

M-493

U. S. Department of Transportation news:



Office of Public and Consumer Affairs

Washington, D.C. 20590

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Wednesday, November 8, 1978

DOT 149-78
Contact: Bill Bishop
Tel.: 202-426-4321

DOT RELEASES ESTIMATES
OF HIGHWAY, TRANSIT AID

The Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978, signed today by President Carter, combines for the first time federal financial assistance programs for highways and transportation.

Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams called the legislation "a historic act, because it confirms as a matter of national policy that we are going to have public transportation in place as an alternative for the 1980's."

"The act gives us the tools to provide alternatives to the automobile," he stated. "It also allows us to shift to the problems of maintaining and improving the country's great Interstate Highway System. We will be streamlining the bureaucracy to meet these challenges."

The Act sets deadlines for completion of segments of the Interstate Highway System. Some of the restrictions on use of highway or transit funds are reduced, allowing states and communities to make better choices of transportation planning and funding.

Attached are estimated apportionments on a state-by-state basis for the Federal Highway Administration's principal formula programs and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration's apportionment by formula to urban areas listed by state and cities.

These are preliminary estimates. Final totals will depend on a more detailed examination of formula statistics.

#####

Estimated Apportionments of Federal-Aid Highway Funds Authorized by H.R. 11733
for FY 1979 Non-Interstate Programs and FY 1980 Interstate System Program. 1/
(In thousands of dollars)

DRAFT/HFP-12
Revised
10-30-78

State	Inter- state System	Inter- state SR	Primary System 2/	Secondary System	Urban System	Urban Planning 3/	Bridge B&R 2/	Hazard Elimina- tion	Rail Highway Crossings	Sec. 402 FEMA	Forest Highways	Total All Programs
Alabama	80,100	3,041	25,270	10,198	9,737	334	8,768	2,174	3,590	432	94	143,738
Alaska	15,804	-	31,019	26,688	3,890	153	1,564	611	2,874	122	2,877	105,602
Arizona	67,139	4,325	18,583	7,543	7,040	276	1,564	1,208	1,589	240	1,857	111,364
Arkansas	15,804	2,320	21,037	9,682	4,402	153	10,403	1,415	2,920	281	449	68,866
California	216,528	15,401	91,082	18,465	92,192	3,876	16,525	9,999	11,282	1,992	4,726	482,068
Colorado	46,467	3,661	21,221	8,403	8,681	339	2,941	1,591	2,319	316	2,370	98,309
Connecticut	87,243	2,212	15,252	4,236	11,868	534	2,130	1,462	1,354	292	-	126,583
Delaware	15,804	121	8,913	2,432	3,890	153	1,564	611	575	122	-	32,185
Dist. of Col.	59,680	113	2,423	-	3,932	180	6,806	611	265	122	-	74,132
Florida	95,746	4,566	36,246	10,504	26,842	1,126	21,862	3,668	5,132	730	192	206,594
Georgia	80,321	4,933	32,265	12,790	13,161	448	16,457	2,797	4,962	556	116	168,786
Hawaii	40,872	212	8,913	2,432	3,890	153	2,292	611	467	122	-	57,964
Idaho	15,804	2,126	12,400	6,016	3,890	153	3,776	804	1,683	159	3,360	50,171
Illinois	134,974	8,624	56,242	14,789	46,354	1,897	50,060	5,846	10,066	1,164	38	328,054
Indiana	28,070	4,509	32,243	11,681	16,579	570	5,649	2,970	6,403	591	22	109,287
Iowa	40,998	2,845	26,097	11,331	7,572	201	14,933	2,110	5,373	431	-	111,881
Kansas	38,406	2,357	24,010	10,426	6,956	187	16,713	2,011	5,585	399	-	107,050
Kentucky	71,375	3,197	23,317	9,697	8,102	270	25,950	1,933	2,974	385	68	147,268
Louisiana	98,307	2,322	22,724	8,223	11,708	424	37,152	2,008	3,572	400	76	186,916
Maine	15,804	946	9,325	4,202	3,890	153	4,424	611	1,107	122	12	40,596
Maryland	132,762	2,222	18,637	4,887	15,393	616	11,678	1,904	1,862	380	-	190,341
Massachusetts	104,597	2,129	22,321	3,978	24,309	1,032	13,408	2,725	2,352	543	-	177,394
Michigan	80,289	5,651	47,971	14,769	32,819	1,366	9,091	4,780	6,951	952	354	204,893
Minnesota	71,533	3,304	31,391	12,590	12,349	465	20,967	2,622	5,373	521	456	161,571
Mississippi	30,093	2,645	19,706	8,933	4,536	153	4,626	1,499	2,641	298	156	75,286
Missouri	72,861	5,344	34,468	12,994	16,151	614	8,740	2,949	5,023	586	169	159,899
Montana	25,730	3,388	16,352	9,147	3,890	153	2,977	846	2,078	168	2,631	69,360
Nebraska	15,804	1,908	18,299	8,219	4,450	153	10,329	1,366	3,415	271	31	64,245
Nevada	27,754	1,745	12,073	5,734	3,890	153	1,564	611	931	122	592	55,169
New Hampshire	15,804	738	8,913	2,432	3,890	153	6,567	611	768	122	176	38,174
New Jersey	68,435	1,840	28,257	4,430	32,642	1,447	10,779	3,361	3,304	670	-	155,165
New Mexico	30,630	3,721	16,586	7,654	3,890	153	2,672	837	1,331	166	1,322	68,963
New York	160,705	4,247	78,797	16,121	79,289	3,639	50,060	8,750	8,156	1,744	-	411,308
North Carolina	65,464	3,023	35,203	15,090	10,823	326	14,735	2,921	4,394	581	203	152,763
North Dakota	15,804	1,951	12,791	6,303	3,890	153	4,110	943	3,268	187	-	49,400
Ohio	100,330	7,124	53,514	15,231	40,496	1,583	14,305	5,484	8,092	1,092	18	247,269
Oklahoma	22,570	2,918	23,092	9,493	8,361	250	3,935	1,974	3,852	392	23	76,859
Oregon	51,903	3,171	19,687	8,214	6,756	234	6,160	1,736	2,445	344	4,546	105,196
Pennsylvania	164,277	5,170	61,704	19,131	41,784	1,663	36,153	6,034	7,186	1,202	80	344,392
Rhode Island	42,547	515	6,913	2,432	4,240	178	3,798	611	545	122	-	61,901
South Carolina	39,544	2,624	18,337	7,834	5,707	172	10,065	1,607	2,975	320	108	89,293
South Dakota	15,804	2,195	13,909	6,915	3,890	153	2,853	862	2,330	170	259	49,340
Tennessee	62,935	4,181	27,687	10,986	11,251	381	20,916	2,339	3,485	465	111	144,737
Texas	159,662	13,871	82,132	29,130	44,195	1,664	25,619	6,882	11,611	1,368	104	376,236
Utah	34,518	2,746	12,328	5,145	4,218	175	1,564	810	1,324	161	1,096	64,085
Vermont	15,804	1,049	6,913	2,432	3,890	153	6,995	611	716	122	59	38,724
Virginia	132,414	4,489	29,723	10,937	14,769	572	24,038	2,511	3,114	500	215	223,287
Washington	106,683	3,765	23,133	8,267	12,253	479	17,795	2,105	3,339	418	2,294	180,531
West Virginia	71,059	1,179	13,434	6,069	3,890	153	9,334	1,030	1,854	205	130	108,337
Wisconsin	30,788	2,477	30,216	11,355	14,279	492	14,809	2,755	5,046	548	185	112,950
Wyoming	19,946	3,066	11,777	5,928	3,890	153	1,564	611	1,061	122	1,408	49,526
Puerto Rico	-	-	11,703	3,788	7,434	258	2,031	1,229	829	245	9	27,526
Sec. of Interior	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	122	-	122
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	407	-	81	-	488
Guam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	407	-	81	-	488
Virgin Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	407	-	81	-	488
Total	3,254,295	170,207	1,382,549	486,306	778,090	30,669	625,750	122,188	185,725	24,438	33,000	7,093,217

