

Memorandum

To: Chair and Commissioners

Date: January 14, 2009



From: John F. Barna, Jr., Executive Director

File No: Item 4.9
ACTION

Ref: Implementation of Federal Stimulus

Efforts are currently underway in Washington to authorize and fund a federal economic stimulus package. Commission staff has been working with the Department, regions, cities, counties, and other interested parties to discuss implementation of a federal stimulus package. Although several federal stimulus proposals have been made, these discussions have focused on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee proposal. Attachment 1 is the Department's summary of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee proposal for a stimulus/recovery bill based on documents received (Attachment 2) and phone conference calls held by Chairman James L. Oberstar.

Following discussions with the Department, regions, cities, counties, and other interested parties, Commission staff developed draft proposed state legislation to implement the federal stimulus package that is currently being discussed (Attachment 3). This draft language does not represent a consensus.

Key elements of the draft proposed state legislation are:

- Flexibility in implementing the federal proposal to ensure that the federal stimulus funds would be fully obligated.
- Priority would be given to delivered projects that are that are at risk for funding because of the current inability to sell voter-authorized bonds.
- To the extent practicable funds would be allocated in equal parts to:
 1. Cities and counties for local streets and road improvements,
 2. Agencies implementing projects selected by a metropolitan planning organization, county transportation commission, or regional transportation planning agency that programs projects for regional surface transportation program funds, and
 3. The department for projects on the state highway system.

In the event that state legislation is not enacted, the distribution of federal funding would be dictated by existing statute. Unless specified otherwise in the federal legislation, the federal funds would flow through the SHOPP and the STIP. If this occurs, existing processes will need to be greatly streamlined in order to meet federal deadlines.

In order to plan for such a contingency, the Commission has noticing a meeting, to be held on or after January 28, 2008, to amend the STIP to add projects nominated by Caltrans and regional transportation planning agencies for federal economic stimulus funding. This notice did not include specific project information normally included in the notice of a STIP amendment because the Department and regional agencies have not yet identified and nominated the specific projects and

Chair and Commissioners

January 14, 2009

Page 2

because the Commission anticipates that the programming deadlines in federal legislation may require prompt action in order to avoid the loss of federal economic stimulus funds to California.

This is an action item. The Commission may provide direction at this time, or provide direction when more details of the federal stimulus package are known.

Attachment 1: Caltrans summary of the current Transportation and Infrastructure Committee proposal for a stimulus/recovery bill based on documents received and phone conference calls held by Chairman Representative James L. Oberstar.

The Congressman is focused on getting money out quickly, creating employment, ensuring accountability, and getting the message to all agencies at the state and federal level that this is an urgent issue. The intent is to have the President Elect sign the bill directly after taking office.

The bill is going to propose \$85 billion for transportation. Of this amount, \$30.25 billion will be for highways and \$12 billion will be made available for transit. The proposal has two tiers: 50 percent of the funds will be allocated for projects that can be awarded in 90 days, and the remainder will be allocated for 180 day projects. The 90 day clock on award starts 10 days after funds are allocated by the federal agencies which should occur one week after the Inauguration. States will have 10 days after allocation to submit a program of projects that can be awarded 90 days later.

The bill will use the Appropriations formula to allocate \$30 billion of the highway funds to states for projects eligible under Title 23, the remaining \$250 million will be allocated for highways in national parks. Transit funds will be allocated as follows:

- \$7.5 billion through the urban and rural transit formulas (5307 and 5311).
- \$2.0 billion for transit energy projects through the transit energy program formula.
- \$2.5 billion for New Starts.

Funds will be allocated to State DOT's but he expects that there will be a suballocation to meet concerns expressed by the National Conference of Mayors. The details of the suballocation have yet to be determined. He has asked AASHTO and the National Conference of Mayors to meet and provide him with a recommendation on how to best address their issues.

He does not intend to allow any of the transit funds to be used for operating expenses. He stated that Congress had authorized funding for this purpose under the energy bill.

In addition to the \$42.25 billion already described, another \$10.25 billion will be spent as follows:

- Rail: \$5 billion (\$3.4 for Intercity and High Speed Rail, \$1.5 billion for AMTRAK, and \$100 million for Shortline Rail)
- Aviation: \$5.25 billion (\$5 billion Airport Improvement Program and \$250 million for FAA Facilities and equipment).

The balance of the \$85 billion will go to environmental infrastructure (\$14.275 billion mostly water related projects), Army Corps of Engineers (\$7 billion), Federal Buildings (\$10 billion), Coast Guard (\$750 million), Economic Development (\$400 million), Maritime Administration (\$55 million) and St. Lawrence Seaway (\$45 million).

During the call the Chairman asked if states would be looking at existing projects that are funded or new projects. Participants responded that it would be most likely a mix of projects. In some cases accelerating outer year projects in the TIP. He stated that he had expected that would happen, but

again emphasized that state's lists would clearly need to present that the stimulus funds would be used to create a net gain of jobs.

He is very concerned about accountability, both for the use of funds and the types of projects selected.

The Governor of each state will be required to sign a maintenance of effort certification. The certification will have a statement of predicted funding levels for the federal program (including state match funds) and a pledge to maintain them. In addition, the Governor will be certifying that the projects on the list represent an equitable distribution between metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas in the state. The program of projects list will be made public by US DOT.

After enactment, US DOT will be required to submit reports to Congress at 30 days, 60 days, 90 days, 180 days, 1 year, and 3 years. The reports will have the following information:

- Amount of funds appropriated, allocated, obligated, and outlays.

- Number of projects put to bid and amount of funds committed to them.

- Number of projects awarded and amount of funds committed to them.

- Number of projects that have begun work and amount of funds committed to them.

- Number of projects completed and amount of funds committed to them.

- Jobs created by the project as well as sustained jobs (the discussion described not only the construction jobs but the jobs created in support of the construction).

- Pay levels for those jobs.

He did mention something about maintenance of effort at this point but I was not able to hear it all because of interference on the line.

There will be a use it or lose it clause that will apply to both 90- and 180 day tiered projects. The funds will be redistributed to other states using the August Redistribution process.

The 180 day program of projects will have the same certification requirements, but the list will not be due until 180 days after the allocation described earlier.

During the call, the Chairman stated that he expects that states will require contractors to be on site and begin work within 30 days after contract award (although he did not go so far to say that it will be a federal requirement to include such a statement in the bid and award documents). During this part of the discussion he asked if states thought they would have capacity issues in finding contractors. All states responded that this should not be a problem.

He is considering relaxing some of the construction start deadlines for northern states experiencing weather problems. From the tone of his statements, it appears that he is not considering relaxing any federal requirements. He noted that he expected that the 90 day projects would have to have the environmental, design and engineering, permitting, and right of way acquisition in place to meet the deadline.

During the call, states and transit operators stated that they are committed to making any stimulus proposal work and getting the funds out. He will be emailing an outline of his proposal to AASHTO and meeting participants.

It is not clear as to how much input for this proposal has come from the incoming administration, although the Chairman did mention that he has spoken with the transition team several times. Also, it is not known whether the Senate will develop its own proposal. Again, in this respect the Chairman did state that he was working with Appropriation Chair Obey and that it was expected that the proposed bill would be sent to the Senate within one week of its introduction in the House.

Attachment 2: Transportation and Infrastructure Committee proposal for a stimulus/recovery bill.

A PROPOSAL TO REBUILD AMERICA
BY INVESTING IN TRANSPORTATION AND
ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE

December 12, 2008

\$85 BILLION FOR INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

- The Rebuild America proposal provides **\$85 billion** of infrastructure investment to enhance the safety, security, and efficiency of our highway, transit, rail, aviation, environmental, inland waterways, public buildings, and maritime transportation infrastructure. Specifically, the proposal provides:
 - **Highways and Bridges: \$30.25 billion**
including Federal-aid Highway Formula (\$30 billion) and National Park Road Funding (\$250 million)
 - **Transit: \$12 billion**
including Transit Urban and Rural Formula (\$7.5 billion), Transit Energy Formula (\$2.0 billion), and New Starts Funding (\$2.5 billion)
 - **Rail: \$5 billion**
including Amtrak (\$1.5 billion), High-speed and Intercity Passenger Rail (\$3.4 billion), and Short-Line Railroad Funding (\$100 million)
 - **Aviation: \$5.25 billion**
including Airport Improvement Program (\$5 billion) and Federal Aviation Administration Facilities & Equipment (\$250 million).
 - **Environmental Infrastructure: \$14.275 billion**
including Clean Water State Revolving Fund (\$12 billion), Alternative Water Source projects (\$500 million), Nonpoint Source Management Program (\$1 billion), National Estuary Program (\$100 million), and Great Lakes Contaminated Sediment Remediation (\$400 million), Brownfields (\$275 million)
 - **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: \$7 billion**
including Construction (\$3.0 billion), Operations & Maintenance (\$3.2 billion), and Mississippi Rivers & Tributaries (\$800 million)
 - **Federal Buildings: \$10 billion**
including General Services Administration (\$9.7 billion), Smithsonian Institution (\$270 million), and Architect of the Capitol (\$20 million)
 - **Economic Development Administration: \$400 million**
 - **Coast Guard: \$734 million**
including Great Lakes Icebreaker (\$153 million), Shore Facilities (\$100 million), and Bridge Alterations (\$481 million)
 - **Maritime Administration: \$55 million**
including Title XI loan guarantees (\$45 million) and Maritime Education and Job Training (\$10 million)
 - **St. Lawrence Seaway: \$45 million**

- The proposal **requires these funds to be invested in ready-to-go projects**. Priority shall be given to projects that can award contracts within 90 days of enactment.
- The proposal **creates green collar jobs and invests in projects that decrease our dependence on foreign oil and address global climate change**. For Federal building renovation funds, priority shall be given to projects that include energy and water conservation elements, including installing photovoltaic roofs and geothermal technology. In addition, the proposal provides significant investment in public transit, Amtrak, and intercity and high-speed rail projects to provide alternatives to traveling by car, and assist transit and rail providers in converting to alternative fuel vehicles.
- The proposal **requires the steel, iron, and manufactured goods for these projects to be manufactured in the United States**.
- The proposal **requires States, cities, public transit agencies, and other recipients of formula funds to certify State and local maintenance of effort and equitable distribution of funding** to ensure that States, cities, public transit agencies, and other recipients continue their current investment levels and distribute funds equitably throughout the State and metropolitan areas. Recipients must submit a plan of projects for projects to be awarded contracts within 90 days, one year, and two years.
- Finally, the proposal **ensures transparency and accountability by including regular reporting requirements** to track the use of the funds, State investments, and the estimated number of jobs created or sustained. The Federal agencies administering these funds will provide periodic reports to Congress and the Economic Recovery Advisory Board (announced by President-elect Obama on November 26, 2008) on the amount of Federal funds apportioned, obligated, and outlayed; the status of bids, contracts, and construction; and the number of jobs created or sustained with the Federal investments. The report will also track State investment levels to ensure state maintenance of effort. The proposal requires six periodic reports: 30 days, 60 days, 120 days, 180 days, one year, and three years after the date of enactment.

READY-TO-GO INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS

- While certain infrastructure projects may require years of engineering and environmental analysis, followed by a lengthy contract award process, a subset of projects – such as projects involving rehabilitation and repair of existing infrastructure – can move much more quickly, with work beginning within 90 days.¹
- The proposal requires Rebuild America funds to be invested in ready-to-go projects. Priority will be given to projects that can award bids within 90 days. For instance, State Departments of Transportation (“DOTs”) have a tremendous backlog of highway resurfacing needs. State DOTs often have open-ended contracts in place for resurfacing projects, which means that work could begin immediately upon receipt of additional funds. Similarly, many State DOTs have bridge deck overlay projects, in which the top two or three inches of concrete on the surface of the bridge (e.g., the deck) is replaced, which are ready-to-go.
- Within seven days of the date of enactment, the U.S. Department of Transportation and Environmental Protection Agency will distribute formula funds to States, cities, and public transit agencies. State DOTs can immediately put out bids (typically for a period of 30 days) for ready-to-go projects. After receipt of the bids and contract award, work can begin on the project within an additional 30 days. **In this way, the Rebuild America proposal can “put shovels in the ground” within 90 days of enactment.**

¹ The Federal Highway Administration’s “August redistribution” of highway funds illustrates the ability of States to obligate additional funds quickly when they become available. In August of each year, States that cannot use their entire obligation authority return the unused authority to the Federal Highway Administration, which then redistributes it to States that can use the funds prior to the end of the fiscal year on September 30.

