formula grant program is altered by the 1978 Act by introducing new factors in the formula and by significantly increasing the funding levels. The Section 3 program for routine capital bus purchases has been transferred to Section 5. The current categorical grant programs in Sections 17 and 18 for commuter rail operations are abolished and are replaced by a new commuter rail/fixed guideway program within Section 5.

The basic program of operating and capital assistance is expanded in FY 1980 to a \$900-million-per-year level and retains



the contract authority mandated by the 1974 Act for FY's 1979 and 1980 (all other Section 5 funding is subject to the appropriation process). As before, the basic program is apportioned to all urbanized areas on the basis of population and population density.

A "second tier" of \$250 million per year for operating and capital assistance is authorized for the Section 5 program. Eighty-five percent of the funds appropriated are to be apportioned to the 33 urbanized areas over 750,000 in population, with the remaining 15 percent going to smaller urbanized areas. Within both groups, the basis for apportionment is population and population density.

There is also a separate formula program for the purchase of buses, bus-related equipment and the construction of bus-related facilities. Funds will be apportioned in FY's 1979 and 1980 also on the basis of population and population weighted by density. The formula for future years is yet to be determined. A study on alternative apportionment methods is required by the Act.

Section 5 also contains a new commuter rail/fixed guideway category to replace the current Sections 17 and 18 commuter rail programs. Two-thirds of the funds appropriated will be apportioned on a commuter rail train mile/route mile formula, and one-third will be apportioned on a fixed guideway route mile basis. Apportioned funds may be used for any eligible capital or operating assistance project on any commuter rail or fixed guideway system in the urbanized area.

A major change has been made in the length of time that apportioned funds are available to the recipient. Availability is extended from 2 years to 4 years, after which the funds are reapportioned.

The act modifies the current maintenance of effort provision by (1) excluding reimbursements for transportation of school children from the maintenance of effort calculation, (2) allowing revenues from fare increases to substitute for reduced local subsidies, and (3) allowing proportionate reductions in maintenance-of-effort contributions where local cost efficiencies are achieved. The maintenance-of-effort provision itself is terminated after fiscal year 1981 unless extended in the interim by Congress.

The act requires public hearings be held before a general increase in fares or substantial change in service can be made.

## **Formula Grant Program, Non-Urbanized Areas – Section 18**

The act adds a new program providing operating and capital assistance funds for the establishment and maintenance of transit programs for areas that are not in urbanized areas (i.e. areas of less than 50,000 population). The federal matching shares for these areas correspond to those in the larger cities: 50 percent for operating and 80 percent for capital assistance projects, although greater flexibility will be given to non-urbanized area in their efforts to obtain the required local share.

This is a formula grant program under which funds will be apportioned to the Governor based on non-urbanized area population. Funds will be available for projects included in a program of projects submitted to the Secretary for his approval. The Secretary must approve the program based on a finding that it provides a fair and equitable distribution within the state and provides for coordination of other federally-assisted transportation projects.

Eligible recipients include public bodies, non-profit organizations and operators of services. Private providers of service are eligible through purchase of service agreements with a local public body for the provision of public transportation services. Up to 15 percent of the apportionment may be used for project planning, administration, coordination, and technical assistance.

The Secretary is authorized to establish terms and conditions of this program which are appropriate to the special needs of public transportation in rural and small urban areas.

As with the Section 5 formula grant program for areas with larger populations, the apportioned funds are available for 4 years to the states. Unobligated apportionments will then be reapportioned among the other states.

### **Intercity Bus Assistance**

Two new, companion programs have been authorized to assist intercity bus carriers. Capital improvements to terminals are covered by the new Section 21, and operating assistance to intercity bus operations serving non-urbanized areas is available through a new Section 22.

**Terminal Development Program**—\$40 million is authorized annually for grants to public bodies and to acquire, construct, or alter facilities (directly operated, operated through a lease, or

otherwise) primarily for use in intercity bus service and in ordinating such service with other modes of transportation.

- No assistance will be provided unless fair and equitable arrangements have been made for the use of such facilities by private bus companies.
- Federal share—80 percent of net projects costs.

**Intercity Bus Service—Section 22**—\$30 million is authorized annually for operating assistance for state and local bodies to pay up to 50 percent of the net cost of purchase of service. Assistance would be through agreements with private intercity bus companies for service to rural areas and small urban communities. To the maximum extent feasible, federal assistance is intended to subsidize deficit operation of a route taking into account all of the income generated by the route and only the direct costs of the operation of the route.

Funds for these new programs will not be available until appropriated by Congress.

### **Additional Provisions**

The new *planning* section deletes the existing planning requirements in Sections 3, 4, 5, and 9 and in place of these scattered requirements, establishes a single planning requirement and authorization section, compatible with the highway requirement. In addition:

- Funding is provided through a five and one-half percent takedown from Section 3 appropriations.
- A program of projects is required to be submitted for approval of the Secretary.
- The plans and programs are to encourage the participation of private enterprise.

The act establishes a program of grants for the purpose of establishing and operating *Transportation Research Centers* at non-profit institutions of higher learning, authorized at \$10 million per year.

The Secretary is directed to make some 13 studies or evaluations. Most relate to specific issues which arose during development of the legislation. Also in Title III is a specific \$25 million authorization made for a *Waterborne Demonstration Project*.



## **TITLE IV**

### ***BUY AMERICA***

Title IV has one provision—Buy America. With certain exceptions, articles, materials, and supplies purchased with grant funds authorized by this act must have been mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States. This requirement only applies to contracts whose total cost exceeds \$500,000.

The Secretary can waive this provision if:

1. Its application would be inconsistent with the public interest.
2. It would result in unreasonable cost for rolling stock.
3. The domestic supplies are not available in reasonable quantities or are not of satisfactory quality.
4. The use of United States' products would increase the cost over 10 percent.



# **TITLE V**

## ***HIGHWAY TRUST FUND***

Title V is known as the Highway Revenue Act of 1978.