1/ Includes only Highway Trust Fund programs that are apportioned by statutory formula. 2 1/4 percent has been deducted for administration. These estimated apportionments are for informational purposes and only approximate the actual apportionments each State will receive due to the necessity of using preliminary data for some of the apportionment factors and the fact that the actual administrative deduction has not been determined. Interstate apportionment includes \$125 million for 1/2 percent minimum.

2/ Primary funds are apportioned after deduction of \$125 million. Bridge B & R are apportioned after deduction of \$200 million for discretionary fund and \$54 million for two Ohio River Bridges has been deducted.

3/ Urban planning funds are derived from a deduction of 1/2 percent from Interstate, Interstate SR, Primary, Secondary and Urban funds before apportionments.

UMTA SECTION 5 FY 79 FORMULA APPORTIONMENT: PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE
FEDERAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1978
(in millions of dollars)

<u>URBANIZED AREA</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>APPORT</u>	<u>URBANIZED AREA</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>APPORT</u>
AKRON	\$4.5	FLINT	\$3.1
ALBANY-SCHENECTADY-TROY	\$4.4	FORT LAUDERDALE-HOLLYWO	\$5.3
ALBUQUERQUE	\$2.5	FORT WAYNE	\$2.1
ALLENTOWN-BETHLEHEM-EAS	\$3.5	FORT WORTH	\$4.8
(PART:NEW JERSEY)	\$1.2	FRESNO	\$2.4
(PART:PENNSYLVANIA)	\$3.3	GRAND RAPIDS	\$2.8
ATLANTA	\$10.8	HARRISBURG	\$2.1
AURORA-ELGIN	\$3.3	HARTFORD	\$4.4
AUSTIN	\$2.4	HONOLULU	\$4.4
BALTIMORE	\$20.3	HOUSTON	\$16.4
BATON ROUGE	\$2.2	INDIANAPOLIS	\$6.9
BIRMINGHAM	\$4.5	JACKSONVILLE	\$3.7
		KANSAS CITY	\$9.4
BOSTON	\$36.1	(PART:KANSAS)	\$3.2
BRIDGEPORT	\$4.1	(PART:MISSOURI)	\$6.3
BUFFALO	\$13.5	LANSING	\$2.1
CANTON	\$2.2		
CHARLESTON	\$1.8	LAS VEGAS	\$1.8
CHARLOTTE	\$2.3	LAWRENCE-HAVERHILL	\$1.6
CHATTANOOGA	\$1.7	(PART:MASSACHUSETTS)	\$1.5
(PART:GEORGIA)	\$1.2	(PART:NEW HAMPSHIRE)	\$1.1
(PART:TENNESSEE)	\$1.5	LITTLE ROCK-NORTH LITTL	\$1.8
CHICAGO	\$96.4	LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH	\$106.8
(PART:ILLINOIS)	\$91.7	LOUISVILLE	\$7.0
(PART:INDIANA)	\$4.7	(PART:INDIANA)	\$1.7
CINCINNATI	\$11.1	(PART:KENTUCKY)	\$6.3
(PART:KENTUCKY)	\$1.9	MADISON	\$1.9
(PART:OHIO)	\$9.3	MEMPHIS	\$6.2
CLEVELAND	\$19.8	(PART:MISSISSIPPI)	\$1.1
		(PART:TENNESSEE)	\$6.1
COLORADO SPRINGS	\$1.6	MIAMI	\$14.6
COLUMBIA	\$1.9	MILWAUKEE	\$11.6
COLUMBUS	\$1.6	MINNEAPOLIS-ST PAUL	\$14.9
(PART:ALABAMA)	\$1.2		
(PART:GEORGIA)	\$1.4	MOBILE	\$1.8
COLUMBUS	\$8.0	NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON	\$3.0
CORPUS CHRISTI	\$1.5	NEW HAVEN	\$3.4
DALLAS	\$11.0	NEW ORLEANS	\$12.3
DAVENPORT-ROCK ISLAND-M	\$2.1	NEWPORT NEWS-HAMPTON	\$2.0
(PART:ILLINOIS)	\$1.2	NEW YORK	\$266.1
(PART:IOWA)	\$1.9	(PART:NEW JERSEY)	\$55.9
DAYTON	\$6.1	(PART:NEW YORK)	\$210.1
DENVER	\$10.9	NORFOLK-PORTSMOUTH	\$5.2
DES MOINES	\$2.0	OKLAHOMA CITY	\$4.1
DETROIT	\$46.8	OMAHA	\$4.5
EL PASO	\$2.9	(PART:IOWA)	\$1.4
		(PART:NEBRASKA)	\$4.0
		ORLANDO	\$2.4
		OXNARD-VENTURA-THOUSAND	\$1.9
		PEORIA	\$2.0