ECONOMIC IMPACT: **MORE THAN 2.4 MILLION JOBS AND
\$439 BILLION OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY**

- The proposed \$85 billion of Federal infrastructure investment will **create or sustain more than 2.4 million jobs and \$439 billion of economic activity**. Each \$1 billion of Federal funds invested in infrastructure creates or sustains approximately 34,779 jobs and \$6.2 billion in economic activity.²
- A national survey found that transportation construction contractors hire employees within three weeks of obtaining a project contract. These employees begin receiving paychecks within two weeks of hiring.
- In addition, this infrastructure investment will **increase business productivity** by reducing the costs of producing goods in virtually all industrial sectors of the economy. Increased productivity results in increased demand for labor, capital, and raw materials and generally leads to lower product prices and increased sales.
- The proposed investment will specifically help unemployed construction workers. The construction sector lost 261,000 jobs in 2007, and has lost an additional 513,000 jobs during the first 11 months of 2008 (through November). The unemployment rate in construction was 12.7 percent in November 2008 – up 6.5 points since November 2007. This is the highest unemployment rate of any industrial sector. As of November 2008, there are 1,237,000 unemployed construction workers in the nation – that’s 592,000 more unemployed construction workers than in November 2007. Within the overall construction sector, heavy and civil engineering construction employment is now the lowest it has been since February 2005.
- In contrast to the economic stimulus effect from tax cuts, virtually all of the stimulus effect from public infrastructure investment will be felt in the United States. Not only would the construction work be done here, but most transportation construction materials and equipment are manufactured in the United States, as well.³

MINORITY-OWNED AND WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESS IMPACT:

- This investment will also help address the disproportionate effect that the increase in unemployment has had on people of color. In November 2008, the rate of unemployment for African Americans was 11.2 percent – nearly twice the rate for whites. The unemployment rate for Hispanic or Latino Americans was 8.5 percent, 47 percent more than the rate for whites.
- Under existing highway, transit, and other infrastructure laws, as a general rule, States, cities, and infrastructure financing authorities are required to provide at least 10 percent of the amounts made available to Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (“DBEs”), including minority- and women-owned businesses.

² These estimates are based on 2007 Federal Highway Administration data on the correlation between highway infrastructure investment and employment and economic activity, and assume a 20 percent state or local matching share of project costs. Some infrastructure programs have slightly higher or lower estimates of the number of jobs created or the economic activity generated per \$1 billion of Federal funds invested. To enable easy comparisons among the elements of the bill, this document presumes the FHWA model for employment and economic activity. In most cases, the requirement for State or local matching funds would be waived under this proposal. Where appropriate, estimates of employment and economic activity have been adjusted to reflect these match waivers.

³ Previous experience with using public infrastructure investment to stimulate the economy can be found with the Public Works Acceleration Act (P.L. 87-658), signed by President Kennedy on September 14, 1962. Under this program, a total investment of \$1.8 billion (\$880 million Federal investment and \$920 million in local investment) generated 250,000 job-years.

HIGHWAYS AND BRIDGES – \$30.25 BILLION

Infrastructure Needs: The cost of traffic congestion in our cities nationwide is a staggering \$78 billion annually in wasted time (4.2 billion hours of delay) and fuel (2.9 billion gallons of excess fuel).

Data contained in the Department of Transportation's 2006 Conditions and Performance Report indicate that a total investment of \$78.8 billion (in constant 2004 dollars) is needed annually to maintain our highway and bridges in their current condition. To improve the overall condition of highways and bridges, a combined investment of \$131.7 billion (in constant 2004 dollars) is needed each year. **According to the Department of Transportation ("DOT"), the annual investment gap is \$8.5 billion to maintain our current systems and \$61.4 billion to begin to improve highway and bridges.**⁴

According to the U.S. Department of Transportation:

- Only 42.2 percent of travel on roads for which data are available occurred on pavements with "good" ride quality; and
- 25.4 percent of highway bridges are structurally deficient (12.1 percent) or functionally obsolete (13.3 percent).

Ready-to-Go Projects: States and cities have many projects that are ready-to-go to construction within 90 days if additional funding is made available. A December 2008 survey of State Departments of Transportation by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials ("AASHTO") identified 5,148 highway and bridge projects at a total cost of \$64.3 billion that are ready to go to construction within 180 days. *See attached Table A.* Similarly, a December 2008 survey of 427 cities by the U.S. Conference of Mayors identified 2,403 road and street projects at a total cost of \$17.4 billion that are ready to go to construction in 2009.⁵

While major highway construction projects take time to plan and design and thus are not good candidates for an economic stimulus package, every State DOT has a number of highway resurfacing and minor reconstruction projects in the pipeline that could be brought to construction with short notice. There is a pent-up demand for, and capacity to supply, these projects. Highway resurfacing work has been in decline because of the increasing cost of materials, labor, and equipment, coupled with the fixed budgets of state and local transportation agencies. According to the National Asphalt Pavement Association, the production of hot-mix asphalt declined 9.5 percent nationally from 2006 to 2007. At this time, the production of hot-mix asphalt is expected to decline about another 20 percent nationally in 2008.

In addition, the National Park Service has identified 18 transportation projects in 15 States and the District of Columbia that are ready to go, but unfunded. These projects have obtained environmental clearance and can be underway within 180 days.

Proposal:

1. **Provide an additional \$30.0 billion in funding for Federal-Aid Highway formula investments.**
2. **Provide an additional \$250 million in funding for National Park Roads.**

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute Federal-Aid Highway funds to States and cities pursuant to existing statutory highway formula under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users ("SAFETEA-LU"). A percentage of these funds would be suballocated to large metropolitan areas. Distribute National Park Road funds pursuant to existing Federal Highway Administration administrative process.

⁴ According to DOT's 2006 Conditions and Performance Report, Federal, State, and local capital expenditure for highways and bridges totaled \$70.3 billion in 2004. This is \$8.5 billion less than the annual expenditure needed to maintain highways and bridges, and \$61.4 billion less than the annual expenditure needed to improve highways and bridges.

⁵ *MainStreet Economic Recovery, "Ready to Go" Jobs and Infrastructure Projects*, U.S. Conference of Mayors, December 8, 2008.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days. Formula funds that are not obligated within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act shall be redistributed to States that are able to obligate the funds.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require the Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”), States, and cities to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$15 billion (50 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of allocation. Require FHWA, States, and cities to award contracts for all of the funding within one year of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create more than 841,000 jobs and \$150 billion of economic activity.

Equal Opportunity: Pursuant to SAFETEA-LU, as a general rule, States and cities are required to provide at least 10 percent (\$3.025 billion) of the amounts made available to Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (“DBEs”), including minority- and women-owned businesses.

TRANSIT URBAN AND RURAL FORMULA GRANTS – \$7.5 BILLION

Infrastructure Needs: The cost of traffic congestion in our cities nationwide is a staggering \$78 billion annually in wasted time (4.2 billion hours of delay) and fuel (2.9 billion gallons of excess fuel).

Data contained in the Department of Transportation's 2006 Conditions and Performance Report indicate that a total investment of \$15.8 billion (in constant 2004 dollars) is needed annually to maintain transit systems at their current condition and level of performance. To improve the overall condition and performance of transit systems, a combined investment of \$21.8 billion (in constant 2004 dollars) is needed each year. **According to DOT, the annual investment gap is \$3.2 billion to maintain our transit systems and \$9.2 billion to begin to improve our transit systems.**⁶

According to DOT's 2006 Conditions and Performance Report:

- Over one-half of all urban rail transit stations are substandard;
- One-third of our nation's bus maintenance facilities are substandard;
- 16 percent of elevated transit structures and 13 percent of underground transit tunnels are substandard; and
- eight percent of transit track is substandard.

Ready-to-Go Projects: Public transit agencies have many projects that are ready to go to construction within 90 days if additional funding is made available. As of December 2008, a survey of public transportation agencies by the American Public Transportation Association ("APTA") identified 736 ready-to-go transit projects at a total cost of \$12.2 billion.⁷ In addition, APTA estimates that an estimated \$32.4 billion in transit investment projects could be underway within two years. Similarly, a December 2008 survey of 427 cities by the U.S. Conference of Mayors identified 628 projects at a total cost of \$7.1 billion that are ready to go to construction in 2009.⁸

According to APTA, almost one in five buses (approximately 12,000 buses) is eligible for replacement under Federal Transit Administration ("FTA") regulations. Public transit agencies have many existing options to purchase buses and rail vehicles, which could be exercised to purchase these vehicles if additional funding is made available. According to APTA, public transit agencies hold options for more than 10,000 buses, valued at \$5 billion, which could be exercised immediately without a new procurement process. Bus manufacturers and their suppliers have indicated that their production rates could be increased 30 to 35 percent if orders indicated a sustained Federal investment.⁹ Similarly, public transit agencies hold options for more than 1,000 rail vehicles, valued at more than \$2 billion, based on existing designs for subway cars, light rail vehicles, streetcars, and other rail vehicles.¹⁰

Proposal: Provide \$7.5 billion in transit capital and operating grants for ready-to-go projects, including \$6.75 billion of transit urban formula funds and \$750 million of transit rural formula funds.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute transit urban and rural formula funds to States, cities, and public transit agencies pursuant to existing statutory transit formulas under 49 U.S.C. 5307 and 49 U.S.C. 5311.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

⁶ According to DOT's 2006 Conditions and Performance report, Federal, State, and local capital expenditure for transit totaled \$12.6 billion in 2004. This amount is \$3.2 billion less than the annual expenditure needed to maintain transit systems, and \$9.2 billion less than the annual expenditure needed to improve transit systems.

⁷ The survey results are based on 216 public transportation agencies reporting of approximately 400 APTA members who received the survey. APTA members serve over 90 percent of U.S. transit users.

⁸ *MainStreet Economic Recovery, "Ready to Go" Jobs and Infrastructure Projects*, U.S. Conference of Mayors, December 8, 2008.

⁹ American Public Transportation Association letter to Mortimer L. Downey, December 11, 2008.

¹⁰ *Id.*

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require States, cities, and public transit agencies to award contracts for at least \$3.75 billion (50 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of allocation. Require States, cities, and public transit agencies to award contracts for all of the funding within one year of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create more than 208,000 jobs and \$37 billion of economic activity.

Equal Opportunity: Pursuant to SAFETEA-LU, as a general rule, States, cities, and public transit agencies are required to provide at least 10 percent (\$750 million) of the amounts made available to DBEs, including minority- and women-owned businesses.

TRANSIT ENERGY FUNDING – \$2.0 BILLION

Infrastructure Needs: The cost of fuel has skyrocketed, and the number of Americans choosing to commute by transit to save money and reduce their reliance on foreign oil has surged. In 2007, Americans took more than 10.3 billion trips on public transportation, the highest level in 50 years.

According to a recent study, the direct petroleum savings attributable to current public transportation use in the United States is 1.4 billion gallons per year. When the secondary effects of transit availability on travel are also taken into account, the equivalent of 4.2 billion gallons of gasoline is saved annually – more than 11 million gallons of gasoline per day.¹¹ If Americans used public transit at the same rate as Europeans – for roughly 10 percent of their daily travel needs – the United States could reduce its dependence on imported oil by more than 40 percent, nearly equal to the 550 million barrels of crude oil that we import from Saudi Arabia each year.¹²

Ready-to-Go Projects: Public transportation authorities have many energy-related projects – including the need to meet increased fuel costs and purchase clean fuel vehicles – that are ready-to-go within 90 days if additional funding is made available. As of May 2008, a survey of public transportation agencies by APTA had identified an increase in transit fuel costs of 166 percent in just four years. These added costs translate to a sharp increase in the share of operating costs dedicated to fuel, which is now almost 11 percent of public transit agencies' total operating budgets.¹³

Proposal: Provide \$2 billion in transit operating and capital grants to public transit agencies to meet increased fuel costs and purchase clean fuel or alternative fuel vehicles.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute transit energy funds to States, cities, and public transit agencies pursuant to existing statutory transit urban and rural formulas under SAFETEA-LU. See section 3 of H.R. 6052, the "Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008", as passed by the House on June 26, 2008.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require States, cities, and public transit agencies to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$1 billion (50 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of allocation. Require States, cities, and public transit agencies to award contracts for all of the funding within one year of the date of enactment.

Equal Opportunity: Pursuant to SAFETEA-LU, as a general rule, States, cities, and public transit agencies are required to provide at least 10 percent (\$200 million) of the amounts made available to DBEs, including minority- and women-owned businesses.