The Highway Trust Fund taxes had been scheduled to expire in 1979, at which time the dedicated highway user taxes (gas, tire, etc.) would revert to pre-1951 levels and stay as general funds. However, this Act extended the Trust Fund taxes to 1984 and the Trust Fund to 1985. This 5-year extension is expected to more than adequately support the 4-year program authorized by the STAA.

As of September 30, 1978, the Trust Fund had a \$11.7 billion balance with \$18.8 billion in unpaid authorizations. It is estimated that revenues from Trust Fund taxes will average \$8 billion annually for fiscal years 1979-1984.

The "Byrd Amendment" was modified by this section. This refers to the previously required reduction in Interstate apportionments alone when anticipated Trust Fund revenues were inadequate to cover expenditures. Now, a pro-rata reduction of all apportioned Highway Trust Funded programs will be required.

A 2-year experimental program is authorized providing taxi cabs a refund of the 4-cents-per-gallon excise tax on gasoline. Certain conditions must be met before the exemption is allowed—the cabs must permit ride-sharing and their fuel economy rating must exceed the fleet average for cars purchased in 1978 or later. The Treasury Department and the taxicab industry are to report to Congress on the effectiveness of the exemption in encouraging more energy efficient taxicabs and in removing barriers to ride sharing.

Another law affecting the Trust Fund is The Energy Tax Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-618) which exempts intercity, local, and school buses from most highway user taxes. The annual loss of revenues to the Trust Fund is nominal as it will average about \$25 million a year.

Two studies are required by this title of the STAA:

- A study of the existing highway excise tax structure will be conducted by the Treasury Department and will focus on the ease or difficulty of administering and complying with each excise tax.

- A cost allocation study will determine whether different types of vehicles are paying their proportionate share of the costs of federal aid highways. It is scheduled to be completed by 1982 so that Congress may consider its findings when the question of extending the Trust Fund comes up again.



# APPENDIX A

## Authorizations Contained in the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-599)

Program	Fiscal Year				Federal Share, %
	1979	1980	1981	1982	
<b>TITLE I PROGRAMS</b>					
Interstate <sup>1</sup> .....	3,250	3,500	3,500	3,200	90 <sup>2</sup>
Interstate 1/2% minimum <sup>1</sup> .....	125	125	125	125	75-90 <sup>2</sup>
Interstate 3R <sup>1</sup> .....	175	175	275	275	75 <sup>2</sup>
Primary .....	1,550	1,700	1,800	1,500	75 <sup>2</sup>
Secondary .....	500	550	600	400	75 <sup>2</sup>
Urban .....	800	800	800	800	75 <sup>2</sup>
Forest Highway .....	33	33	33	33	100
Public Lands Highway .....	16	16	16	16	100
Forest Development Roads & Trails* .....	140	140	140	140	100
Public Lands Development Roads and Trails* .....	10	10	10	10	100
Park Roads and Trails* .....	30	30	30	30	100
Parkways* .....	45	45	45	45	100
Indian Roads and Bridges* .....	83	83	83	83	100
Economic Growth Center .....	50	50	50	50	75 <sup>2</sup>
Beautification Adminis- tration* .....	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	NA
Territories:					
Virgin Islands* .....	5	5	5	5	100
Guam* .....	5	5	5	5	100
American Samoa* .....	1	1	1	1	100
Northern Marianas* .....	1	1	1	1	100
Northeast Corridor					
Demonstration* .....	45	40	—	—	80-100
Great River Road:					
On System .....	25	25	25	25	75 <sup>2</sup>
Off System* .....	10	10	10	10	75
Outdoor Advertising					
Control* .....	30	30	30	30	75
Safer Off-System Roads* .....	200	200	200	200	75 <sup>2</sup>
Access Highways to Lakes* .....	15	15	15	15	75
Urban High Density .....	85	—	—	—	90
Emergency Relief .....	100	100	100	100	75-100 <sup>2</sup>
Carpool and Vanpool					
Projects .....	4	10	1	—	75
Bridges on Dams .....	15	—	—	—	100
Multimodal Concept .....	9	—	—	—	NA

\* All programs are Trust Fund except those identified by an asterisk. Parkways on the Federal-aid system are financed from the Trust Fund. The Railroad Highway Crossing Demonstration is financed two-thirds Trust Fund on one-third general funds. The Bicycle Program is \$10 million Trust Fund and \$10 million general funds annually.

<sup>1</sup> Interstate System authorizations are for FY 1980-83. They are listed here in the fiscal year in which they are apportioned.

<sup>2</sup> May be increased in States containing large amounts of Federally owned lands.

## APPENDIX A—(Continued)

### Authorizations Contained in the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978 (P.L.95-599)—(Continued)

Program	Fiscal Year				Federal Share. %
	1979	1980	1981	1982	
TITLE I PROGRAMS—(Continued)					
Railroad Highway Crossing					
Demonstration*	70	90	100	100	95
Overseas Highway	8.8	—	—	—	70
Appalachian Regional					
Commission*	1.8	—	—	—	80
Bicycle Program*	20	20	20	20	75
Bloomington Ferry Bridge	0.2	—	—	—	75
Access Control					
Demonstration	10	20	—	—	75
Bypass Highway					
Demonstration	5	25	20	—	90
Automated Roadway					
Demonstration	1.5	2.5	26	—	90
Impact of Increased Unit					
Train Traffic*	.35	—	—	—	NA
National Alcohol Fuels					
Commission*	1.5	—	—	—	NA
Total All Programs	7,477.65	7,858	8,067.5	7,220.5	
Source:					
Trust Fund	6,819.17	7,201.5	7,447.67	6,600.67	
General Fund	658.48	656.5	619.83	619.83	

#### TITLE II PROGRAMS

Highway Safety Programs (NHTSA)	175	175	200	200	75 <sup>2</sup>
Research & Development Program (NHTSA)	50	50	50	50	NA
Highway Safety Program (FHWA)	25	25	25	25	75 <sup>2</sup>
National Maximum Speed Limit	50	67.5	67.5	67.5	75
Research & Development (FHWA)	10	10	10	10	NA
Bridge Reconstruction & Replacement	900	1,100	1,300	900	80

\* All programs are Trust Fund except those identified by an asterisk. Parkways on the Federal-aid system are financed from the Trust Fund. The Railroad Highway Crossing Demonstration is financed two-thirds Trust Fund on one-third general funds. The Bicycle Program is \$10 million Trust Fund and \$10 million general funds annually.