UMTA SECTION 5 FY 79 FORMULA APPORTIONMENT: PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE
FEDERAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1978

<u>URBANIZED AREA</u>	<u>TOTAL APPORT</u>	<u>URBANIZED AREA</u>	<u>TOTAL APPORT</u>
PHILADELPHIA	\$62.8	WASHINGTON	\$32.5
(PART:NEW JERSEY)	\$8.0	(PART:MARYLAND)	\$19.7
(PART:PENNSYLVANIA)	\$54.7	(PART:DISTRICT OF COLUM	\$14.1
PHOENIX	\$7.4	(PART:VIRGINIA)	\$7.7
PITTSBURGH	\$19.4	WEST PALM BEACH	\$2.2
PORTLAND	\$8.1	WICHITA	\$2.6
(PART:OREGON)	\$7.4	WILKES-BARRE	\$1.9
(PART:WASHINGTON)	\$1.6	WILMINGTON	\$3.4
PROVIDENCE-PAWTUCKET-WA	\$7.9	(PART:DELAWARE)	\$3.3
(PART:MASSACHUSETTS)	\$1.5	(PART:NEW JERSEY)	\$1.2
(PART:RHODE ISLAND)	\$7.4	MORCESTER	\$2.2
RICHMOND	\$3.6	YOUNGSTOWN-WARREN	\$3.5
ROCHESTER	\$6.2		
ROCKFORD	\$1.9	ALABAMA	\$4.1
SACRAMENTO	\$5.3	HUNTSVILLE	\$1.0
SALT LAKE CITY	\$4.0	MONTGOMERY	\$1.2
		TUSCALOOSA	\$1.6
SAN ANTONIO	\$7.9	GADSDEN	\$1.4
SAN BERNADINO-RIVERSIDE	\$4.3	FLORENCE	\$1.4
SAN DIEGO	\$11.8	ANNISTON	\$1.4
SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND	\$38.1		
SAN JOSE	\$11.2	ALASKA	\$1.8
SAN JUAN	\$13.8	ANCHORAGE	\$1.8
SCRANTON	\$1.6		
SEATTLE-EVERETT	\$11.9	ARIZONA	
SHREVEPORT	\$1.9		
SOUTH BEND	\$2.5	ARKANSAS	\$1.2
(PART:INDIANA)	\$2.3	FORT SMITH	\$1.5
(PART:MICHIGAN)	\$1.2	PINE BLUFF	\$1.5
SPOKANE	\$2.0	TEXARKANA	\$1.2
SPRINGFIELD-CHICOPEE-HO	\$4.0		
(PART:CONNECTICUT)	\$1.5	CALIFORNIA	\$8.9
(PART:MASSACHUSETTS)	\$3.5	BAKERSFIELD	\$1.6
		STOCKTON	\$1.5
ST. LOUIS	\$20.9	SANTA BARBARA	\$1.2
(PART:ILLINOIS)	\$2.8	MODESTO	\$1.9
(PART:MISSOURI)	\$18.1	SEASIDE-MONTEREY	\$1.9
ST. PETERSBURG	\$4.4	SANTA ROSA	\$1.6
SYRACUSE	\$3.7	SANTA CRUZ	\$1.6
TACOMA	\$2.8	SALINAS	\$1.6
TAMPA	\$3.2	ANTIOCH-PITTSBURG	\$1.5
TOLEDO	\$4.3	SIMI VALLEY	\$1.5
(PART:MICHIGAN)	\$1.1		
(PART:OHIO)	\$4.2	COLORADO	\$1.7
TRENTON	\$2.8	PUEBLO	\$1.9
(PART:NEW JERSEY)	\$2.6	BOULDER	\$1.8
(PART:PENNSYLVANIA)	\$1.3		
TUCSON	\$2.5		
TULSA	\$2.8		

**UMTA SECTION 5 FY 79 FORMULA APPORTIONMENT: PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE
FEDERAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1978**