¹¹ *Public Transportation and Petroleum Savings in the U.S.: Reducing Dependence on Oil*, ICF International, January 2007; *The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reductions*, ICF International, February 2008.

¹² *Conserving Energy and Preserving the Environment: The Role of Public Transportation*, Shapiro, Hassett, and Arnold, 2002.

¹³ Survey results based on 96 public transportation agencies reporting. Survey was sent to just under 400 APTA members. APTA members serve over 90 percent of U.S. transit users.

TRANSIT NEW STARTS CONSTRUCTION – \$2.5 BILLION

Infrastructure Needs: New Starts transit project delays are growing at an alarming rate. The Department of Transportation has not signed any federal funding agreements for New Starts projects during 2008, even though approximately 300 New Starts projects were authorized in SAFETEA-LU.

Data from the Federal Transit Administration (“FTA”) indicate that more than \$4 billion in existing New Starts funding agreements are outstanding as of FY 2009. In addition, projects that already have multi-year New Starts funding agreements have seen their yearly Federal commitments cut. This delay and backtracking at the Federal level creates additional financial burdens for state and local governments. **One study shows that for each year of delay in major transportation projects (those with total project costs of \$1 billion or more), an additional \$46 million is added to the project cost.**¹⁴

Ready-to-Go Projects: Public transportation authorities have many New Starts projects that are either currently in construction or ready-to-go to construction within 90 days if additional funding is made available. FTA has documented more than \$2.4 billion in pre-approved New Starts funding that could immediately be advanced to 19 projects across the country to construct New Start and Small Start projects. In addition, FTA has identified a New Starts funding shortfall of more than \$71.1 million that is required to be restored to 13 New Starts construction projects, and could also be advanced immediately.

Proposal: Provide \$2.5 billion in transit capital grants for New Starts construction projects.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute New Starts project construction funds to public transit agencies pursuant to existing authority under SAFETEA-LU, FTA Full Funding Grant Agreements, and FTA Project Construction Grant Agreements. The FAA would determine the distribution of funds through its existing competitive process.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require public transit agencies to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$625 million (25 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of grant receipt. Require public transit agencies to award contracts for all of the funding within one year of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create more than 168,000 jobs and \$30 billion of economic activity.

Furthermore, the additional \$2.5 billion of New Starts funding will make available an additional \$5 billion of contingent commitment authority to enable FTA to sign additional New Starts funding agreements for future transit construction projects.

Equal Opportunity: Pursuant to SAFETEA-LU, as a general rule, states, cities, and public transit agencies are required to provide at least 10 percent (\$250 million) of the amounts made available to DBEs, including minority- and women-owned businesses.

¹⁴ *What Causes Cost Overrun in Transport Infrastructure Projects?*, Flyvbjerg, Holm and Buhl, January 2004.

RAIL – \$5 BILLION

Infrastructure Needs: Demand for intercity passenger rail has increased and Amtrak ridership is higher than at any point in its history.

In 2007, the Passenger Rail Working Group of the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission reported that the total capital cost for re-establishing the national intercity passenger rail network between now and 2050 is \$357.2 billion, or an annualized cost of \$8.1 billion.

With respect to freight rail, DOT estimates that the demand for rail freight transportation – measured in tonnage – will increase 88 percent by 2035. A study conducted by Cambridge Systematics, Inc. estimates that an investment of \$148 billion (in 2007 dollars) for rail infrastructure expansion over the next 28 years is required to keep pace with economic growth and meet DOT's forecast demand. Of this amount, the short line and regional freight railroads' share is projected to be \$13 billion, which includes \$320 million for line expansion; \$5 billion for major improvements to tunnels, bridges, and clearances; and \$7.23 billion for branch line upgrades.

Ready-to-Go Projects: Amtrak has identified at least \$500 million in ready-to-go projects, including car overhauls, replacement of aging equipment, fire and life safety improvements, improvements to track, structures, electric traction, and communications and signals, and customer and information technology enhancements, if additional funding is made available. Amtrak has identified a total of \$3.8 billion of projects that are ready to go to construction within two years. Similarly, a December 2008 survey of 427 cities by the U.S. Conference of Mayors identified 41 Amtrak projects at a total cost of \$1.1 billion that are ready to go to construction in 2009.¹⁵ In addition, the States for Passenger Rail Coalition has identified \$1.4 billion in ready-to-go intercity passenger rail capital projects, including corridor development projects, station and terminal improvements, improvements to track, siding, signal, and grade crossings, and the purchase of new equipment. The States for Passenger Rail Coalition has identified a total of \$9.4 billion of projects that are ready to go to construction within two years. Similarly, the Midwest Interstate Passenger Rail Commission has identified more than \$815 million of high-speed and intercity passenger rail projects that are ready to go to construction within 120 days.

The American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association has identified \$511 million in ready-to-go projects, including upgrades to rail and roadbed, bridges, tunnels, and intermodal terminals, overhaul and replacement of existing locomotives to "green technology", expansion of rail yards, and grade crossing improvements.

Proposal:

1. **Provide \$1.5 billion for capital grants to Amtrak;**
2. **Provide \$3.4 billion for high-speed and intercity passenger rail capital grants to States; and**
3. **Provide \$100 million for capital grants to short line and regional railroads.**

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute \$1.5 billion of capital grants to Amtrak; distribute \$3.4 billion of high-speed intercity passenger rail capital grants to States through DOT competitive grant programs as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 26106, as added by section 501 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (Division B of P.L. 110-432) and chapter 244 of Title 49, United States Code, as added by section 301 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (Division B of P.L. 110-432); and distribute \$100 million of short line capital grants to regional and short line railroads through a DOT competitive grant program as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 22301, as amended by section 1112 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-140).

¹⁵ *Main Street Economic Recovery, "Ready to Go" Jobs and Infrastructure Projects*, U.S. Conference of Mayors, December 8, 2008.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines:

1. Require Amtrak to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$375 million (25 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of grant receipt. Require Amtrak to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$750 billion (50 percent) of these funds within one year of the date of enactment and award contracts for all of the funds within two years of the date of enactment;
2. Require States to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$850 million (25 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of grant receipt. Require States to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$1.7 billion (50 percent) of these funds within one year of the date of enactment and award contracts for all of the funds within two years of the date of enactment; and
3. Require short line and regional railroads to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$50 million (50 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of grant receipt. Require the railroads to award contracts for all of the funding within one year of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create approximately 139,000 jobs and \$25 billion of economic activity.

AVIATION
AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM – \$5 BILLION

Infrastructure Needs: Increased investment in our airport infrastructure is necessary to maintain a safe and efficient aviation system. The Federal Aviation Administration’s (“FAA”) recently-released National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (2009-2013) (“NPIAS”) estimates that there will be \$49.7 billion of Airport Improvement Program (“AIP”)-eligible projects during the next five years – an increase of 21 percent compared to the last NPIAS that the FAA issued two years ago. Additional funds are needed to allow the AIP program to keep pace with inflationary cost increases and meet airport safety and capacity needs.

Ready-to-Go Projects: The FAA has identified at least \$1.5 billion of ready-to-go AIP projects if additional funding is made available. The FAA has identified a total of \$5 billion of AIP projects that are ready-to-go to construction within two years. These projects include runway or taxiway rehabilitations, extensions, and widening; obstruction removal; apron construction, expansion or rehabilitation; runway lighting improvements; signage improvements; security enhancements; Airport Rescue and Firefighting equipment and facilities; and airside service or public access roads.

Proposal: Provide \$5 billion for the Airport Improvement Program.

Source: Appropriate funds from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds to airports through existing AIP Discretionary Grants program. The FAA would determine the distribution of funds through its existing competitive process.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require airports to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$1 billion (20 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of grant receipt. Require airports to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$2.5 billion (50 percent) of these funds within one year of the date of enactment and award contracts for all of the funds within two years of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create approximately 174,000 jobs and \$31 billion of economic activity.

AVIATION
FAA FACILITIES & EQUIPMENT – \$250 MILLION

Infrastructure Needs: The Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”) has a significant backlog of infrastructure projects needed to sustain or replace existing air traffic control facilities. In addition, the FAA could accelerate the installation of runway safety technology and equipment at airports if additional funding is made available. Runway incursions are an identified risk that can be mitigated by installing systems such as the Airport Surface Detection Equipment Model X (“ASDE X”) and Runway Status Lights. Accelerated installation of these systems would provide immediate economic stimulus in the form of construction jobs, as well as increased safety to the public.

Ready-to-Go Projects: The FAA has identified at least \$185 million in infrastructure projects and \$65 million in runway safety projects that are ready to go within 90 to 180 days, if additional funding is made available.

The infrastructure projects include:

- **Backup Power Systems:** Fund backup power projects such as battery, engine generator and cable replacements, enroute traffic control center power improvements, and lightning protection (\$40 million).
- **Enroute Traffic Control Center Modernization/Sustainment:** Fund modernization and sustainment of enroute traffic control centers (\$40 million).
- **Air Traffic Control Tower/Approach Control (“TRACON”) Facilities:** Fund replacement of air traffic control towers and approach control facilities that are in poor condition. TRACON replacement projects have completed design and engineering, and contracts could be awarded within three or four months of receipt of funding (\$80 million).
- **Navigation and Landing/Unmanned Air Traffic Control facilities sustainment:** Fund installation and sustainment of Instrument Landing Systems (\$15 million).
- **FAA Technical Center and Aeronautical Center:** Fund facility sustainment of the FAA’s Technical Center and Aeronautical Center (\$10 million).

The runway safety projects include:

- **Accelerate Installation of ASDE X:** Accelerate installation of ASDE X, which is a surface surveillance system that processes information from radar and other sources to provide location and aircraft identification information to air traffic controllers, at major airports. ASDE X provides controllers with a visual representation of the traffic situation on the airport surface and arrival corridors. The accelerated installation can be accomplished under the existing AXDE X contract (\$15 million).
- **Accelerate Installation of Runway Status Lights:** Accelerate installation of Runway Status Light (“RWSL”) systems. Implementation includes construction of lighting equipment at airports equipped with ASDE X technology to share common runway status information with pilots. The accelerated installation can be accomplished under the existing RWSL contract (\$50 million).

Proposal: Provide \$250 million for the FAA’s Facilities and Equipment program.

Source: Appropriate funds from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds through the FAA’s existing administrative processes.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require the Federal Aviation Administration to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$125 million (50 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of enactment. Require the FAA to award contracts for all of the funding within one year of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create approximately 7,000 jobs and \$1.55 billion of economic activity.

ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE
CLEAN WATER SRF – \$12 BILLION

Infrastructure Needs: High quality drinking water and wastewater treatment are critical to protecting human health and the environment. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that there is an annual investment need of between \$11.6 billion and \$20.1 billion, to ensure a safe, clean supply of drinking water, and an additional need for annual investment of between \$13 billion and \$20.9 billion in wastewater treatment. Given current funding levels from all sources, **there is an annual investment gap for wastewater and drinking water infrastructure of at least \$3 billion and as much as \$19.4 billion.**

There are 772 communities in 33 states and the District of Columbia with a total of 9,471 identified combined sewer overflow problems. Combined sewer overflows contribute to the ongoing contamination of the nation's waters by releasing approximately 850 million gallons of raw or partially-treated sewage annually. In addition, the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") estimates that between 23,000 and 75,000 sanitary sewer overflows occur each year in the United States, releasing between 3 to 10 billion gallons of sewage per year. The EPA estimates that more than \$50.6 billion is necessary to correct combined sewer overflow problems, and an additional \$88.5 billion to eliminate sanitary sewer overflows.

While the demand for Clean Water State Revolving Fund ("Clean Water SRF") funds is increasing, appropriations have declined significantly. The decreased funding has created a pent-up demand in the States for project funding. Needs are driven by new treatment requirements that must be met (e.g., to control nutrients, sewer overflows, stormwater and nonpoint sources), as well as aging infrastructure that must be replaced or repaired to maintain current levels of pollution control. There are additional needs to implement "green infrastructure" technologies, such as on-site source controls to capture stormwater, stream buffers, and other water reuse technologies, that provide equal or greater environmental benefit at a reduced cost, reduce wet-weather related "peak" loads, and promote water conservation and reuse. Similarly, there is a significant need for energy-efficiency improvements at publicly owned treatment works.