<sup>1</sup> Interstate System authorizations are for FY 1980-83. They are listed here in the fiscal year in which they are apportioned.

<sup>2</sup> May be increased in States containing large amounts of Federally-owned lands.

## APPENDIX A — (Continued)

### Authorizations Contained in the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-599) — (Continued)

Program	Fiscal Year				Federal Share, %
	1979	1980	1981	1982	
TITLE II PROGRAMS—(Continued)					
Pavement Marking . . . . .	65	65	65	—	100
Hazard Elimination . . . . .	125	150	150	200	90
Schoolbus Driver Training . . . . .	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	75
Innovative Project Grants . . . . .	—	5	10	15	75
Rail Highway Crossing . . . . .	190	190	190	190	90
Accident Data . . . . .	5	5	5	5	NA
Highway Safety Education & Information . . . . .	16	—	—	—	NA
Total Title II Highway Safety . . . . .	1,613.5	1,845	2,075	1,665	
Source: Trust Fund . . . . .	1,613.5	1,845	2,075	1,665	
General Funds . . . . .	—	—	—	—	
TITLE III PROGRAMS					
Discretionary Capital Grant or Loan Program <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	1,375	1,410	1,515	1,600	80
Transportation Centers . . . . .	10	10	10	10	50
Research, Development and Demonstration, Administration and Misc. . . . .	90	95	100	105	
Formula Capital and Operating Assistance					
Urbanized Areas:					
Base . . . . .	850	900	900	900	<sup>5</sup>
Second Tier . . . . .	250	250	250	250	<sup>5</sup>
Commuter Rail or Fixed Guideways . . . . .	115	130	145	160	<sup>5</sup>
Bus Purchase and Related Capital Improvements . . . . .	300	300	370	455	<sup>5</sup>
Nonurbanized Areas . . . . .	90	100	110	120	<sup>5</sup>
Terminal Development . . . . .	40	40	40	40	80
Intercity Bus Service . . . . .	30	30	30	30	50
Waterborne Transportation Demonstration . . . . .	25				
Total Title III Public Transportation <sup>1, 4</sup> . . . . .	3,175	3,265	3,470	3,670	
Source: Trust Fund . . . . .	—	—	—	—	
General Funds . . . . .	3,175	3,265	3,470	3,670	
<sup>1</sup> \$1.58 billion is also authorized for FY 1983. <sup>4</sup> No specific amounts are authorized for Interstate Substitute Mass Transit Projects. <sup>5</sup> 80% for capital, 50% for operating.					

## APPENDIX B

### Apportionments of Certain Federal-Aid Highway Funds Authorized by P.L. 95-599 for FY 1979 Non-Interstate Programs and FY 1980 Interstate Program<sup>1</sup>

(in thousands of dollars)

38

State	Interstate System	Interstate 3R	Primary System	Secondary System	Urban System	Urban Planning	Bridge R&R	Hazard Elimination	Rail Highway Crossing	Sec 402 FHWA	Forest Highway	All Programs
Alabama	80,304	3,049	25,341	10,226	9,762	335	8,799	2,172	3,601	432	92	144,113
Alaska	15,845	—	51,162	26,757	3,900	154	1,570	612	2,883	122	2,790	105,795
Arizona	67,311	4,336	18,635	7,559	7,057	276	1,570	1,207	1,597	240	1,802	111,590
Arkansas	15,845	2,326	21,096	9,704	4,413	154	10,441	1,414	2,930	281	435	69,039
California	217,082	15,440	91,336	18,510	92,428	3,886	16,584	9,989	11,286	1,990	4,584	483,115
Colorado	46,585	3,670	21,281	8,426	8,703	340	2,951	1,590	2,331	316	2,299	98,492
Connecticut	87,466	2,217	15,295	4,247	11,898	535	2,137	1,461	1,348	291	—	126,895
Delaware	15,845	122	6,932	2,438	3,900	154	1,570	612	578	122	—	32,273
District of Columbia	59,832	113	2,430	—	3,942	181	6,830	612	265	122	—	74,327
Florida	95,991	4,578	36,348	10,530	26,911	1,129	21,920	3,664	5,100	729	186	207,080
Georgia	80,526	4,946	32,355	12,823	13,194	449	16,516	2,794	4,970	556	113	169,242
Hawaii	40,976	213	6,932	2,438	3,900	154	2,300	612	468	122	—	58,115
Idaho	15,845	2,131	12,435	6,032	3,900	154	3,789	803	1,750	159	3,259	50,257
Illinois	135,320	6,641	56,399	14,828	46,473	1,902	50,240	5,840	10,098	1,163	37	328,941
Indiana	28,141	4,520	32,332	11,712	16,620	572	5,669	2,967	6,433	590	21	109,577
Iowa	41,103	2,852	26,169	11,358	7,591	201	14,987	2,108	5,361	418	—	112,148
Kansas	38,504	2,363	24,078	10,454	6,974	188	16,773	2,009	5,546	398	—	107,287
Kentucky	71,558	3,205	23,382	9,719	8,123	271	26,043	1,931	2,968	384	66	147,650
Louisiana	98,558	2,327	22,788	8,248	11,738	425	37,285	2,006	3,583	399	74	187,431
Maine	15,845	949	9,351	4,211	3,900	154	4,440	612	1,110	122	12	40,706

<sup>1</sup> The apportionments shown here are for programs with statutory apportionment formulas and financed from the Highway Trust Fund.