<u>URBANIZED AREA</u>	<u>TOTAL APPORT</u>	<u>URBANIZED AREA</u>	<u>TOTAL APPORT</u>
CONNECTICUT	\$8.8	IOWA	\$3.0
STAMFORD	\$2.2	CEDAR RAPIDS	\$1.0
NEW LONDON-NORWICH	\$1.0	WATERLOO	\$.8
NEW BRITAIN	\$1.2	SIOUX CITY	\$.6
NORWALK	\$1.2	DUBUQUE	\$.6
MERIDEN	\$.7		
BRISTOL	\$.5	KANSAS	\$1.1
DANBURY	\$.6	TOPEKA	\$1.1
		ST JOSEPH	
DELAWARE			
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		KENTUCKY	\$2.7
		HUNTINGTON-ASHLAND	\$.4
FLORIDA	\$6.9	LEXINGTON	\$1.6
MELBOURNE-COCOA	\$1.3	CLARKSVILLE	\$.1
SARASOTA-BRADENTON	\$1.2	OWENSBORO	\$.6
PENSACOLA	\$1.4		
DAYTONA BEACH	\$.8	LOUISIANA	\$2.7
TALLAHASSEE	\$.6	MONROE	\$.7
GAINESVILLE	\$.6	LAKE CHARLES	\$.7
FORT MYERS	\$.5	LAFAYETTE	\$.7
LAKELAND	\$.5	ALEXANDRIA	\$.6
GEORGIA	\$4.1	MAINE	\$1.2
SAVANNAH	\$1.3	PORTLAND	\$.8
AUGUSTA	\$1.1	LEWISTON-AUBURN	\$.4
MACON	\$1.0		
ALBANY	\$.6	MARYLAND	
HAWAII		MASSACHUSETTS	\$6.3
		LOWELL	\$1.6
IDAHO	\$.7	BROCKTON	\$1.3
BOISE	\$.7	FALL RIVER	\$1.2
		NEW BEDFORD	\$1.3
ILLINOIS	\$7.7	FITCHBURG-LEOMINSTER	\$.5
JOLIET	\$3.0	PITTSFIELD	\$.4
SPRINGFIELD	\$1.2		
CHAMPAIGN-URBANA	\$1.2	MICHIGAN	\$7.1
DECATUR	\$.8	ANN ARBOR	\$1.8
ALTON	\$.8	KALAMAZOO	\$1.2
BLOOMINGTON-NORMAL	\$.7	SAGINAW	\$1.4
DUBUQUE		MUSKEGON-MUSKEGON HEIGHTS	\$.8
		JACKSON	\$.6
INDIANA	\$4.3	BAY CITY	\$.7
EVANSVILLE	\$1.3	BATTLE CREEK	\$.6
MUNCIE	\$.9		
TERRE HAUTE	\$.7		
ANDERSON	\$.6		
LAFAYETTE-WEST LAFAYETTE	\$.8		

**UMTA SECTION 5 FY 79 FORMULA APPORTIONMENT: PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE
FEDERAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1978**

<u>URBANIZED AREA</u>	<u>TOTAL APPORT</u>	<u>URBANIZED AREA</u>	<u>TOTAL APPORT</u>
MINNESOTA	\$2.0	NORTH CAROLINA	\$8.3
DULUTH-SUPERIOR	\$.7	FAYETTEVILLE	\$1.3
FARGO-MOORHEAD	\$.3	RALEIGH	\$1.2
LA CROSSE		GREENSBORO	\$1.2
ROCHESTER	\$.6	WINSTON-SALEM	\$1.1
ST. CLOUD	\$.4	DURHAM	\$.8
		GASTONIA	\$.7
MISSISSIPPI	\$2.5	HIGH POINT	\$.7
JACKSON	\$1.6	ASHEVILLE	\$.5
BILOXI-GULFPORT	\$.9	BURLINGTON	\$.4
		WILMINGTON	\$.4
MISSOURI	\$1.9		
SPRINGFIELD	\$.9	NORTH DAKOTA	\$.5
ST. JOSEPH	\$.6	FARGO-MOORHEAD	\$.5
COLUMBIA	\$.4		
		OHIO	\$5.2
MONTANA	\$1.2	LORAIN-ELYRIA	\$1.4
BILLINGS	\$.6	HUNTINGTON-ASHLAND	\$.2
GREAT FALLS	\$.6	SPRINGFIELD	\$.9
		WHEELING	\$.4
NEBRASKA	\$1.4	HAMILTON	\$.7
LINCOLN	\$1.3	STEUBENVILLE-WEIRTON	\$.4
SIOUX CITY	\$.1	MAHSFIELD	\$.6
		LIMA	\$.6
NEVADA	\$.8	PARKERSBURG	\$.1
RENO	\$.8		
		OKLAHOMA	\$.8
NEW HAMPSHIRE	\$1.2	LANTON	\$.7
MANCHESTER	\$.8	FORT SMITH	
NASHUA	\$.4		
		OREGON	\$1.9
NEW JERSEY	\$1.5	EUGENE	\$1.1
ATLANTIC CITY	\$1.0	SALEM	\$.8
VINELAND-MILLVILLE	\$.4		
		PENNSYLVANIA	\$7.9
NEW MEXICO		ERIE	\$1.8
		READING	\$1.7
NEW YORK	\$4.6	YORK	\$1.1
UTICA-ROME	\$1.5	LANCASTER	\$1.0
BINGHAMTON	\$1.5	JOHNSTOWN	\$.9
POUGHKEEPSIE	\$1.0	ALTOONA	\$.8
ELMIRA	\$.7	WILLIAMSPORT	\$.6
		PUERTO RICO	\$3.6
		PONCE	\$1.9
		MAYAGUEZ	\$.8
		CAGUAS	\$1.0

UMTA SECTION 5 FY 79 FORMULA APPORTIONMENT: PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE
FEDERAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1978