Ready-to-Go Projects: A recent survey by the Council of Infrastructure Financing Authorities and the Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators ("ASIWPCA") identified \$10 billion of Clean Water SRF projects (with only 30 States reporting) that are ready to go to construction if additional funding is made available. For example, most wastewater treatment utilities have small capital-related projects on the shelf that could be carried out very quickly, such as pumps, compressors, bar screens, trucks, security measures, and polishing pond expansions. Similarly, a December 2008 survey of 427 cities by the U.S. Conference of Mayors identified 2,536 water and wastewater treatment projects at a total cost of \$15.4 billion that are ready to go to construction in 2009.¹⁶ Finally, American Rivers has identified 77 "green infrastructure" projects (with only 13 States and the District of Columbia reporting) valued at more than \$600 million that could be obligated within six months of the date of enactment.

Proposal: Provide an additional \$12 billion to construct, rehabilitate, and modernize the nation's wastewater infrastructure through the Clean Water SRF program. Within the existing Clean Water SRF allocation to States, direct individual State infrastructure financing authorities to: (1) utilize 40 percent of the capitalization grants for additional subsidizations or grants to disadvantaged communities and communities with populations of 50,000 individuals or fewer, and (2) utilize 15 percent of the capitalization grant for investment in projects or technologies that use environmentally sensitive, and energy and water efficient plans or components (i.e., green infrastructure).

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute \$12 billion for the Clean Water SRF pursuant to the existing Clean Water Act distribution formula.

The Clean Water SRF serves communities of all sizes – 75 percent of loans have been made to communities with a population of less than 10,000 and 45 percent of the funds have gone to communities with a population of 100,000 or more. However, in 1987, Congress converted the

¹⁶ *MainStreet Economic Recovery, "Ready to Go" Jobs and Infrastructure Projects*, U.S. Conference of Mayors, December 8, 2008.

Clean Water Construction Grants program to the Clean Water SRF. As a result, Federal wastewater infrastructure funding for most medium-sized and smaller communities (communities with populations of 50,000 individuals or fewer) has come in the form of loans under the SRF rather than grants. Under this proposal, State infrastructure financing authorities are required to utilize 40 percent of the capitalization grant for additional subsidizations or grants to communities with populations of 50,000 individuals or fewer, thereby increasing the affordability of wastewater infrastructure projects to many medium-sized and smaller communities.

In addition, this proposal requires State infrastructure financing authorities to utilize an additional 15 percent of the capitalization grant for “green technologies”, either through additional subsidizations, grants, or other mechanisms that encourage investment in projects or technologies which utilize environmentally sensitive, and energy and water efficient plans or components.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require State infrastructure financing authorities to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$3 billion (25 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of allocation. Require authorities to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$6 billion (50 percent) of these funds within one year and award contracts for all of the funding within two years of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create approximately 334,000 jobs and \$59 billion of economic activity.

ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE
ALTERNATIVE WATER SOURCE – \$500 MILLION

Infrastructure Needs: In recent years, there has been increasing interest by communities across the nation to ensure the availability of water sources to meet future water supply needs. Growth in population, increased awareness of the impacts of global climate change, and increasing environmental awareness are causing many communities to explore alternative water supplies through reclamation, reuse, and conservation of water and wastewater.

Although alternative water source projects are eligible under the Clean Water Act SRF program, most Clean Water SRF funding is used to finance traditional wastewater infrastructure projects, not projects to enhance water supplies.

In 2000, Congress enacted the Estuaries and Clean Waters Act (P.L. 106-457), which created a competitive grant pilot program for alternative water source projects (section 220 of the Clean Water Act.)

Proposal: Provide an additional \$500 million for the Environmental Protection Agency's ("EPA") Alternative Water Source Program.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds to States, water resource development agencies, local government agencies, private utilities, and nonprofit entities through EPA's competitive grant process.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require States, water resources development agencies, local government agencies, private utilities, and nonprofit entities to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$125 million (25 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of grant receipt. Require that authorities to award contracts totaling at least \$250 million (50 percent) of these funds within one year and award contracts for all of the funding within two years of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create more than 13,900 jobs and \$2.4 billion of economic activity.

**ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE –
NONPOINT SOURCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM – \$1 BILLION**

Infrastructure Needs: Over the past 30 years, the Clean Water Act has made great advances in improving the quality of U.S. waters and controlling various sources of pollution, with one large exception – nonpoint sources of pollution. Nonpoint source pollution refers to the polluting of water by diffuse sources rather than single identifiable “point” sources. These diffuse sources are usually associated with land use activities as opposed to end-of-pipe discharges. Examples of common nonpoint source pollutants include: sediments, fertilizers, and pesticides from rural farms and urban lawns; bacteria and viruses from livestock and pet waste; sediments and soil from improperly managed construction sites and timber harvesting; oil and chemicals from urban runoff flowing over streets, parking lots, and industrial facilities; and a variety of pollutants from airborne pathways. After 36 years of Federal and state efforts to protect water quality, the single largest remaining and uncontrolled contributor of pollutants to the nation’s waters is nonpoint sources. In fact, EPA has estimated that 90 percent of the nation’s impaired waters are contaminated, in part, by nonpoint sources of pollution.

In 1987, Congress amended the Clean Water Act to establish the section 319 Nonpoint Source Management Program because it recognized the need for greater Federal leadership to help focus State and local nonpoint source efforts. Under section 319 of the Clean Water Act, States, Territories, and Indian Tribes receive grants which support a wide variety of activities including technical assistance, financial assistance, education, training, technology transfer, demonstration projects, and monitoring to assess the success of specific nonpoint source implementation projects. Section 319 funds are allocated to each State according to the Environmental Protection Agency’s (“EPA”) administrative allocation formula.

In fiscal year 2008, Congress appropriated \$201 million for the Nonpoint Source Management Program.

According to the most recent EPA Clean Water Needs Survey, total nonpoint source needs over the next 20 years are \$38 billion or \$1.9 billion annually on average. However, this amount does not include data from all States and all categories of nonpoint sources of pollution.

A recent report published by the Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators (“ASIWPCA”), entitled “Call for Change”, notes that the current level of section 319 funding is not sufficient to run a comprehensive nonpoint source program. For example, according to a State survey conducted by ASIWPCA, States in the Northeast have reported that they could utilize 100 percent to 500 percent more section 319 funding than is currently allocated to these States. These projections, however, are likely to be much larger for the agricultural-intensive Midwestern States.

Proposal: Provide \$1 billion for EPA’s Nonpoint Source Management Program.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds to States pursuant to EPA’s existing administrative allocation formula. The allocation formula is contained in Appendix G of EPA’s *1997 Nonpoint Source Guidance*.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require States to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$250 million (25 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of allocation. Require States to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$500 million (50 percent) of these funds within one year and award contracts for all of the funding within two years of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create more than 27,800 jobs and \$4.96 billion of economic activity.

ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE
NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM – \$100 MILLION

Infrastructure Needs: The National Estuary Program is intended to promote comprehensive planning efforts to help protect nationally significant estuaries in the United States that are deemed to be threatened by pollution, development, or overuse. Twenty-eight estuaries are currently authorized by the Clean Water Act, including Chesapeake Bay, Long Island Sound, New York and Connecticut; Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island; Puget Sound, Washington; San Francisco Bay, California; and Galveston Bay, Texas.

National Estuary Program (“NEP”) offices are intended to utilize Federal funds, in part, to leverage additional resources from state and local governments, and from public and private sector sources. Over the past two decades, NEPs have attracted funding from a variety of sources and partnerships including the Clean Water State Revolving Fund program, stormwater utility fees, municipal bond funding, fines and settlements, and sales fees. According to the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”), the National Estuary Program received a total of \$85 million between fiscal years 2003 and 2007. However, the Program was able to leverage nearly \$1.3 billion in funding from non-EPA sources. This is a funding ratio of non-EPA to EPA funds of 15.5 to 1.

EPA exercises oversight authority over the local NEP programs, and provides technical assistance (e.g., finance planning, smart growth, monitoring and assessment) and programmatic assistance (policy development) to estuary management programs. For example, estuary management programs are required to periodically monitor the effectiveness of their management activities to address estuary-specific priority actions (as established through the Management Conference).

Ready-to-Go Projects: The Restore America’s Estuaries coalition, which represents 11 of the nation’s 28 estuary management programs, conducted a study of a majority of all 28 estuaries and identified \$71.6 million in 121 ready-to-go projects, including projects to address stormwater runoff, create tidal lagoons for habitat restoration, and restore wetlands.

Proposal: Provide \$100 million for the National Estuary Program.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds to estuary management programs through EPA’s current administrative process.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require estuary management programs to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$50 million (50 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of grant receipt. Require estuary management programs to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$75 million (75 percent) of these funds within one year and award contracts for all of the funding within two years of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create approximately 2,780 jobs and \$500 million of economic activity.

ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE
GREAT LAKES LEGACY CONTAMINATED SEDIMENT REMEDIATION – \$400 MILLION

Infrastructure Needs: The Great Lakes Legacy Act authorizes funding to clean up contaminated sediment sites in those areas of the U.S. Great Lakes that have areas of concern. This funding is used for remediation, public outreach, and research. Legacy Act cleanup is primarily focused on those sites that are not National Priorities List (i.e., Superfund) sites.

Thirty-one areas of concern – with multiple discrete hazardous waste sites eligible for Legacy Act funding – exist in and around the Great Lakes. Sites with high concentrations of toxic substances are often the historical, or legacy, remnants of former industrial pollution. While the discharge of these pollutants has largely ceased, these historical pollutants remain in contaminated sediment in those areas. Due, in part, to stagnant funding levels, only four discrete hazardous waste sites (within U.S. areas of concern) have been remediated since the Legacy Act was enacted in 2002.

Legacy Act remediation projects are conducted through negotiated agreements between the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) and a non-Federal sponsor. Cleanup projects are cost-shared, with the non-Federal sponsor being responsible for 100 percent of the operation and maintenance costs. Projects are first monitored and evaluated by EPA to determine the nature and extent of contamination. Pursuant to the Great Lakes Legacy Reauthorization Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-365), the Federal Government is responsible for 100 percent of initial site assessment costs. After site assessment, the non-Federal sponsor enters into a cost-share agreement with the Federal Government and remediation begins. When remediation is complete at a site, or project, in a given area of concern and beneficial uses are no longer impaired, an area of concern can be delisted.

The Great Lakes Commission, which includes State-elected representatives from each of the eight Great Lakes States, recommends an additional \$250 million for Legacy Act projects for the upcoming fiscal year.

Ready-to-Go Projects: The Environmental Protection Agency has identified \$160 million of Legacy Act ready-to-go projects. EPA has identified a total of \$657 million of Legacy Act projects that are ready-to-go to construction within two years.

Proposal: Provide \$400 million for EPA’s Great Lakes Legacy Act Program.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds to Legacy Act projects through EPA’s current administrative process.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require non-Federal sponsors to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$100 million (25 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of grant receipt. Require non-Federal sponsors to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$200 million (50 percent) of these funds within one year and award contracts for all of the funding within two years of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create approximately 11,000 jobs and \$2 billion of economic activity.

ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE
BROWNFIELDS – \$275 MILLION

Infrastructure Needs: Brownfields are properties, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant. Types of brownfields include inactive factories, gas stations, salvage yards, or abandoned warehouses. These sites drive down property values, provide little or no tax revenue, and contribute to community blight. There are estimated to be between 450,000 to one million brownfields sites in the United States. Redevelopment of these abandoned sites can promote economic development, revitalize neighborhoods, enable the creation of public parks and open space, or preserve existing properties, including undeveloped green spaces.

According to Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) statistics, Federal funding of brownfields cleanup has a significant beneficial impact on state and local governments, in terms of returning underutilized properties to productive use and local tax rolls, as well a proven track record of leveraging additional public and private sector redevelopment funding and job creation. According to EPA, since the enactment of EPA’s brownfields program in 2002, the Federal investment of \$593.7 million has leveraged more than \$10.4 billion in cleanup and redevelopment funding and helped create 47,201 jobs in cleanup, construction, and redevelopment. Given current Federal funding levels (approximately \$70 million per year), **there is an annual investment gap of approximately \$280 million for backlogged applications for brownfield projects.**

Ready-to-Go Projects: In fiscal year 2008, the Environmental Protection Agency received 845 proposals requesting funding, but announced that only 209 projects were selected to receive 314 assessment, revolving loan fund, and cleanup grants totaling \$74 million. Fully funding these 845 proposals would require a total of \$350 million.