## APPENDIX B — (Continued)

### Apportionments of Certain Federal-Aid Highway Funds Authorized by P.L. 95-599 for FY 1979 Non-Interstate Programs and FY 1980 Interstate Program<sup>1</sup> — (Continued)

(in thousands of dollars)

State	Interstate System	Interstate 3R	Primary System	Secondary System	Urban System	Urban Planning	Bridge R&R	Hazard Elimination	Rail Highway Crossing	Sec 402 FHWA	Forest Highway	All Programs
Maryland	133,101	2,228	18,689	4,903	15,432	618	11,720	1,902	1,869	379	—	190,841
Massachusetts	104,865	2,134	22,384	3,985	24,371	1,034	13,456	2,722	2,359	543	—	177,853
Michigan	80,495	5,666	48,106	14,807	32,902	1,369	9,123	4,776	6,944	951	343	205,482
Minnesota	71,716	3,312	31,479	12,622	12,381	466	21,042	2,619	5,330	520	443	161,930
Mississippi	30,170	2,652	19,761	8,957	4,547	154	4,643	1,497	2,661	297	151	75,490
Missouri	73,047	5,358	34,563	13,026	16,192	615	8,772	2,946	5,030	586	164	160,299
Montana	25,796	3,397	18,403	9,172	3,900	154	2,988	845	2,086	167	2,552	69,460
Nebraska	15,845	1,913	18,351	8,241	4,461	154	10,366	1,365	3,425	271	30	64,422
Nevada	27,824	1,749	12,108	5,745	3,900	154	1,570	612	935	122	574	55,293
New Hampshire	15,845	739	6,932	2,438	3,900	154	6,590	612	772	122	171	38,275
New Jersey	68,610	1,845	28,335	4,444	32,725	1,451	10,818	3,358	3,322	669	—	155,577
New Mexico	30,708	3,730	16,632	7,675	3,900	154	2,681	836	1,326	166	1,283	69,091
New York	161,116	4,258	79,017	16,164	79,492	3,447	50,240	8,741	8,185	1,742	—	412,402
North Carolina	65,632	3,031	35,301	15,127	10,850	326	14,788	2,918	4,432	581	197	153,183
North Dakota	15,845	1,956	12,827	6,317	3,900	154	4,125	943	3,299	186	—	49,552
Ohio	100,586	7,143	53,665	15,269	40,599	1,587	14,357	5,478	8,130	1,091	18	247,923
Oklahoma	22,627	2,926	23,155	9,516	8,383	250	3,949	1,972	3,875	391	22	77,066
Oregon	52,036	3,179	19,741	8,233	6,773	235	6,183	1,734	2,440	344	4,410	105,308
Pennsylvania	164,697	5,183	61,876	19,183	41,890	1,667	36,283	6,028	7,205	1,200	85	345,297
Rhode Island	42,656	517	6,932	2,438	4,250	178	3,811	612	545	122	—	62,061

<sup>1</sup> The apportionments shown here are for programs with statutory apportionment formulas and financed from the Highway Trust Fund.

<sup>2</sup> Apportionment less than \$500.

## APPENDIX B—(Continued)

### Apportionments of Certain Federal-Aid Highway Funds Authorized by P.L. 95-599 for FY 1979 Non-Interstate Programs and FY 1980 Interstate Program<sup>1</sup>—(Continued)

(in thousands of dollars)

State	Interstate System	Interstate 3R	Primary System	Secondary System	Urban System	Urban Planning	Bridge R&R	Hazard Elimina- tion	Rail Highway Crossing	Sec. 402 FHWA	Total Forest Highway	All Programs
South Carolina . . . . .	39,645	2,631	18,387	7,857	5,722	173	10,102	1,605	2,986	319	105	89,532
South Dakota . . . . .	14,261	1,981	12,553	6,241	3,510	138	2,863	861	2,304	170	251	45,133
Tennessee . . . . .	63,096	4,192	27,764	11,017	11,280	382	20,991	2,337	3,502	465	107	145,133
Texas . . . . .	160,070	13,907	82,361	29,205	44,308	1,668	25,711	6,875	11,671	1,367	101	377,244
Utah . . . . .	34,606	2,753	12,362	5,160	4,229	175	1,570	810	1,330	161	1,063	64,219
Vermont . . . . .	15,845	1,032	6,932	2,438	3,900	154	7,020	612	719	122	57	38,381
Virginia . . . . .	132,753	4,501	29,806	10,962	14,807	573	24,124	2,509	3,148	499	208	223,890
Washington . . . . .	106,956	3,774	23,198	8,288	12,285	480	17,859	2,102	3,354	418	2,225	180,939
West Virginia . . . . .	71,241	1,182	13,472	6,085	3,900	154	9,367	1,029	1,865	205	126	108,626
Wisconsin . . . . .	30,867	2,484	30,301	11,380	14,316	493	14,862	2,753	5,050	547	179	113,232
Wyoming . . . . .	19,997	3,073	11,809	5,946	3,900	154	1,570	612	1,067	122	1,365	49,615
Puerto Rico . . . . .	—	—	11,734	3,796	7,452	259	2,038	1,228	831	245	9	27,592
Secretary of Interior . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	122	—	122
American Samoa . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	408	—	82	—	490
Guam . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	408	—	82	—	490
Virgin Islands . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	408	—	82	—	490
Northern Marianas . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	408	—	82	—	490
<b>Total . . . . .</b>	<b>3,261,042</b>	<b>170,422</b>	<b>1,385,000</b>	<b>486,857</b>	<b>779,690</b>	<b>30,732</b>	<b>628,000</b>	<b>122,500</b>	<b>186,200</b>	<b>24,500</b>	<b>32,010</b>	<b>7,106,953</b>

<sup>1</sup> The apportionments shown here are for programs with statutory apportionment formulas and financed from the Highway Trust Fund.