<u>URBANIZED AREA</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>APPORT</u>	<u>URBANIZED AREA</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>APPORT</u>
RHODE ISLAND	\$.1	UTAH	\$1.9
FALL RIVER	\$.1	OGDEN	\$1.2
		PROVO-OREM	\$.7
SOUTH CAROLINA	\$1.9		
GREENVILLE	\$1.2	VIRGINIA	\$2.6
AUGUSTA	\$.2	ROANOKE	\$1.3
SPARTANBURG	\$.6	PETERSBURG-COLONIAL HEI	\$.8
		LYNCHBURG	\$.5
SOUTH DAKOTA	\$.6	KINGSFORT	
SIOUX CITY			
SIOUX FALLS	\$.6	WASHINGTON	\$1.0
		RICHLAND-KENNEWICK	\$.5
TENNESSEE	\$2.2	YAKIMA	\$.6
KNOXVILLE	\$1.5		
KINGSFORT	\$.4	WEST VIRGINIA	\$3.5
CLARKSVILLE	\$.3	HUNTINGTON-ASHLAND	\$.8
		CHARLESTON	\$1.3
TEXAS	\$12.9	WHEELING	\$.5
LUBBOCK	\$1.1	STEUBENVILLE-WEIRTON	\$.3
AMARILLO	\$1.0	PARKERSBURG	\$.5
WACO	\$.8		
PORT ARTHUR	\$.8	WISCONSIN	\$5.6
BEAUMONT	\$.8	DULUTH-SUPERIOR	\$.2
WICHITA FALLS	\$.8	APPLETON	\$1.2
MCALLEN-PHARR-EDINBURG	\$.8	GREEN BAY	\$.9
ABILENE	\$.6	RACINE	\$1.2
TEXAS CITY-LA MARQUE	\$.5	KENOSHA	\$.9
ODESSA	\$.7	LA CROSSE	\$.5
KILLEEN	\$.5	OSHKOSH	\$.6
LAREDO	\$.6		
SAN ANGELO	\$.5		
GALVESTON	\$.5		
MIDLAND	\$.4		
TYLER	\$.5		
TEXARKANA	\$.3		
SHERMAN-DENISON	\$.4		
BROWNSVILLE	\$.5		
BRYAN-COLLEGE STATION	\$.4		
HARLIGEN-SAN BENITO	\$.3		

Small Urban and Rural Apportionments

Section 18 Apportionments \$75 million (in thousands)

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

TOTAL	75,000
-------	--------

U. S. Department of Transportation

news:

Office of Public and Consumer Affairs

Washington, D.C. 20590



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Wednesday, November 8, 1978

DOT 150-78

Contact: Howard Coan

Tel.: 202-426-4321

ADAMS, CALIFANO SIGN AGREEMENT
ON EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams and Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Joseph A. Califano Jr. today announced they have signed a memorandum of understanding on emergency medical services.

The interagency agreement defines the areas of responsibility of the two federal departments in providing financial and technical assistance for emergency medical programs.

Both departments have funded emergency medical services for a number of years. In the last fiscal year they gave about \$88 million to the states. The agreement will avoid the duplication of effort in developing guidelines that sometimes has occurred.

The goals of the two departments, the memorandum said, will be to strengthen comprehensive national standards and procedures for the emergency systems and coordinate technical assistance.

The close coordination and cooperation between the two departments, called for in the memorandum, is expected to help achieve continued improvements in emergency medical service systems.

The memorandum of understanding will make state and local planners aware of previously established standards and procedures in a number of areas, including transportation, communications, transfer of patients, and coordinated medical recordkeeping.

- more -

The 1966 Highway Safety Act requires each state to have an emergency medical system for highway accident victims. States must train emergency personnel, buy and equip ambulances, and develop adequate communications between ambulances and emergency rooms and for patient care enroute to the hospital.

Since the Department of Transportation was created in 1967, it has provided financial and technical assistance to this program, which is administered by DOT's National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

The department has developed training programs for emergency medical technicians, ambulance drivers, paramedics and others. DOT also has set ambulance standards, including vehicle performance limits and emergency equipment requirements. In addition, the department has developed national standards for the communication system which links the ambulance to the hospital and monitors the patient's condition.

DOT is continuing to upgrade these various programs.

The states decide the amount of federal highway safety funds they will use for emergency training, equipment or communications. Since 1966, the states have designated about \$129 million of such funds for these purposes. In the last fiscal year, ending Sept. 30, 1978, the total was approximately \$28 million.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is authorized by the 1973 Emergency Medical Services Systems Act to provide technical assistance and funds. In the last fiscal year, HEW gave about \$60 million in grants to the states to improve communications and hospital emergency rooms, to do research, and for other areas.

In the past 12 years, states and private foundations have supplied about two-thirds of emergency systems' cost, and the federal government the remaining one-third.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Washington, D.C. 20590

Official Business

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION
DOT 518

FIRST CLASS



U. S. Department of Transportation

news:



Office of Public and Consumer Affairs

Washington, D.C. 20590

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Thursday, November 9, 1978

DOT 152-78

Contact: Howard Coan

Tel.: 202-426-4321

SOUTH DAKOTA PENALIZED FOR ROAD SIGN VIOLATIONS

South Dakota has been penalized 10 percent of last year's allotment of federal-aid highway funds -- about \$4.5 million -- for failing to keep roadside signs under proper control.

Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams ruled today that the state's sign laws are too lenient to meet standards set by the Highway Beautification Act. He imposed the penalty that the Beautification Act provides.

The highway funds already had been held back from the state pending the Secretary's decision. If South Dakota's legislature does not pass a law conforming to the Beautification Act by next March 31, the state also will lose 10 percent of the apportionment of federal highway funds being sent out today.

"I cannot accept South Dakota's wide deviation from the standards which federal law requires all states to meet," Adams said.

"By imposing the 10 percent penalty," Adams said, "I have shown South Dakota and all other states that the Department of Transportation is serious about enforcing the Beautification Act."

South Dakota's sign control laws, Secretary Adams said in his decision, permit many more types of advertising signs along the highways than the federal law permits. The state's statutes also prohibit removal of many signs which, under the federal act, must be taken down. In addition, South Dakota permits large signs over 660 feet away from the highway in about 180 more towns than is allowed by the federal law.