Proposal: Provide \$275 million for EPA’s Brownfields Discretionary Grant Program.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds to States, cities, and redevelopment agencies through existing EPA Brownfields Discretionary Grant program for site assessments, remediation and cleanup grants, and to capitalize state brownfield revolving loan programs as authorized under section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended by the Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act of 2001 (P.L. 107-118).

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require States, cities, and redevelopment agencies to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$137.5 million (50 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of grant receipt. Require States, cities, and redevelopment agencies to award contracts for all of the funding within one year of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create more than 7,600 jobs and \$1.4 billion of economic activity.

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS – \$7 BILLION

Infrastructure Needs: Due to relatively flat funding for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' ("Corps") budget over the last 20 years, there has been an ever increasing backlog of unfunded or underfunded flood control, navigation, and environmental restoration projects. This backlog has resulted in increased timelines for project completion, tremendous cost overruns due to inflation, and denied benefits to public safety, the environment, and the economy. The current total for the backlog of authorized projects is estimated to be \$60 billion.

Many existing Corps projects are advancing more slowly than they could be because of lack of funding. For example, considering only those projects for which funding was requested in the President's FY 2009 Budget, the Corps could proceed with a total of \$8 billion for these projects in FY 2009. However, the President only requested \$5.242 billion for the Corps, more than one-third less than necessary to fund these FY 2009 projects at full capability. These figures do not include any funding for projects authorized in the recent Water Resources Development Act of 2007 or many other projects which were authorized in prior Water Resources Development Acts.

Ready-to-Go Projects: According to the Corps, additional funds could be used for the following ready-to-go projects:

- substantially reduce the backlog of critical maintenance and repairs at approximately 360 multiple purpose, flood control, hydropower, recreation, water supply, and navigation projects;
- repair several high-risk dam safety projects;
- rehabilitate and upgrade hydropower plants to achieve an industry standard of 98 percent plant availability;
- address the oldest and most at-risk projects on the inland waterways system;
- expedite the construction of critical environmental projects, returning critical ecosystems to a more natural state sooner than would otherwise be possible. Projects producing beneficial impacts on more than one million acres could be expedited. Of these outputs, approximately 90 percent are nationally significant and would contribute greatly to long-term environmental sustainability;
- dredge the nation's 296 highest-use, deep-draft commercial ports to their authorized depths. Approximately 94 percent of the nation's imports and exports are carried through these ports;
- dredge our inland waterways to authorized depth and width to facilitate the movement of approximately 750 million tons of freight per year, including the majority of the nation's agricultural exports and bulk commodities such as iron ore, coal, fertilizer, and bulk road construction materials; and
- repair and upgrade critical flood damage reduction and hurricane and storm damage reduction projects that serve as a defense to key population centers.

Proposal:

1. **Provide an additional \$3.0 billion for the Corps of Engineers Construction program;**
2. **Provide an additional \$3.2 billion for the Corps of Engineers Operations and Maintenance program; and**
3. **Provide an additional \$800 million for the Corps of Engineers Mississippi River and Tributaries program.**

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds to the Corps of Engineers. The Corps would determine the distribution of funds through its existing project selection process.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require the Corps of Engineers to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$1.4 billion (20 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of enactment. Require the Corps to award contracts totaling at least \$3.5 billion (50 percent) of these funds within one year and award contracts for all of the funding within two years of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create approximately 147,000 jobs and \$34 billion of economic activity.

According to the Corps, it is estimated that \$7 billion of additional funding would create 147,000 new jobs. These new jobs would include almost 52,800 new private sector jobs with the average income for workers in these jobs of \$38,000 to \$42,500. In addition, this funding would create an additional 94,200 new jobs in industries supplying the construction and operation and maintenance activities and the industries that sell goods and services to these new workers and their families.

FEDERAL BUILDINGS – \$9.7 BILLION

Infrastructure Needs: According to the General Services Administration (“GSA”), capital reinvestment requirements to maintain existing Federal buildings exceed \$7 billion. Federal building infrastructure in the United States has long been neglected. Numerous studies indicate that the nation’s ability to make efficient resource allocations for vital infrastructure is hampered by entrenched obstacles that include competing interests, legal and budgetary limitations, and the bias in the existing budget process against capital planning.

Moreover, Federal buildings have high energy cost requirements. Each year, GSA spends more than \$450 million on energy costs on the government-owned inventory of Federal buildings. Renovations of Federal buildings include important energy and water conservation measures. Pursuant to sections 431 and 433 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-140) and Executive Order 13423, these renovations must reduce the energy cost of the building by at least 20 percent and reduce the consumption of fossil fuel-generated electricity by 55 percent below comparable buildings. For instance, GSA proposes to renovate the Federal building at 1800 F Street in Washington, D.C., which was constructed in 1917. The proposed renovation includes installing a photovoltaic roof and geothermal technology to increase the efficiency of the chilled-water plant on the site. Similarly, the construction of new Federal buildings with significant renewable energy components, particularly photovoltaic systems, can provide Federal leadership to reduce our nation’s dependence on foreign oil and address global climate change.

Ready-to-Go Projects: GSA has identified \$4.88 billion of major repair and alteration and new construction projects that are ready to go to construction within 90 to 120 days if additional funding is made available. According to GSA, these ready-to-go Federal building, U.S. courthouse, and border station projects include 29 major repair and alteration projects in 18 States and the District of Columbia, at a cost of \$3.15 billion. The renovations of these Federal buildings and U.S. courthouses include important energy and water conservation elements. In addition, GSA has identified \$513 million of small ready-to-go repair projects nationwide under its non-prospectus and energy and water conservation programs. Finally, GSA has identified 10 Federal buildings, U.S. courthouses, and border stations in 10 States that are ready to go to construction, at a cost of \$1.2 billion, within 120 days.

In addition, GSA has identified a total of \$21.3 billion of major repair and alteration and new construction projects that are ready to go to construction within two years if additional funding is made available. These projects include 47 major repair and alteration projects in 24 States and the District of Columbia, at a cost of \$6.27 billion. In addition, GSA has identified \$914 million of small ready-to-go repair projects nationwide under its non-prospectus and energy and water conservation programs. Finally, GSA has identified 107 new Federal buildings, U.S. courthouses, and border stations across the country that are ready-to-go to construction, at a cost of \$14.1 billion, within two years.

Proposal:

1. **Provide \$6 billion for repair and alteration of Federal buildings and U.S. courthouses; and**
2. **Provide \$3.7 billion for construction of Federal buildings, U.S. courthouses, and border stations**
3. **Of the amounts provided, not less than \$1 billion shall be available for the repair, alteration, and construction of U.S. courthouses. Funds are available for construction of a U.S. courthouse only if the design of the project provides courtroom space for senior judges for up to 10 years from senior status not to exceed one courtroom for every two senior judges.**

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds through existing GSA prospectus and non-prospectus programs. GSA would determine the distribution of funds through its existing administrative processes.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require GSA to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$2.43 billion (25 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of enactment. Require GSA to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$4.85 billion (50 percent) of these funds within one year and award contracts for all of the funding within two years of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create approximately 270,000 jobs and \$48 billion of economic activity.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION – \$270 MILLION

Infrastructure Needs: According to the Smithsonian Institution, there is an urgent need for capital investment in several of the Institution's landmark facilities to maintain and upgrade these facilities. Energy efficiency upgrades comprise about 50 percent of the capital funding needs.

Ready-to-Go Projects: The Smithsonian Institution has identified more than \$403 million of projects that are ready to go to construction in fiscal year 2009 if additional funding is made available. These ready-to-go projects include repair and alteration of the Smithsonian Institution's Arts and Industries Building and National Zoo and construction of the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center Mathias Laboratory.

Proposal: Provide \$270 million for repair, alteration, and construction of Smithsonian Institution facilities.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds through the Smithsonian Institution's existing administrative processes.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require the Smithsonian Institution to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$135 million (50 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of enactment. Require the Smithsonian Institution to award contracts for all of the funding within one year of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create more than 7,500 jobs and \$1.3 billion of economic activity.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL – \$20 MILLION

Infrastructure Needs: According to the Architect of the Capitol (“AOC”), there is an urgent need for capital investment in several AOC facilities to maintain and upgrade these facilities. These projects include energy efficiency upgrades and life safety and security upgrades.

Ready-to-Go Projects: The AOC has identified eight projects that are ready to go to construction within 90 to 120 days if additional funding is made available. These projects include roof replacement, street repaving, security barrier replacement, and Capitol Power Plant infrastructure maintenance.

Proposal: Provide \$20 million for repair and alteration of U.S. Capitol Complex facilities and grounds.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds through the Architect of the Capitol’s existing administrative processes.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require the Architect of the Capitol to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$10 million (50 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of enactment. Require the Architect of the Capitol to award contracts for all of the funding within one year of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create more than 550 jobs and \$99 million of economic activity.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION – \$400 MILLION

Infrastructure Needs: The Economic Development Administration (“EDA”) is uniquely positioned to provide effective and timely job creation and economic development assistance to economically distressed communities. EDA assistance is available to rural and urban areas of the nation experiencing high unemployment, low income, or other severe economic distress.

EDA provides grants to construct and rehabilitate essential public infrastructure and facilities necessary to generate or retain long-term private sector jobs and investments, attract private sector capital, and promote regional competitiveness. Typical projects include investments in facilities such as water and sewer systems, industrial access roads, industrial and business parks, port facilities, distance learning facilities, skill-training facilities, business incubator facilities, brownfield redevelopment, eco-industrial facilities, and telecommunications and broadband infrastructure improvements necessary for business creation, retention, and expansion.

Ready-to-Go Projects: EDA’s local partners have a significant backlog of ready-to-go economic development projects that have been stalled because of a lack of funds. According to the National Association of Development Organizations, an informal survey of a small sample of its members identified more than 200 projects with a total Federal cost of \$885 million that are ready to go to construction if additional funding is made available. These projects would leverage an estimated \$3 billion in private investment.

Proposal: Provide \$400 million for the Economic Development Administration.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds to local partners through EDA’s existing project selection processes. Some of these funds should be specifically focused on addressing sudden and severe economic dislocation caused by the downturn in U.S. automotive manufacturing.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require EDA grant recipients to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$100 million (25 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of grant receipt. Require EDA to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$200 million (50 percent) of these funds within one year and award contracts for all of the funding within two years of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create approximately 11,000 jobs and \$2 billion of economic activity.

MARITIME TRANSPORTATION
GREAT LAKES ICEBREAKER – \$153 MILLION

Infrastructure Needs: Additional icebreaking capacity is needed on the Great Lakes to provide for safe navigation of ships supplying iron ore and other raw materials to U.S. heavy industries. During the winter months, commercial ships transport more than \$2 billion worth of materials to U.S. industries.

Ready-to-Go Project: This proposal would fund construction of a sister icebreaker to the MACKINAW. The Coast Guard has an existing contract with the shipyard that built the MACKINAW. If funds are made available to construct another Great Lakes icebreaker, the shipyard is expected to hire 50 workers within 30 days to begin construction. An additional Great Lakes icebreaker would enable the Coast Guard to reassign the buoy tender ALDER, which currently operates in the Great Lakes, to meet other buoy tending needs in the United States.

Proposal: Provide \$153 million for a Coast Guard Great Lakes Icebreaker.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds through the Coast Guard's existing administrative processes.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Economic Impact: Create more than 4,250 jobs (including 150-200 direct shipyard jobs) and \$750 million of economic activity.

Equal Opportunity: As a general rule, the Coast Guard is required to provide at least 10 percent (\$15.3 million) of the amounts made available to DBEs, including minority- and women-owned businesses.

MARITIME TRANSPORTATION
COAST GUARD SHORE FACILITIES – \$100 MILLION

Infrastructure Needs: The Coast Guard has a significant backlog of needed repairs for aging Coast Guard shore facilities, including personnel housing, air stations, sector offices, small boat stations, and the dormitory at the Coast Guard Academy.

Ready-to-Go Projects: The Coast Guard has more than \$1 billion in deferred facility repair and improvement projects. Many of these projects are ready to go to construction within 90 to 120 days if additional funding is made available.

Proposal: Provide \$100 million for the Coast Guard's Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements program to fund ready-to-go Coast Guard shore facility repair projects.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds through the Coast Guard's existing administrative processes.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require the Coast Guard to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$50 million (50 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of enactment. Require the Coast Guard to award contracts for all of the funding within one year of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create approximately 2,780 jobs and \$500 million of economic activity.

Equal Opportunity: As a general rule, the Coast Guard is required to provide at least 10 percent (\$10 million) of the amounts made available to DBEs, including minority- and women-owned businesses.