## APPENDIX C

### UMTA Section 5 FY 79 Formula Apportionment: Preliminary Estimate Federal Public Transportation Act of 1978\*

(in millions of dollars, rounded)

*Urbanized Areas with Population of 200,00 or more*

<i>Urbanized Area</i>	<i>Total Apport</i>	<i>Urbanized Area</i>	<i>Total Apport</i>
Akron . . . . .	\$ 4.5	Dayton . . . . .	6.1
Albany-Schenectady-Troy . . . . .	4.4	Denver . . . . .	10.9
Albuquerque . . . . .	2.5	Des Moines . . . . .	2.0
Allentown-Bethlehen-EHS . . . . .	3.5	Detroit . . . . .	46.8
(Part New Jersey) . . . . .	.2	El Paso . . . . .	2.9
(Pennsylvania) . . . . .	3.3		
Atlanta . . . . .	10.8	Flint . . . . .	3.1
Aurora-Elgin . . . . .	3.3	Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood . . . . .	5.3
Austin . . . . .	2.4	Fort Wayne . . . . .	2.1
Baltimore . . . . .	20.3	Fort Worth . . . . .	4.8
Baton Rouge . . . . .	2.2	Fresno . . . . .	2.4
Birmingham . . . . .	4.5	Grand Rapids . . . . .	2.8
		Harrisburg . . . . .	2.1
Boston . . . . .	36.1	Hartford . . . . .	4.4
Bridgeport . . . . .	4.1	Honolulu . . . . .	4.4
Buffalo . . . . .	13.5	Houston . . . . .	16.4
Canton . . . . .	2.2	Indianapolis . . . . .	6.9
Charleston . . . . .	1.8	Jacksonville . . . . .	3.7
Charlotte . . . . .	2.3	Kansas City . . . . .	9.4
Chattanooga . . . . .	1.7	(Part Kansas) . . . . .	3.2
(Part Georgia) . . . . .	.2	(Part Missouri) . . . . .	6.3
(Part Tennessee) . . . . .	1.5	Lansing . . . . .	2.1
Chicago . . . . .	96.4		
(Part Illinois) . . . . .	91.7	Las Vegas . . . . .	1.8
(Part Indiana) . . . . .	4.7	Lawrence-Haverhill . . . . .	1.6
Cincinnati . . . . .	11.1	(Part Massachusetts) . . . . .	1.5
(Part Kentucky) . . . . .	1.9	(Part New Hampshire) . . . . .	.1
(Part Ohio) . . . . .	9.3	Little Rock-North Little Rock . . . . .	1.8
Cleveland . . . . .	19.8	Los Angeles-Long Beach . . . . .	106.8
		Louisville . . . . .	7.0
Colorado Springs . . . . .	1.6	(Part Indiana) . . . . .	.7
Columbia . . . . .	1.9	(Part Kentucky) . . . . .	6.3
Columbus . . . . .	1.6	Madison . . . . .	1.9
(Part Alabama) . . . . .	.2	Memphis . . . . .	6.2
(Part Georgia) . . . . .	1.4	(Part Mississippi) . . . . .	.1
Columbus . . . . .	8.0	(Part Tennessee) . . . . .	6.1
Corpus Christi . . . . .	1.5	Miami . . . . .	14.6
Dallas . . . . .	11.0	Milwaukee . . . . .	11.6
Davenport Rock Island . . . . .	2.1	Minneapolis-St. Paul . . . . .	14.9
(Part Illinois) . . . . .	1.2	Mobile . . . . .	1.8
(Part Iowa) . . . . .	.9		

\* Does not include commuter rail/fixed guideway apportionments.

## APPENDIX C — (Continued)

### UMTA Section 5 FY 79 Formula Apportionment: Preliminary Estimate Federal Public Transportation Act of 1978\* — (Continued) (in millions of dollars, rounded)

<i>Urbanized Area</i>	<i>Total Apport</i>	<i>Urbanized Area</i>	<i>Total Apport</i>
Nashville-Davidson . . . . .	3.0	South Bend . . . . .	2.5
New Haven . . . . .	3.4	(Part Indiana) . . . . .	2.3
New Orleans . . . . .	12.3	(Part Michigan) . . . . .	.2
Newport News-Hampton . . . . .	2.0	Spokane . . . . .	2.0
New York . . . . .	266.1	Springfield-Chicofee . . . . .	4.0
(Part New Jersey) . . . . .	55.9	(Part Connecticut) . . . . .	.5
(Part New York) . . . . .	210.1	(Part Massachusetts) . . . . .	3.5
Norfolk-Portsmouth . . . . .	5.2		
Oklahoma City . . . . .	4.1	St. Louis . . . . .	20.9
Omaha . . . . .	4.5	(Part Illinois) . . . . .	2.8
(Part Iowa) . . . . .	.4	(Part Missouri) . . . . .	18.1
(Part Nebraska) . . . . .	4.0	St. Petersburg . . . . .	4.4
Orlando . . . . .	2.4	Syracuse . . . . .	3.7
Oxnard-Ventura-Thousand		Tacoma . . . . .	2.8
Oaks . . . . .	1.9	Tampa . . . . .	3.2
Peoria . . . . .	2.0	Toledo . . . . .	4.3
		(Part Michigan) . . . . .	.1
Philadelphia . . . . .	\$ 62.8	(Part Ohio) . . . . .	4.2
(Part New Jersey) . . . . .	8.0	Trenton . . . . .	2.8
(Part Pennsylvania) . . . . .	54.7	(Part New Jersey) . . . . .	2.6
Phoenix . . . . .	7.4	(Part Pennsylvania) . . . . .	.3
Pittsburgh . . . . .	19.4	Tucson . . . . .	2.5
Portland . . . . .	8.1	Tulsa . . . . .	2.8
(Part Oregon) . . . . .	7.4		
(Part Washington) . . . . .	.6	Washington . . . . .	32.5
Providence-Pawtucket . . . . .	7.9	(Part Maryland) . . . . .	10.7
(Part Massachusetts) . . . . .	.5	(Part District of Colum. . . . .	14.1
(Part Rhode Island) . . . . .	7.4	(Part Virginia) . . . . .	7.7
Richmond . . . . .	3.6	West Palm Beach . . . . .	2.2
Rochester . . . . .	6.2	Wichita . . . . .	2.6
Rockford . . . . .	1.9	Wilkes-Barre . . . . .	1.9
Sacramento . . . . .	5.3	Wilmington . . . . .	3.4
Salt Lake City . . . . .	4.0	(Part Delaware) . . . . .	3.3
		(Part New Jersey) . . . . .	.2
San Antonio . . . . .	7.9	Worcester . . . . .	2.2
San Bernadino-Riverside . . . . .	4.3	Youngstown-Warren . . . . .	3.5
San Diego . . . . .	11.8		
San Francisco-Oakland . . . . .	38.1	Urbanized Areas with Populations Less	
San Jose . . . . .	11.2	than 200,000, by State	
San Juan . . . . .	13.8		
Scranton . . . . .	1.6	ALABAMA . . . . .	4.1
Seattle-Everett . . . . .	11.9	Huntsville . . . . .	1.0
Shreveport . . . . .	1.9	Montgomery . . . . .	1.2