Moreover, Adams found the South Dakota laws created commercial or industrial highway areas where signs may be placed that are several times larger than those of any other state.

South Dakota has 45 days in which to ask for judicial review of the Secretary's decision in the Federal District Court for South Dakota. The penalties imposed by the decision will not actually take effect until this 45-day period has ended, or any judicial review process is concluded.

The Secretary's decision ended a proceeding which began on July 11, 1977, when Adams notified former South Dakota Gov. Richard Kneip that the state was not complying with the federal law.

Officials of DOT's Federal Highway Administration and South Dakota presented evidence and arguments in a four-day hearing in Pierre, S.D., last December. The Secretary based his decision on this hearing and other material submitted by the state and the Federal Highway Administration.

#####

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Washington, D.C. 20590

Official Business

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION
DOT 518

FIRST CLASS



U. S. Department of Transportation

news:

Office of Public and Consumer Affairs

Washington, D.C. 20590



FOR RELEASE 8 P.M. EST MONDAY
November 13, 1978

DOT 15378

Contact: Jerry Clingerman
Phone: (202) 426-4321

SECRETARY ADAMS OUTLINES
ADMINISTRATION PUSH
FOR RAIL DEREGULATION

Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams said today the administration would push for an end to economic regulation of the railroad and trucking industries when Congress returns next year.

In remarks prepared for a meeting with leaders of the railroad industry in Hershey, Pa., Adams also said the 8.3 percent general rate increase requested by the railroads is "too high," but indicated administration support of a 6.6 percent increase.

"Any new rate request must be evaluated against President Carter's wage and price standards and the industry's requested 8.3 percent increase does not fall within those guidelines," Adams said.

The railroad industry has requested the general rate increase from the Interstate Commerce Commission, the federal regulatory agency for the industry.

He said there are several actions needed if the economic revival of the railroads is to succeed, including:

- The railroad industry must be freed from the existing regulatory system which is unfair, outdated and cumbersome.
- The industry must have more freedom to eliminate excess or redundant facilities.

- The government must discontinue policies that benefit other modes of transportation at the expense of the railroads.
- The government will have to continue financial aid to the rail industry for several years.

Adams noted that the railroad industry is 100 percent regulated; the truck industry about 40 percent; and the domestic water transportation industry, less than 10 percent.

"This allows shippers to 'shop around' for an unregulated carrier, where that is to the shipper's advantage. It forces railroads to provide unprofitable service in some markets, and to set unnecessarily high rates in other markets," Secretary Adams said.

Adams said a transition period of about five years is expected before "we have an almost entirely deregulated industry."

He noted, however, that some reforms are urgently needed, including:

- Railroads should be free to negotiate with shippers, just as other businesses can.
- Railroads should be exempt from regulation where other modes of transportation are not regulated, for example, in fresh produce traffic which is dominated by unregulated carriers.
- The ICC's powers to suspend and investigate rates have outlived their usefulness and should be eliminated.
- The notice period for setting or cancelling various price changes must be reduced to allow railroads to raise or lower rates in response to demand, just as their competitors do.
- The railroad industry, not government regulators, should control its own interline car movements and per diem payments.

Adams said he believes the rail industry can again become a profitable one.

"Certainly there is no danger of the rail industry becoming a transportation 'drop-out.' We need the railroads. We need their fuel-efficiency, their carrying capacities, their brute strength and inter-modal versatility," Secretary Adams said.

The administration, Adams said, "is firmly committed to a healthy private rail system."

U. S. Department of Transportation

news:



Office of Public and Consumer Affairs

Washington, D.C. 20590

FOR RELEASE 12 NOON THURSDAY
November 16, 1978

DOT 154-78
Contact: Bill Bishop
Phone: (202) 426-4321

UNUSED HIGHWAY LAND
FREED FOR OTHER USES

States that decide not to complete planned federally-aided highways and want to use left-over land for public projects such as parks, schools, public housing, urban renewal or other transportation projects will be able to do so under a final rule announced today by Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams.

The decision means that million of dollars worth of land no longer needed for highways which state and local officials have decided not to build can be made available for use as part of urban and rural restoration efforts without repayment of federal highway funds used for the original acquisition.

The final rule has been issued by the Federal Highway Administration after considering comments received in response to a proposed rule published in the Federal Register in August. The final rule will be published in the Register on November 17, and will be effective 30 days later.

"These new rules," Secretary Adams said, "show that the different departments of the federal government are working together to help communities restore devastated areas as quickly as possible. We believe that making this land available without requiring repayment of federal highway funds will help achieve the President's urban revitalization goals."

In cities such as Atlanta, Boston, Minneapolis, Milwaukee, New Orleans, New York, and Washington, where officials have decided not to proceed with the completion of highways planned in the 1950s and 1960s, large areas have been acquired and partially cleared, often with remaining buildings either vacant or partially demolished.

The rules were released today in Atlanta to a national conference on "Re-using Abandoned Highway Rights-of-Way." The conference is sponsored jointly by the U.S. Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Interior and Transportation, the City of Atlanta and Georgia State University. Officials and private citizens from 16 cities are expected to attend.

In describing the rules to the conference, DOT Deputy General Counsel John G. Wofford noted that the rule applies to all federally- aided highway programs -- Interstate and other categories.

He said that state laws concerning the disposition of abandoned highway land must be followed, and if a state sells the land, the federal government will recoup its original share of the proceeds of that sale.

Wofford said that the rules follow a government-wide directive on the general method to be used in disposing of assets no longer needed for a federal project, as well as a provision of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978, signed into law by the President last week.