MARITIME TRANSPORTATION
COAST GUARD BRIDGE ALTERATIONS – \$481 MILLION

Infrastructure Needs: The Coast Guard bridge alteration program provides Federal funding to remove or alter bridges that are a safety hazard to navigation and an unreasonable obstruction to navigation. This program is normally funded at approximately \$15 million per year. Increasing funding for this program would help eliminate the \$481 million backlog of unfunded projects and create jobs across the United States.

Ready-to-Go Projects: The Coast Guard has 12 bridge alteration projects that are ready to go to construction within 90 to 120 days if additional funding is made available.

Proposal: Provide \$481 million for the Coast Guard's Alteration of Bridges program.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds through the Coast Guard's existing administrative processes.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require the Coast Guard to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$120 million (25 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of enactment. Require the Coast Guard to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$240 million (50 percent) of these funds within one year and award contracts for all of the funding within two years of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create approximately 13,380 jobs and \$2.4 billion of economic activity.

Equal Opportunity: As a general rule, the Coast Guard is required to provide at least 10 percent (\$48.1 million) of the amounts made available to DBEs, including minority- and women-owned businesses.

MARITIME TRANSPORTATION
SHORT SEA SHIPPING AND
RENEWABLE ENERGY LOAN GUARANTEES – \$45 MILLION

Infrastructure Needs: Subtitle C of Title XI of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-140) established within the Maritime Administration a program to identify and promote short sea shipping in the United States. Short sea shipping is the transportation of goods and passengers by water between U.S. ports. These projects can help eliminate truck traffic and reduce highway congestion. In addition, the Maritime Administration has a loan guarantee program for the construction of ocean renewable energy facilities (e.g., wind, wave, and tidal energy generators) along the U.S. coast.

Proposal:

1. Provide \$15 million to finance \$300 million of Title XI loan guarantees under chapter 537 of Title 46, United States Code, for construction of short sea ships in U.S. shipyards;
2. Provide \$15 million to finance \$300 million of Title XI loan guarantees under chapter 537 of Title 46 for construction of shore-side terminals and the purchase of equipment necessary to accommodate short sea shipping; and
3. Provide \$15 million to finance \$300 million of Title XI loan guarantees under chapter 537 of Title 46 for the ocean renewable energy program administered by the Maritime Administration.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds for loan guarantees through the Maritime Administration's existing administrative processes.

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Economic Impact: The \$900 million of Federal loan guarantees creates more than 25,000 jobs and \$4.46 billion of economic activity.

Equal Opportunity: Maritime Administration contracts require contractors to maximize the use of small and minority subcontractors.

MARITIME TRANSPORTATION
JOB CREATION AND TRAINING – \$10 MILLION

Job Creation and Training Needs: The U.S. maritime industry is currently experiencing a shortage of trained workers, particularly in the offshore energy and towing vessel industry. This Maritime Administration program would fund educational loans for individuals seeking to attend Coast Guard-approved maritime training courses (both entry-level courses and training to upgrade licenses). Under the program, a student may receive up to \$15,000 per year with a lifetime limit of \$60,000 in low-interest loans. Statutory authorization is required for this program.

Proposal: Provide \$10 million to the Maritime Administration for a maritime educational loan program. This funding will provide loans to more than 2,000 students for maritime education and training programs.

Source: Appropriate funds from the General Fund.

Distribution: Distribute funds for educational loans through the Maritime Administration's administrative processes.

Equal Opportunity: These schools are prohibited from discriminating in their admission policies.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION – \$45 MILLION

Infrastructure Needs: Maritime commerce on the Great Lakes Seaway System affects 150,000 jobs and provides \$9 million per day in business revenues for firms engaging in trade in the U.S. Without renewed capital investment in the assets of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the reliability and availability of the Seaway, and access to the communities and economies of the Great Lakes and Midwestern regions, is in jeopardy.

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (“SLSDC”) has developed a ten-year U.S. Asset Renewal Program (“ARP”) Capital Investment Plan (“CIP”) for navigation infrastructure and facilities. The objectives of ARP/CIP include: lock operation upgrade and maintenance, waterway management, tunnel and bridge maintenance and facility upgrade and maintenance. The ten-year asset renewal program consists of 50 projects ranging in cost from \$200,000 for upgrading and replacing fire alarm protection systems, to \$13.6 million for replacing the deck of the Seaway International Bridge. The total cost of the ten-year asset renewal program is \$164.6 million, which is authorized pursuant to section 5015 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-114).

Projects scheduled to begin in years 1 and 2 of ARP are currently ready for implementation and construction. These projects include \$5 million for installation of an ice flushing system in the Snell Lock and \$3 million for rehabilitation of downstream miter gates at both the Snell and Eisenhower locks. In addition, other projects ready for implementation include \$3 million for completion of the deck replacement of the Seaway International Bridge. Work on these projects will be done by contractors, by SLSDC staff, or by a combination of contractors and SLSDC staff.

Ready-to-Go Projects: Section 5015 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 authorizes the SLSDC to undertake a ten-year asset renewal program. The SLSDC has identified \$45 million in projects that are ready to go to construction within the larger asset renewal program.

Proposal: Provide \$45 million to begin the SLSDC’s ten-year asset renewal program.

Source: Appropriate funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and the general fund of the United States.

Distribution: Distribute funds pursuant to section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238)

Prioritization: Prioritize funds on projects that are ready to go to construction and can be underway within 90 days.

Shovel-Ready Deadlines: Require SLSDC to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$11.25 million (25 percent) of these funds within 90 days of the date of enactment. Require SLSDC to award contracts for projects totaling at least \$22.5 million (50 percent) of these funds within one year and award contracts for all of the funding within two years of the date of enactment.

Economic Impact: Create approximately 1,250 jobs and \$223 million of economic activity.

**Results of December 2008
AASHTO Survey of Ready-to-Go Highway & Bridge Projects**

State	Number of Projects	Dollar Value (in Millions)
Alabama	16	\$877.0
Alaska	4	\$139.3
Arizona	72	\$1,091.5
Arkansas	130	\$1,120.5
California		\$5,000.0
Colorado	113	\$1,154.0
Connecticut	5	\$764.7
Delaware		\$125.0
District of Columbia	3	\$56.0
Florida	92	\$6,968.3
Georgia	319	\$1,932.9
Hawaii	51	\$417.9
Idaho	126	\$805.0
Illinois	245	\$783.3
Indiana	109	\$501.2
Iowa	41	\$221.2
Kansas	107	\$357.0
Kentucky	50	\$400.0
Louisiana	58	\$423.0
Maine	44	\$221.0
Maryland		\$230.0
Massachusetts	37	\$220.0
Michigan	208	\$1,750.0
Minnesota	200	\$950.0
Mississippi	75	\$600.0
Missouri	34	\$510.0
Montana	158	\$350.0
Nebraska	30	\$250.0
Nevada	40	\$250.0
New Hampshire	27	\$230.5
New Jersey	153	\$1,640.0
New Mexico	49	\$1,136.1
New York	40	\$550.0
North Carolina	296	\$5,170.0
North Dakota		\$300.0
Ohio		\$2,160.0
Oklahoma	95	\$778.0
Oregon	105	\$564.0
Pennsylvania	319	\$1,030.0
Rhode Island	40	\$100.0
South Carolina	51	\$850.0
South Dakota	29	\$155.0
Tennessee	120	\$400.0
Texas	853	\$6,018.4
Utah	136	\$10,800.0
Vermont	22	\$94.7
Virginia	40	\$680.4
Washington	60	\$1,339.0
West Virginia	181	\$1,134.4
Wisconsin	60	\$320.0
Wyoming	105	\$400.3
Total	5,148	\$64,319.6

**Additional Infrastructure Investment Formula Funding
Provided Under T&I Proposal**

State	Highways and Bridges	Transit Capital	Transit Energy	Clean Water SRF	Nonpoint Source Management	Infrastructure Investment Total
Alabama	\$572,060,276	\$49,931,464	\$17,561,960	\$132,511,183	\$19,534,536	\$791,599,419
Alaska	\$243,600,415	\$50,603,645	\$14,910,700	\$70,924,610	\$12,159,252	\$392,198,622
Arizona	\$599,544,222	\$114,080,632	\$31,174,414	\$80,040,312	\$16,345,224	\$841,184,804
Arkansas	\$378,503,879	\$30,070,186	\$11,509,324	\$77,524,425	\$19,634,202	\$517,242,016
California	\$2,858,915,164	\$1,199,943,342	\$294,302,276	\$847,526,269	\$53,221,644	\$5,253,908,695
Colorado	\$421,994,413	\$112,555,562	\$30,399,288	\$94,784,580	\$12,657,582	\$672,391,425
Connecticut	\$400,021,064	\$84,937,669	\$21,288,086	\$145,172,531	\$9,767,268	\$661,186,618
Delaware	\$123,530,543	\$14,591,755	\$3,986,592	\$58,181,350	\$7,175,952	\$207,466,192
District of Columbia	\$127,289,815	\$138,165,805	\$32,750,412	\$58,181,350	\$6,278,958	\$362,666,340
Florida	\$1,494,156,469	\$363,587,293	\$91,907,220	\$400,002,629	\$39,069,072	\$2,388,722,683
Georgia	\$1,069,065,734	\$154,852,769	\$43,846,626	\$200,358,220	\$23,321,844	\$1,491,445,193
Hawaii	\$132,301,315	\$52,334,892	\$13,245,816	\$91,777,217	\$7,674,282	\$297,333,522
Idaho	\$221,369,668	\$19,846,654	\$7,326,216	\$58,181,350	\$12,358,584	\$319,082,472
Illinois	\$1,023,859,262	\$448,699,592	\$112,483,590	\$535,942,440	\$41,062,392	\$2,162,047,276
Indiana	\$762,868,306	\$87,657,760	\$26,598,080	\$285,594,131	\$22,424,850	\$1,185,143,127
Iowa	\$360,864,054	\$39,894,562	\$13,894,524	\$160,384,871	\$22,823,514	\$597,861,525
Kansas	\$324,257,708	\$33,185,764	\$12,040,006	\$106,966,154	\$18,438,210	\$494,887,842
Kentucky	\$467,437,405	\$54,594,593	\$18,447,548	\$150,824,500	\$17,042,886	\$708,346,932
Louisiana	\$481,072,396	\$72,952,097	\$21,774,774	\$130,264,438	\$24,318,504	\$730,382,209
Maine	\$141,735,930	\$14,022,576	\$5,697,366	\$91,730,410	\$11,660,922	\$264,847,204
Maryland	\$489,255,943	\$146,057,862	\$36,729,438	\$286,600,486	\$13,355,244	\$971,998,973
Massachusetts	\$517,578,530	\$238,980,293	\$58,143,464	\$402,342,989	\$13,554,576	\$1,230,599,852
Michigan	\$894,549,254	\$153,958,568	\$43,985,550	\$509,531,477	\$29,202,138	\$1,631,226,987
Minnesota	\$488,211,309	\$106,864,850	\$30,876,584	\$217,805,603	\$34,484,436	\$878,242,782
Mississippi	\$360,843,637	\$26,401,242	\$11,262,064	\$106,767,223	\$19,135,872	\$524,410,038
Missouri	\$703,563,771	\$92,681,374	\$27,968,028	\$328,504,631	\$23,022,846	\$1,175,740,650
Montana	\$283,597,227	\$16,993,970	\$7,561,488	\$58,181,350	\$13,255,578	\$379,589,613
Nebraska	\$235,360,213	\$25,653,567	\$9,042,344	\$60,615,324	\$18,139,212	\$348,810,660
Nevada	\$222,557,888	\$57,250,968	\$15,869,754	\$58,181,350	\$8,471,610	\$362,331,570
New Hampshire	\$140,571,607	\$14,153,033	\$4,842,774	\$118,422,216	\$7,574,616	\$285,564,246
New Jersey	\$795,034,411	\$423,618,947	\$101,797,276	\$484,255,589	\$16,644,222	\$1,821,350,445
New Mexico	\$287,385,600	\$30,655,975	\$11,001,768	\$58,181,350	\$12,159,252	\$399,383,945
New York	\$1,384,893,218	\$1,072,655,895	\$261,819,988	\$1,307,992,099	\$33,886,440	\$4,061,247,640
North Carolina	\$820,025,812	\$112,496,949	\$35,882,130	\$213,873,799	\$23,222,178	\$1,205,500,868
North Dakota	\$198,805,207	\$12,286,681	\$4,774,706	\$58,181,350	\$24,119,172	\$298,167,116
Ohio	\$1,059,032,410	\$194,364,690	\$54,671,262	\$667,119,618	\$30,298,464	\$2,005,486,444
Oklahoma	\$474,509,481	\$42,011,280	\$14,895,918	\$95,744,128	\$15,747,228	\$642,908,035
Oregon	\$357,088,483	\$87,405,043	\$25,035,200	\$133,868,592	\$13,853,574	\$617,250,892
Pennsylvania	\$1,282,044,303	\$311,941,825	\$82,651,414	\$469,406,005	\$29,401,470	\$2,175,445,017
Rhode Island	\$157,709,524	\$21,239,097	\$5,283,404	\$79,572,240	\$6,777,288	\$270,581,553
South Carolina	\$490,486,367	\$43,501,743	\$14,993,720	\$121,394,473	\$15,547,896	\$685,924,199
South Dakota	\$203,089,210	\$12,247,755	\$5,165,914	\$58,181,350	\$16,345,224	\$295,029,453
Tennessee	\$626,691,888	\$75,955,303	\$24,011,872	\$172,145,180	\$15,846,894	\$914,651,137
Texas	\$2,474,313,510	\$423,824,974	\$114,709,948	\$541,629,515	\$47,341,350	\$3,601,819,297
Utah	\$226,226,859	\$67,576,295	\$18,219,112	\$62,440,805	\$9,169,272	\$383,632,343
Vermont	\$132,401,858	\$5,894,231	\$2,536,300	\$58,181,350	\$7,375,284	\$206,389,023
Virginia	\$762,047,660	\$126,443,045	\$35,239,008	\$242,519,805	\$19,634,202	\$1,185,883,720
Washington	\$541,275,082	\$204,484,350	\$52,611,384	\$206,080,400	\$19,135,872	\$1,023,587,088
West Virginia	\$248,865,546	\$19,602,655	\$7,575,132	\$184,736,317	\$10,963,260	\$471,742,910
Wisconsin	\$576,265,153	\$92,741,283	\$27,796,430	\$320,360,179	\$25,813,494	\$1,042,976,539
Wyoming	\$203,649,174	\$10,147,915	\$4,608,324	\$58,181,350	\$9,767,268	\$286,354,031
American Samoa	\$3,953,584	\$387,847	\$206,852	\$10,636,936	\$2,690,982	\$17,876,201
Guam	\$19,767,920	\$1,048,335	\$559,112	\$7,677,560	\$2,690,982	\$31,743,909
Northern Marianas	\$3,953,584	\$1,387,132	\$346,492	\$4,888,040	\$2,690,982	\$13,266,230
Puerto Rico	\$110,178,819	\$88,971,038	\$21,800,494	\$154,557,374	\$5,581,296	\$381,089,021
Virgin Islands	\$19,767,920	\$1,605,378	\$380,534	\$6,140,960	\$2,690,982	\$30,585,774
Indian Tribes	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$180,000,000	\$3,340,000	\$183,340,000
Total	\$30,000,000,000	\$7,500,000,000	\$2,000,000,000	\$12,000,000,000	\$1,000,000,000	\$52,500,000,000