\* Does not include commuter rail/fixed guideway apportionments.



## APPENDIX C — (Continued)

### UMTA Section 5 FY 79 Formula Apportionment: Preliminary Estimate Federal Public Transportation Act of 1978\* — (Continued) (in millions of dollars, rounded)

Urbanized Area	Total Apport	Urbanized Area	Total Apport
Tuscaloosa .....	.6	FLORIDA .....	6.9
Gadsen .....	.4	Melbourne-Cocoa .....	1.3
Florence .....	.4	Saratoga-Bradenton .....	1.2
Anniston .....	.4	Pensacola .....	1.4
ALASKA .....	.8	Daytona Beach .....	.8
Anchorage .....	.8	Tallahasee .....	.6
ARIZONA .....	.0	Gainesville .....	.6
ARKANSAS .....	1.2	Fort Myers .....	.5
Fort Smith .....	.5	Lakeland .....	.5
Pine Bluff .....	.5	GEORGIA .....	4.1
Texarkana .....	.2	Savannah .....	1.3
CALIFORNIA .....	8.9	Augusta .....	1.1
Bakersfield .....	1.6	Macon .....	1.0
Stockton .....	1.5	Albany .....	.6
Santo Barbara .....	1.2	HAWAII .....	0
Modesto .....	.9	IDAHO .....	.7
Seaside-Monterey .....	.9	Boise .....	.7
Santa Rosa .....	.6	ILLINOIS .....	7.7
Sant Cruz .....	.6	Joliet .....	3.0
Salinas .....	.6	Springfield .....	1.2
Antioch-Pittsburg .....	.5	Champaign-Urbana .....	1.2
Sima Valley .....	.5	Decatur .....	.8
COLORADO .....	1.7	Alton .....	.8
Pueblo .....	.9	Bloomington-Normal .....	.7
Boulder .....	.8	Dubuque .....	.8
CONNECTICUT .....	8.8	INDIANA .....	4.3
Stamford .....	2.2	Evansville .....	1.3
New London-Norwich .....	1.0	Muncie .....	.9
New Britain .....	1.2	Terre Haute .....	.7
Norwalk .....	1.2	Anderson .....	.6
Meriden .....	.7	Lafayette-West Lafayette .....	.8
Bristol .....	.5	IOWA .....	3.0
Danbury .....	.6	Cedar Rapids .....	1.0
DELAWARE .....	0	Waterloo .....	.8
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA .....	0	Sioux City .....	.6
		Dubuque .....	.6

\* Does not include commuter rail/fixed guideway apportionments.

## APPENDIX C—(Continued)

### UMTA Section 5 FY 79 Formula Apportionment: Preliminary Estimate Federal Public Transportation Act of 1978\*—(Continued) (in millions of dollars, rounded)

<i>Urbanized Area</i>	<i>Total Apport</i>	<i>Urbanized Area</i>	<i>Total Apport</i>
KANSAS .....	1.1	MINNESOTA .....	2.0
Topeka .....	1.1	Duluth-Superior .....	.7
St. Joseph .....	0	Fargo-Moorhead .....	.3
		La Crosse .....	.6
KENTUCKY .....	2.7	Rochester .....	.6
Huntington-Ashland .....	.4	St. Cloud .....	.4
Lexington .....	1.6	MISSISSIPPI .....	2.5
Clarksville .....	.1	Jackson .....	1.6
Owensboro .....	.6	Biloxi-Gulfport .....	.9
		MISSOURI .....	1.9
LOUISIANA .....	2.7	Springfield .....	.9
Monroe .....	.7	St. Joseph .....	.6
Lake Charles .....	.7	Columbia .....	.4
Lafayette .....	.7		
Alexandria .....	.6	MONTANA .....	1.2
		Billings .....	.6
MAINE .....	1.2	Great Falls .....	.6
Portland .....	.8	NEBRASKA .....	1.4
Lewiston-Auburn .....	.4	Lincoln .....	1.3
		Sioux City .....	.1
MARYLAND .....	0	NEVADA .....	.8
		Reno .....	.8
MASSACHUSETTS .....	6.3	NEW HAMPSHIRE .....	1.2
Lowell .....	1.6	Manchester .....	.8
Brockton .....	1.3	Washua .....	.4
Fall River .....	1.2	NEW JERSEY .....	1.5
New Bedford .....	1.3	Atlantic City .....	1.0
Fitchburg-Leominster .....	.5	Vineland-Millville .....	.4
Pittsfield .....	.4		
MICHIGAN .....	7.1	NEW MEXICO .....	0
Ann Arbor .....	1.8	NEW YORK .....	4.6
Kalamazoo .....	1.2	Utica-Rome .....	1.5
Saginaw .....	1.4	Binghamton .....	1.5
Muskegon .....	.8	Poughkeepsie .....	1.0
Jackson .....	.6	Elmira .....	.7
Bay City .....	.7		
Battle Creek .....	.6		

\* Does not include commuter rail/fixed guideway apportionments.