Responding to suggestions made by commenters during the rule-making process, the final rule provides:

- Existing federal, state, and local laws requiring concurrence by local officials or participation by private citizens in planning for the reuse proposal must be observed, but no new review requirements are added by the rule.
- States must certify as part of their reuse proposal that the property was originally acquired with the intention of constructing a highway, and that rights of former owners under state law have been observed.
- FHWA may provide relocation and property management assistance until the state sells or otherwise disposes of the property so that no one loses benefits to which they should be entitled, with the end point of FHWA participation in any given project to be decided by negotiation between the state and FHWA. After this end point, such assistance becomes the responsibility of the state and any federal agency involved with the substitute project.
- Both rural and urban areas are covered by the rule.
- States must take into account the preservation of historic structures or sites as they plan substitute projects.
- While the primary intent of the regulations is to free the states from having to repay federal highway funds to assist in the development of publicly-owned projects for public benefit, transfers to private parties may also be exempt from repayment requirements if specifically justified as necessary, and in the public interest. "Urban homesteading" and other forms of urban renewal may qualify in this respect. Generally, however, where there is a sale to a private buyer, the states will have to return to the FHWA its original share

of the proceeds of that sale. Thus, if the federal government contributed 70% of the original cost of the land acquisition, it would receive 70% of the net proceeds of any sale.

- To use the land for non-highway uses without repayment to FHWA, the states must apply the land to the substitute use within 10 years of the decision not to build the highway. In some instances, such decisions were made in the early 1970's, leaving few years for a state to make a firm commitment to devote the property to a specific reuse.

#####

U. S. Department of Transportation

news:

Office of Public and Consumer Affairs

Washington, D.C. 20590



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Thursday, November 16, 1978

DOT 155-78
Contact: Bill Bishop
Phone: (202) 426-4321

SECRETARY ADAMS ORDERS REVIEW OF COAST GUARD TRAINING PROGRAM

Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams today ordered an immediate assessment of the Coast Guard's shipboard training program at the service's major training centers.

The Secretary directed Coast Guard Commandant Admiral John B. Hayes and Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Budget and Programs Mortimer L. Downey to conduct the review jointly and report to him by January 15.

In his directive, Secretary Adams stressed that the intradepartmental review must not interfere with the ongoing Marine Board of Inquiry investigation of the recent Cuyahoga tragedy. The board's report is not expected until next year.

"The Coast Guard's long and enduring record of service to the nation needs no defense," Adams said. But, he pointed out, the service's resources have been stretched in recent years to meet new challenges such as the prevention and containment of oil pollution at sea, patrol of the nation's 200-mile fishing limit and the Coast Guard's major role in combatting drug smuggling.

"In light of the Cuyahoga tragedy what is needed now is an impartial evaluation of the Coast Guard's training program and facilities," Adams said. "Both Commandant Hayes and I are determined to provide the men and women of the Coast Guard the best possible training, equipment and leadership."

Secretary Adams directed that the review assess the following areas:

- * The types of ships and boats available to each training facility on both a permanent and part-time basis.
- * The administrative organization by which the training ships and boats are operated including their funding, personnel and engineering support.
- * The numbers of persons trained at each facility and the grade, rank and experience level of the trainees.
- * The source of training instructors.
- * The curricula, procedures, instructions and standing orders directly concerned with afloat training.

Assistant Secretary Downey is a former Coast Guard officer and once served on the Cuyahoga.

####

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Washington, D.C. 20590

Official Business

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION
DOT 518

FIRST CLASS



U. S. Department of Transportation

news:

Office of Public and Consumer Affairs

Washington, D.C. 20590



FOR 11:00 AM RELEASE
Tuesday, November 21, 1978

DOT 156-78
CONTACT: Bill Bishop
PHONE : (202) 426-4321

DEREGULATION OPTIONS DUE SOON, DEPUTY SECRETARY BUTCHMAN SAYS

MIAMI, FLORIDA -- Proposals to lift much of the regulatory burden from the rail and trucking industries will be made to President Carter by mid-December, Deputy Secretary of Transportation Alan Butchman said today.

The two industries should "be prepared to live in a more free and competitive environment," Butchman said in a speech prepared for delivery at the annual meeting of the National Industrial Traffic League here.

He noted that Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams has promised to have deregulation options on the President's desk by December 15.

"The demand for rail service is high," Butchman said. "...But we must question how long government or shippers can be expected to pay the overhead costs of an overregulated, capital-starved system."

The trucking industry is growing and prosperous, Butchman pointed out. Shippers are penalized and costs are kept high, however, when rate bureaus meet privately to set rates and the Interstate Commerce Commission prevents new companies from entering the market, he added.

Regulatory change can improve substantially the economic health of the transportation industry, reduce bureaucratic waste and aid in the anti-inflation fight, Butchman said.

He cited the railroad industry's rate of return on net worth as one of the lowest in the country. The industry's net income in this year's second quarter dropped 12 percent following a first-quarter operating loss of \$70 million.

"We know the railroads can do better, given the chance," Butchman said. "We want to give them that chance, by cutting them loose from the regulation that restricts their freedom to compete and discourages innovation."

Butchman said the Administration has three objectives for railroad deregulation: greater freedom to raise or lower rates; freedom from the unprofitable services railroads are required to provide as common carriers; and increased productivity.

"We believe the railroads can and should become much more profitable on their own, and depend less on federal aid," Butchman noted.

The trucking industry employs two million people and its total revenues are estimated at more than \$60 billion a year, Butchman said. The industry competes very effectively with the railroads, and truck traffic has been taking a larger share of the total freight market, he added.

"Most of the motor carriers that compete with the railroads are exempt from regulation," Butchman said. The reason for any trucking regulation at all is to protect the industry from competition, he said. "It does not serve to protect the public."

"The trucking industry is growing, it is economically healthy and the industry as a whole enjoys an excellent rate of return on net worth," Butchman said. "We don't want to change any of that. We just believe the industry should prosper with more competition, and less protection."