*Prepared by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure majority staff based on technical assistance provided by the Department of Transportation.

**Additional Infrastructure Investment Formula Funding
Provided Under T&I Proposal for
Highways and Bridges**

State	Total Funding
Alabama	\$572,060,276
Alaska	\$243,600,415
Arizona	\$599,544,222
Arkansas	\$378,503,879
California	\$2,858,915,164
Colorado	\$421,994,413
Connecticut	\$400,021,064
Delaware	\$123,530,543
District of Columbia	\$127,289,815
Florida	\$1,494,156,469
Georgia	\$1,069,065,734
Hawaii	\$132,301,315
Idaho	\$221,369,668
Illinois	\$1,023,859,262
Indiana	\$762,868,306
Iowa	\$360,864,054
Kansas	\$324,257,708
Kentucky	\$467,437,405
Louisiana	\$481,072,396
Maine	\$141,735,930
Maryland	\$489,255,943
Massachusetts	\$517,578,530
Michigan	\$894,549,254
Minnesota	\$488,211,309
Mississippi	\$360,843,637
Missouri	\$703,563,771
Montana	\$283,597,227
Nebraska	\$235,360,213
Nevada	\$222,557,888
New Hampshire	\$140,571,607
New Jersey	\$795,034,411
New Mexico	\$287,385,600
New York	\$1,384,893,218
North Carolina	\$820,025,812
North Dakota	\$198,805,207
Ohio	\$1,059,032,410
Oklahoma	\$474,509,481
Oregon	\$357,088,483
Pennsylvania	\$1,282,044,303
Rhode Island	\$157,709,524
South Carolina	\$490,486,367
South Dakota	\$203,089,210
Tennessee	\$626,691,888
Texas	\$2,474,313,510
Utah	\$226,226,859
Vermont	\$132,401,858
Virginia	\$762,047,660
Washington	\$541,275,082
West Virginia	\$248,865,546
Wisconsin	\$576,265,153
Wyoming	\$203,649,174
American Samoa	\$3,953,584
Guam	\$19,767,920
Northern Marianas	\$3,953,584
Puerto Rico	\$110,178,819
Virgin Islands	\$19,767,920
Total	\$30,000,000,000

*Prepared by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure majority staff based on technical assistance provided by the Federal Highway Administration.

**Additional Infrastructure Investment Formula Funding
Provided Under T&I Proposal for
Transit Capital Grants**

State	Urban Formula	Rural Formula	Total Funding
Alabama	\$30,605,017	\$19,326,447	\$49,931,464
Alaska	\$40,762,947	\$9,840,698	\$50,603,645
Arizona	\$100,131,490	\$13,949,142	\$114,080,632
Arkansas	\$15,282,363	\$14,787,823	\$30,070,186
California	\$1,166,627,837	\$33,315,505	\$1,199,943,342
Colorado	\$100,002,410	\$12,553,152	\$112,555,562
Connecticut	\$81,040,512	\$3,897,157	\$84,937,669
Delaware	\$12,810,407	\$1,781,348	\$14,591,755
District of Columbia	\$138,165,805	\$0	\$138,165,805
Florida	\$344,270,263	\$19,317,030	\$363,587,293
Georgia	\$130,752,617	\$24,100,152	\$154,852,769
Hawaii	\$49,498,175	\$2,836,717	\$52,334,892
Idaho	\$10,997,997	\$8,848,657	\$19,846,654
Illinois	\$428,027,150	\$20,672,442	\$448,699,592
Indiana	\$68,015,448	\$19,642,312	\$87,657,760
Iowa	\$24,916,192	\$14,978,370	\$39,894,562
Kansas	\$19,099,352	\$14,086,412	\$33,185,764
Kentucky	\$36,009,798	\$18,584,795	\$54,594,593
Louisiana	\$57,823,912	\$15,128,185	\$72,952,097
Maine	\$6,012,028	\$8,010,548	\$14,022,576
Maryland	\$138,942,297	\$7,115,565	\$146,057,862
Massachusetts	\$233,930,338	\$5,049,955	\$238,980,293
Michigan	\$128,674,193	\$25,284,375	\$153,958,568
Minnesota	\$88,148,258	\$18,716,592	\$106,864,850
Mississippi	\$9,512,767	\$16,888,475	\$26,401,242
Missouri	\$72,434,382	\$20,246,992	\$92,681,374
Montana	\$5,069,118	\$11,924,852	\$16,993,970
Nebraska	\$15,658,507	\$9,995,060	\$25,653,567
Nevada	\$49,491,320	\$7,759,648	\$57,250,968
New Hampshire	\$9,131,098	\$5,021,935	\$14,153,033
New Jersey	\$418,948,295	\$4,670,652	\$423,618,947
New Mexico	\$18,049,782	\$12,606,193	\$30,655,975
New York	\$1,047,138,182	\$25,517,713	\$1,072,655,895
North Carolina	\$81,392,317	\$31,104,632	\$112,496,949
North Dakota	\$6,001,393	\$6,285,288	\$12,286,681
Ohio	\$165,340,932	\$29,023,758	\$194,364,690
Oklahoma	\$25,346,580	\$16,664,700	\$42,011,280
Oregon	\$72,835,280	\$14,569,763	\$87,405,043
Pennsylvania	\$282,546,763	\$29,395,062	\$311,941,825
Rhode Island	\$20,398,882	\$840,215	\$21,239,097
South Carolina	\$27,699,328	\$15,802,415	\$43,501,743
South Dakota	\$4,610,995	\$7,636,760	\$12,247,755
Tennessee	\$55,679,478	\$20,275,825	\$75,955,303
Texas	\$375,738,898	\$48,086,076	\$423,824,974
Utah	\$60,147,827	\$7,428,468	\$67,576,295
Vermont	\$2,049,608	\$3,844,623	\$5,894,231
Virginia	\$108,665,828	\$17,777,217	\$126,443,045
Washington	\$190,508,412	\$13,975,938	\$204,484,350
West Virginia	\$9,718,710	\$9,883,945	\$19,602,655
Wisconsin	\$73,121,353	\$19,619,930	\$92,741,283
Wyoming	\$2,713,158	\$7,434,757	\$10,147,915
American Samoa	\$0	\$387,847	\$387,847
Guam	\$0	\$1,048,335	\$1,048,335
Northern Marianas	\$1,327,425	\$59,707	\$1,387,132
Puerto Rico	\$86,571,198	\$2,399,840	\$88,971,038
Virgin Islands	\$1,605,378	\$0	\$1,605,378
Total	\$6,750,000,000	\$750,000,000	\$7,500,000,000

*Prepared by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure majority staff based on technical assistance provided by the Federal Transit Administration.

**Additional Infrastructure Investment Formula Funding
Provided Under T&I Proposal for
Transit Energy Grants**

State	Urban Formula	Rural Formula	Total Funding
Alabama	\$7,254,522	\$10,307,438	\$17,561,960
Alaska	\$9,662,328	\$5,248,372	\$14,910,700
Arizona	\$23,734,872	\$7,439,542	\$31,174,414
Arkansas	\$3,622,486	\$7,886,838	\$11,509,324
California	\$276,534,006	\$17,768,270	\$294,302,276
Colorado	\$23,704,274	\$6,695,014	\$30,399,288
Connecticut	\$19,209,602	\$2,078,484	\$21,288,086
Delaware	\$3,036,540	\$950,052	\$3,986,592
District of Columbia	\$32,750,412	\$0	\$32,750,412
Florida	\$81,604,804	\$10,302,416	\$91,907,220
Georgia	\$30,993,212	\$12,853,414	\$43,846,626
Hawaii	\$11,732,900	\$1,512,916	\$13,245,816
Idaho	\$2,606,932	\$4,719,284	\$7,326,216
Illinois	\$101,458,288	\$11,025,302	\$112,483,590
Indiana	\$16,122,180	\$10,475,900	\$26,598,080
Iowa	\$5,906,060	\$7,988,464	\$13,894,524
Kansas	\$4,527,254	\$7,512,752	\$12,040,006
Kentucky	\$8,535,656	\$9,911,892	\$18,447,548
Louisiana	\$13,706,408	\$8,068,366	\$21,774,774
Maine	\$1,425,074	\$4,272,292	\$5,697,366
Maryland	\$32,934,470	\$3,794,968	\$36,729,438
Massachusetts	\$55,450,154	\$2,693,310	\$58,143,464
Michigan	\$30,500,550	\$13,485,000	\$43,985,550
Minnesota	\$20,894,402	\$9,982,182	\$30,876,584
Mississippi	\$2,254,878	\$9,007,186	\$11,262,064
Missouri	\$17,169,632	\$10,798,396	\$27,968,028
Montana	\$1,201,568	\$6,359,920	\$7,561,488
Nebraska	\$3,711,646	\$5,330,698	\$9,042,344
Nevada	\$11,731,276	\$4,138,478	\$15,869,754
New Hampshire	\$2,164,408	\$2,678,366	\$4,842,774
New Jersey	\$99,306,262	\$2,491,014	\$101,797,276
New Mexico	\$4,278,466	\$6,723,302	\$11,001,768
New York	\$248,210,540	\$13,609,448	\$261,819,988
North Carolina	\$19,292,994	\$16,589,136	\$35,882,130
North Dakota	\$1,422,552	\$3,352,154	\$4,774,706
Ohio	\$39,191,924	\$15,479,338	\$54,671,262
Oklahoma	\$6,008,078	\$8,887,840	\$14,895,918
Oregon	\$17,264,660	\$7,770,540	\$25,035,200
Pennsylvania	\$66,974,048	\$15,677,366	\$82,651,414
Rhode Island	\$4,835,290	\$448,114	\$5,283,404
South Carolina	\$6,565,766	\$8,427,954	\$14,993,720
South Dakota	\$1,092,976	\$4,072,938	\$5,165,914
Tennessee	\$13,198,098	\$10,813,774	\$24,011,872
Texas	\$89,064,036	\$25,645,912	\$114,709,948
Utah	\$14,257,262	\$3,961,850	\$18,219,112
Vermont	\$485,834	\$2,050,466	\$2,536,300
Virginia	\$25,757,826	\$9,481,182	\$35,239,008
Washington	\$45,157,550	\$7,453,834	\$52,611,384
West Virginia	\$2,303,694	\$5,271,438	\$7,575,132
Wisconsin	\$17,332,468	\$10,463,962	\$27,796,430
Wyoming	\$643,120	\$3,965,204	\$4,608,324
American Samoa	\$0	\$206,852	\$206,852
Guam	\$0	\$559,112	\$559,112
Northern Marianas	\$314,648	\$31,844	\$346,492
Puerto Rico	\$20,520,580	\$1,279,914	\$21,800,494
Virgin Islands	\$380,534	\$0	\$380,534
Total	\$1,600,000,000	\$400,000,000	\$2,000,000,000

*Prepared by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure majority staff based on technical assistance provided by the Federal Transit Administration.