## APPENDIX C—(Continued)

### UMTA Section 5 FY 79 Formula Apportionment: Preliminary Estimate Federal Public Transportation Act of 1978\*—(Continued) (in millions of dollars, rounded)

Urbanized Area	Total Apport	Urbanized Area	Total Apport
NORTH CAROLINA . . . . .	8.3	PUERTO RICO . . . . .	3.6
Fayetteville . . . . .	1.3	Ponce . . . . .	1.9
Raleigh . . . . .	1.2	Mayaguez . . . . .	.8
Greensboro . . . . .	1.2	Caguas . . . . .	1.0
Winston-Salem . . . . .	1.1	RHODE ISLAND . . . . .	.1
Durham . . . . .	.8	Fall River . . . . .	.1
Gastonia . . . . .	.7	SOUTH CAROLINA . . . . .	1.9
High Point . . . . .	.7	Greenville . . . . .	1.2
Asheville . . . . .	.5	Augusta . . . . .	.2
Burlington . . . . .	4.4	Spartanburg . . . . .	.6
Wilmington . . . . .	.4	SOUTH DAKOTA . . . . .	.6
NORTH DAKOTA . . . . .	.5	Sioux City . . . . .	0
Fargo-Moorhead . . . . .	.5	Sioux Falls . . . . .	.6
OHIO . . . . .	5.2	TENNESSEE . . . . .	2.2
Lorain-Elyria . . . . .	1.4	Knoxville . . . . .	1.5
Huntington-Ashland . . . . .	.2	Kingsport . . . . .	.4
Springfield . . . . .	.9	Clarksville . . . . .	.3
Wheeling . . . . .	.4	TEXAS . . . . .	12.9
Hamilton . . . . .	.7	Lubbock . . . . .	1.1
Steubenville-Weirton . . . . .	.4	Amarillo . . . . .	1.0
Mansfield . . . . .	.6	Waco . . . . .	.8
Lima . . . . .	.6	Port Arthur . . . . .	.8
Parkersburg . . . . .	.1	Beaumont . . . . .	.8
OKLAHOMA . . . . .	.8	Wichita Falls . . . . .	.8
Lawton . . . . .	.7	McAllen-Pharr-Edinburg . . . . .	.8
Fort Smith . . . . .	0	Abilene . . . . .	.6
OREGON . . . . .	1.9	Texas City-LaGrange . . . . .	.5
Eugene . . . . .	1.1	Odesa . . . . .	.7
Salem . . . . .	.8	Killeen . . . . .	.5
PENNSYLVANIA . . . . .	7.9	Laredo . . . . .	.6
Erie . . . . .	1.8	San Angelo . . . . .	.5
Reading . . . . .	1.7	Galveston . . . . .	.5
York . . . . .	1.1	Midland . . . . .	.4
Lancaster . . . . .	1.0	Tyler . . . . .	.5
Johnstown . . . . .	.9	Texarkana . . . . .	.3
Altoona . . . . .	.8	Sherman-Denison . . . . .	.4
Williamsport . . . . .	.6	Brownsville . . . . .	.5
		Bryan-College Station . . . . .	.4
		Harlingen-San Benito . . . . .	.3

\* Does not include commuter rail/fixed guideway apportionments.

## APPENDIX C — (Continued)

### UMTA Section 5 FY 79 Formula Apportionment: Preliminary Estimate Federal Public Transportation Act of 1978\* — (Continued) (in millions of dollars, rounded)

<i>Urbanized Area</i>	<i>Total Apport</i>	<i>Urbanized Area</i>	<i>Total Appt</i>
UTAH .....	1.9	WEST VIRGINIA .....	3.5
Ogden .....	1.2	Huntington-Ashland .....	.8
Provo-Orem .....	.7	Charleston .....	1.3
VERMONT .....	0	Wheeling .....	.5
		Steubenville-Weirton .....	.3
		Parkersburg .....	.5
VIRGINIA .....	2.6	WISCONSIN .....	5.6
Roanoke .....	12.3	Duluth-Superior .....	.2
Petersburg-Colonial Heights .....	.8	Appleton .....	1.2
Lynchburg .....	.5	Green Bay .....	.9
Kingsport .....	0	Racine .....	1.2
WASHINGTON .....	1.0	Kenosha .....	.9
Richland-Kennewick .....	.5	La Crosse .....	.5
Yakima .....	.6	Oshkosh .....	.6

\* Does not include commuter rail/fixed guideway apportionments.

# APPENDIX D

## Small Urban and Rural Apportionments

	<i>Section 18 Apportionments \$75 million (in thousands)</i>		<i>Section 18 Apportionments \$75 million (in thousands)</i>
Alabama .....	2,135	New Mexico .....	638
Alaska .....	171	New York .....	3,301
Arizona .....	546	North Carolina .....	3,229
Arkansas .....	1,373	North Dakota .....	501
California .....	3,263	Ohio .....	3,484
Colorado .....	697	Oklahoma .....	1,341
Connecticut .....	704	Oregon .....	983
Delaware .....	177	Pennsylvania .....	4,201
Florida .....	1,829	Rhode Island .....	181
Georgia .....	2,408	South Carolina .....	1,659
Hawaii .....	292	South Dakota .....	524
Idaho .....	558	Tennessee .....	2,065
Illinois .....	2,796	Texas .....	3,733
Indiana .....	2,489	Utah .....	289
Iowa .....	1,763	Vermont .....	395
Kansas .....	1,301	Virginia .....	1,997
Kentucky .....	1,854	Washington .....	1,245
Louisiana .....	1,655	West Virginia .....	1,196
Maine .....	731	Wisconsin .....	2,089
Maryland .....	1,185	Wyoming .....	295
Massachusetts .....	1,205	District of Columbia ..	0
Michigan .....	2,791	Puerto Rico .....	1,447
Minnesota .....	1,646	American Samoa .....	24
Mississippi .....	1,686	Guam .....	75
Missouri .....	1,867	Virgin Islands .....	55
Montana .....	491	Commonwealth of	
Nebraska .....	796	Northern Mariana	
Nevada .....	136	Islands .....	8
New Hampshire .....	501		
New Jersey .....	969	TOTAL .....	75,000

# APPENDIX E

## One-Time Studies and Reports

Section	Study Report Description	Due Date
<b>Title I</b>		
124	Review of special bridge program application procedure	9 months after enactment
126	Administrative effectiveness of carpool/vanpool programs. — Study — Proposed plan	Sept. 30, 1979 Mar. 30, 1980
156	Alaska and Puerto Rico Interstate Study	July 1, 1979
157	East-West Toll Road-Indiana Study	Nov. 15, 1978
158	Columbia River Bridge Feasibility Study	Jan. 1, 1979
159	Study of Potential for urban blight reduction in CBD's.	2 years after enactment
160	Interdepartmental Coordination Study on implementation of Clean Air Amendments, EPCA, and Title 23.	1 year after enactment
161	Uniform Maximum Truck Size and Weight Study	Jan. 15, 1981
162	Increased Unit Train Traffic Impacts Study	Mar. 31, 1979
163	Mississippi River Interstate Bridge Diversion Study	2 years after enactment
164	Toll Roads' Outstanding Bonded Indebtedness Study	July 1, 1980
165	Study of commuter access to Dulles Airport Highway	90 days after enactment
166	Study of risk factors affecting operations of toll facilities	None specified
170	National Alcohol Fuels Commission Report	1 Year after establishment of the Commission

## APPENDIX E—(Continued)

### One-Time Studies and Reports—(Continued)

Section	Study Report Description	Due Date
<b>Title II</b>		
204	National Driver Register Study	1 year after enactment
210	Motorcycle Helmet Usage Study	1 year after enactment
211	Study of Outsized Vehicles (e.g., double bottoms)	6 month after enactment
212	Report on marijuana and other drug use by motor vehicle operators.	Dec. 31, 1979
214	Study of methods to encourage safety belt usage	1 year after enactment
<b>Title III</b>		
303 (h) (2)	Report on Sections 3 and 5 authorization requests: for FY 1981 through 1984 for FY 1983 through 1986	Oct. 1, 1979 Oct. 1, 1981
309	Study of rolling stock procurement process	July 1, 1979
310	Report on system required under Sec. 15 of the 1964 UMT Act.	July 1, 1979
313	Study of insurance rate escalation for operators of special public transportation services	Jan. 1, 1980
318	Study of establishing a low-cost, "basic" mass transportation system	1 year after enactment
319 (a)	Study of alternative Sec. 5 funds formula distributions	Jan. 1, 1980
319 (b)	Study of mass transit funds allocation based partially on the nature and extent of air pollution	Jan. 1, 1980
321 (a)	Cost estimates on retrofitting fixed guideway (other than light rail) transit systems for elderly and handicapped accessibility	Jan 30, 1980

## APPENDIX E—(Continued)

### One-Time Studies and Reports—(Continued)

Section	Study/Report Description	Due Date
321 (b)	Evaluation of light rail and commuter rail mass transit system to determine elderly and handicapped accessibility potential	Jan. 30, 1980
323	Study of need for subsidy of intercity bus service in non-urbanized areas	Sept. 30, 1979

#### Title IV

506	Highway Cost Allocation Study	
	— CBO guidelines due to the Secretary and Congress	90 days after enactment
	— Study plan report from Secretary to Congress	130 days after enactment
	— Progress reports	Jan. 15, 1980 Jan. 15, 1981
	— Final report, including alternative tax structures and their impacts	Jan. 15, 1982
507	Report on Highway Trust Fund excise tax structure	
	— Interim reports	April 15, 1980 April 15, 1981
	— Final report	April 15, 1982



# APPENDIX F

## Periodic Studies and Reports

Section	Study/Report Description	Due Date
<b>Title I</b>		
110	Report on status of the obligation of funds and balances for highway programs.	20th of each month for preceding month
123	Report on (1) State penalty systems for vehicle weight law violations, (2) State systems for issuance of special permits, and (3) States' annual certifications as required by 23 USC 141	January 1 of the second calendar year after enactment and annually thereafter
124	Report on special bridge program project approvals and current inventories	Annual
168	Progress report on the hazard elimination program	Annual
<b>Title II</b>		
208	Report and evaluation of innovative highway safety grant projects	Annual
209	Report on national highway safety campaign and pilot project techniques	July 1 of every year campaign is in effect
<b>Title III</b>		
303 (h) (1)	Report on current status of funds in the transit program	Quarterly
307	Status report on program for establishing and operating transportation centers at universities	Annual (October 1)

## APPENDIX F—(Continued)

### Reports On Demonstration Projects

Section	Study/Report Description	Due Date
<b>Title I</b>		
136	Report on project acceleration demonstration	6 months after completion of project
147	Report on bridge project acceleration demonstration	6 months after completion of project
150	Report on access control demonstration projects	Sept. 30, 1982
152	Report on the bypass highway demonstration project in California	Upon completion
153	Report on vending machines in Interstate System rest areas demonstration project	2 years after enactment
155	Restricted access demonstration project: — Progress reports — Final report, including recommendations	Annual 3 years after enactment
<b>Title II</b>		
209	Evaluation report on highway safety education pilot projects	90 days after end of 1 year pilot project
<b>Title III</b>		
320	Report on high-speed waterborne transportation demonstration project	Sept. 30, 1981

S.C.R.T.D. LIBRARY