**Additional Infrastructure Investment Formula Funding
Provided Under T&I Proposal for
Clean Water State Revolving Fund**

State	Total Funding
Alabama	\$132,511,183
Alaska	\$70,924,610
Arizona	\$80,040,312
Arkansas	\$77,524,425
California	\$847,526,269
Colorado	\$94,784,580
Connecticut	\$145,172,531
Delaware	\$58,181,350
District of Columbia	\$58,181,350
Florida	\$400,002,629
Georgia	\$200,358,220
Hawaii	\$91,777,217
Idaho	\$58,181,350
Illinois	\$535,942,440
Indiana	\$285,594,131
Iowa	\$160,384,871
Kansas	\$106,966,154
Kentucky	\$150,824,500
Louisiana	\$130,264,438
Maine	\$91,730,410
Maryland	\$286,600,486
Massachusetts	\$402,342,989
Michigan	\$509,531,477
Minnesota	\$217,805,603
Mississippi	\$106,767,223
Missouri	\$328,504,631
Montana	\$58,181,350
Nebraska	\$60,615,324
Nevada	\$58,181,350
New Hampshire	\$118,422,216
New Jersey	\$484,255,589
New Mexico	\$58,181,350
New York	\$1,307,992,099
North Carolina	\$213,873,799
North Dakota	\$58,181,350
Ohio	\$667,119,618
Oklahoma	\$95,744,128
Oregon	\$133,868,592
Pennsylvania	\$469,406,005
Rhode Island	\$79,572,240
South Carolina	\$121,394,473
South Dakota	\$58,181,350
Tennessee	\$172,145,180
Texas	\$541,629,515
Utah	\$62,440,805
Vermont	\$58,181,350
Virginia	\$242,519,805
Washington	\$206,080,400
West Virginia	\$184,736,317
Wisconsin	\$320,360,179
Wyoming	\$58,181,350
American Samoa	\$10,636,936
Guam	\$7,677,560
Northern Marianas	\$4,888,040
Puerto Rico	\$154,557,374
Virgin Islands	\$6,140,960
Indian Tribes	\$180,000,000
Total	\$12,000,000,000

*Prepared by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure majority staff.

**Additional Infrastructure Investment Formula Funding
Provided Under T&I Proposal for
Nonpoint Source Management Program**

State	Total Funding
Alabama	\$19,534,536
Alaska	\$12,159,252
Arizona	\$16,345,224
Arkansas	\$19,634,202
California	\$53,221,644
Colorado	\$12,657,582
Connecticut	\$9,767,268
Delaware	\$7,175,952
District of Columbia	\$6,278,958
Florida	\$39,069,072
Georgia	\$23,321,844
Hawaii	\$7,674,282
Idaho	\$12,358,584
Illinois	\$41,062,392
Indiana	\$22,424,850
Iowa	\$22,823,514
Kansas	\$18,438,210
Kentucky	\$17,042,886
Louisiana	\$24,318,504
Maine	\$11,660,922
Maryland	\$13,355,244
Massachusetts	\$13,554,576
Michigan	\$29,202,138
Minnesota	\$34,484,436
Mississippi	\$19,135,872
Missouri	\$23,022,846
Montana	\$13,255,578
Nebraska	\$18,139,212
Nevada	\$8,471,610
New Hampshire	\$7,574,616
New Jersey	\$16,644,222
New Mexico	\$12,159,252
New York	\$33,886,440
North Carolina	\$23,222,178
North Dakota	\$24,119,172
Ohio	\$30,298,464
Oklahoma	\$15,747,228
Oregon	\$13,853,574
Pennsylvania	\$29,401,470
Rhode Island	\$6,777,288
South Carolina	\$15,547,896
South Dakota	\$16,345,224
Tennessee	\$15,846,894
Texas	\$47,341,350
Utah	\$9,169,272
Vermont	\$7,375,284
Virginia	\$19,634,202
Washington	\$19,135,872
West Virginia	\$10,963,260
Wisconsin	\$25,813,494
Wyoming	\$9,767,268
American Samoa	\$2,690,982
Guam	\$2,690,982
Northern Marianas	\$2,690,982
Puerto Rico	\$5,581,296
Virgin Islands	\$2,690,982
Indian Tribes	\$3,340,000
Total	\$1,000,000,000

*Prepared by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure majority staff.

PROCESS FOR ENSURING TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN USE OF ECONOMIC RECOVERY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS

- Within one week of enactment, Federal agency allocates formula funds.
- Within 10 days of receipt of allocations, each State submits to DOT its "90-Day Program of Projects" demonstrating how it intends to meet the requirement that 50 percent of funds be obligated (with contracts awarded) within 90 days of the date of allocation.
- Together with the 90-Day Program of Projects, each State submits a one-time certification, signed by the Governor, that the State will maintain its effort with regard to State funding for the types of infrastructure projects that received funding in the economic recovery supplemental appropriation.
- In addition, each State submits a certification, signed by the Governor, that the 90-Day Program of Projects represents an equitable distribution of funds within the State.
- The Programs of Projects and the State certifications will be made publicly available.
- Within 30 days of enactment, DOT's first periodic report is due to Congress. This is the first of six reports, at the following intervals: 30 days, 60 days, 120 days, 180 days, one year, and three years after the date of enactment. This first report will focus on the 90-Day Program of Projects, and begin the process of tracking the use of funds. This report, and each subsequent report, will track the following:
 - the amount of funds apportioned, allocated, obligated, and outlayed;
 - the number of projects that have been put out to bid and the amount of funds associated with such projects;
 - the number of projects for which contracts have been awarded and the amount of funds associated with such projects;
 - the number of projects on which work has begun under such contracts;
 - the number of such contracts that have been completed;

- the number of jobs created or sustained by the Federal funds provided, including information on job sector and pay levels; and
 - maintenance of effort, as measured by comparing planned State spending levels as of the date of enactment of economic recovery act to actual State spending levels that have occurred since enactment.
- Use It Or Lose It: Any funds in the 90-Day Programs of Projects that are not obligated (based on awarded contracts) within 90 days of receipt of allocation will be redistributed by DOT to other States using a process similar to the August redistribution process currently used by FHWA.
- Within 180 days of receipt of allocations, each State submits to DOT a Program of Projects demonstrating how they intend to meet the requirement that the remaining 50 percent of funds be obligated within one year of the date of enactment. In addition, each State submits a certification, signed by the Governor, that such Program of Projects represents an equitable distribution of funds within the State. The Programs of Projects and the State certifications will be made publicly available.

Attachment 3: Draft proposed state legislation prepared by Commission staff following discussions with Caltrans, regions, cities, counties, and other interested parties.

DRAFT

Chapter 9.5 (commencing with Section 2420) is added to Division 3 of the Streets and Highways Code to read:

CHAPTER 9.5. FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ECONOMIC STIMULUS ACT

2420. This chapter may be cited as the Transportation Economic Stimulus Act.

2421. The Legislature finds and declares that:

(a) Congress has enacted the Economic Stimulus Act of 2009, which provides in part for supplemental federal funding to the states for purposes of the Federal Aid Highway Act. For 50 percent of these funds, the federal act requires that the state shall submit a program of projects within 10 days and that the funds be obligated (with contracts awarded) within 90 days after the state receives the federal allocation. For the remaining 50 percent of the funds, the act requires that the state shall submit a program of projects within 180 days and that the fund be obligated within one year after the state receives the federal allocation. The federal share of funds provided to a project under the act is 100 percent of the total cost.

(b) It is in the interest of the state to insure that the transportation funds apportioned to the state under the act are fully obligated within the constraints of the act.

(c) It is the intent of the Legislature that the allocation of project funding under this chapter shall be an augmentation of funding made available under current state transportation programs and shall not be earmarked, distributed, or programmed separately.

(d) It is the intent of the Legislature that the commission, in consultation with the department and the regional transportation planning agencies, shall have broad authority to make full and expeditious use of these funds for economic stimulus in accordance with the federal act and this chapter.

(e) It is the intent of the Legislature that, to the extent practicable and consistent with subdivision (d), the commission shall allocate the funds made available under this chapter in approximately equal parts, (1) to cities and counties for projects eligible for funding from the Local Streets and Road Improvement, Congestion Relief, and Traffic Safety Account of 2006, (2) to agencies implementing projects selected by a metropolitan planning organization, county transportation commission, or regional transportation planning agency that programs projects for regional surface transportation program funds pursuant to Section 182.6, and (3) to the department for projects on the state highway system.

(f) It is the intent of the Legislature that the commission give priority to delivered projects that are at risk for funding because of the current inability to sell voter-authorized bonds.

2422. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount of all federal funds made available to the state under the Federal Economic Stimulus Act shall be continuously appropriated to the commission without regard to fiscal year for allocation to the department or to local agencies to carry out projects eligible under the Act. The commission's allocations to the department under this chapter may be for either capital outlay or support.

2423. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the commission may allocate funds under this chapter for any of the following purposes. The amounts shall augment the funding appropriated for the same purposes from other sources in the Budget Act of 2008.

(a) To the department for a project in the state highway operation and protection program (SHOPP), including a project amended into the SHOPP and delivered within the constraints of the Federal Economic Stimulus Act.

(b) To a city, county, or city and county for a project eligible for funding from the Local Streets and Road Improvement, Congestion Relief, and Traffic Safety Account of 2006 pursuant to subdivision (l) of Section 8879.23 of the Government Code and Article 10 (commencing with Section 8879.65) of Chapter 12.491 of the Government Code. Any amount the commission allocates for this purpose shall be treated as an amount allocated by the Controller under subdivision (l) of Section 8879, and the Controller shall adjust statewide allocations accordingly.

(c) To the department or to a local agency for a project that a metropolitan planning organization, county transportation commission, or regional transportation planning agency has programmed for regional surface transportation program funds pursuant to Section 182.6. Any amount that the commission allocates for this purpose shall be treated as an amount apportioned by the department under subdivision (b) of Section 182.6, and the department shall adjust statewide apportionments accordingly. For allocations from the federal 90-day program of projects, the department shall adjust statewide apportionments for 2008-09. For allocations from the federal one-year program of projects, the department shall adjust statewide apportionments for 2009-10.

(d) To the department or to a local agency for a project that the commission has programmed in the state transportation improvement program (STIP). Any amount that the commission allocates for this purpose shall be treated as STIP revenue for the purposes of Sections 164, 188, and 188.8.

(e) To the department or to a local agency for a project in the commission's program of projects for the Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF). Any amount that the commission allocates for this purpose shall be treated as meeting the commission's commitment under the TCIF program.

(f) To the department or to a local agency for a project scheduled for funding under the Traffic Congestion Relief Act of 2000. Any amount that the commission allocates for this purpose shall be treated as meeting the commitment from the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund under Section 14556.40 of the Government Code.

2424. Notwithstanding Section 14531 of the Government Code, the commission may amend the state transportation improvement program to add any project to be funded under this chapter after providing public notice of the meeting in which the commission

takes formal action. Any funding provided under this chapter for the state transportation improvement program is, together with other state transportation improvement program revenue, subject to Sections 164, 188, and 188.8.