Butchman said a DOT task force is considering various reform proposals for trucking deregulation and now is consulting within the Administration and among various sectors of the trucking industry.

Among the areas that DOT is considering are easier entry into the motor carrier industry, increased pricing flexibility, and reform of rate bureau practices.

#

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Washington, D.C. 20590

Official Business

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION
DOT 518

FIRST CLASS



U.S. Department of Transportation news:



Office of Public and Consumer Affairs

Washington, D.C. 20590

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Friday, November 24, 1978

DOT 157-78

Contact: Robert Holland

Phone: (202) 426-0434

ADAMS ANNOUNCES PLANS TO COMBAT HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams announced today a program to combat escalating highway construction costs.

"I have instructed all of our Federal Highway Administration regional and division offices to work closely with appropriate state agencies to ensure that every aspect of the federal-aid highway construction program is examined for potential cost reduction methods," Adams said.

"In support of the President's anti-inflationary efforts," he said, "I have ordered that in cases where bids exceed estimated cost by as much as 7 percent that such projects be reexamined to determine if contract proposals should be modified and reissued in order to obtain more competitive bidding and resulting lower prices."

The Federal Highway Administration announced earlier this week that its highway construction cost price index for the second and third quarters of 1978 reflected the two highest quarterly cost increases on record -- 17.6 and 14.7 percent, respectively.

Adams said he will ask Federal Highway Administrator Karl Bowers to instruct field offices to:

- Limit size and duration of contracts, where possible, to allow completion within one construction season by "staging" or "phasing" large projects or by letting smaller projects.
- Increase the use of alternate designs to provide more flexibility to contractors and ensure the lowest cost method is used for construction.
- Provide advertising periods and schedule project lettings to attract the most competition available.
- Adopt liberal policies to encourage quick progress payments to contractors and pay for stockpiled materials both on- and off-project sites, thus reducing contractors' needs to borrow.

- Encourage realistic policies for granting time extensions when temporary material shortages occur and the contractor is not at fault.
- Consider including price adjustment, or actual cost payment provisions, in new large contracts when it is anticipated that the contractors would have difficulty in obtaining long-term quotes for the materials and supplies needed for the work. These measures will push downwards on cost escalation.
- Examine the potential cost benefits from using recycled materials.
- Strongly encourage the use of incentive clauses in appropriate contracts to take advantage of contractor initiative and innovations to reduce costs.
- Encourage state DOTs and highway departments to incorporate voluntary wage-price guidelines into their highway construction programs in further support of the President's anti-inflation efforts.

DOT believes that the current increases in contract prices are not entirely due to inflation. Some increases, Adams said, have resulted from a shift to reconstruction and rehabilitation projects involving such cost increasing factors as lower volumes of work per mile, more work under traffic and more work of a manual type in congested areas.

The FHWA is considering revising its price trends index to better identify the effects of this shift in type of work on prices. Since federal-aid highway projects continue to attract an average of five bidders per project, FHWA believes that capacity of the highway construction industry is not a factor in the current inflationary trend. This belief is reinforced by the fact that the physical volume of construction being performed today is less than 50 percent of that being done 10 years ago.

#

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Washington, D.C. 20590

Official Business

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID

DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

DOT 518

FIRST CLASS



U. S. Department of Transportation news:



Office of Public and Consumer Affairs
Washington, D.C. 20590

FOR RELEASE NOON THURSDAY
November 9, 1978

DOT 15178
Contact: Bill Bishop
Phone: (202) 426-4321

DOT PROPOSES CONSOLIDATION OF HIGHWAY, TRANSIT AGENCIES

Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams today proposed the establishment of a new Surface Transportation Administration by consolidating the existing Federal Highway and Urban Mass Transportation Administrations into a single agency.

The Secretary said adoption of the proposal will integrate DOT's public transportation and highway programs, provide for more efficient and effective administration of these programs, and increase the ability to use professional personnel in the problem areas where they are most needed.

The Surface Transportation Administration proposal is endorsed and supported by Federal Highway Administrator Karl S. Bowers and Urban Mass Transportation Administrator Richard S. Page.

Together, the two agencies have about 5,500 employees and budgets totaling approximately \$11 billion.

As the first step toward the proposed reorganization Adams released for public comment a draft proposal detailing the structure and management philosophy of the Surface Transportation Administration.

The merger of the FHWA and UMTA will be "the culmination of an evolutionary process that has brought about the gradual convergence of highway and public transportation programs," Adams said.

"The Congress," he said, "clearly recognized the need for a highway-mass transit partnership by this year addressing those programs in a single legislative package."

"The bill Congress produced -- the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978, signed by the President this week -- gives us the final building block for a new surface transportation organization."

Adams said the new surface transportation statute solidifies and strengthens the existing highway-mass transit joint planning process.

And, he said, "Its new provisions for a rural and small urban areas transportation program can be implemented only by a mass transit-highway partnership, as is the case with a number of studies, projections and demonstrations required by the act."

Secretary Adams pointed out that the Federal Highway Administration was formed at the height of Interstate and other federally-assisted highway construction programs. And the Urban Mass Transportation Administration was created to stem the attrition of privately-operated and financially-failing transit companies, he said.

"The Interstate and other major highway construction programs are nearing completion," Adams said. "We must redirect our emphasis to maintaining this nationwide basic system and coordinate its use into a single surface transportation system."

"The restoration of public transit is not a subject of debate," he said. "It's a fact of national policy."

Neither of the two agencies proposed for reorganization functions in the environment of its birth, Adams pointed out. "Their merger," he said, "should produce the most effective administration of programs designed to meet today's transportation needs."

Secretary Adams made clear that the Surface Transportation Administration proposal is not intended to alter existing highway and mass transit program funding levels, which are prescribed by legislation.

Nor does he contemplate any change in funding sources for these programs, Adams said. "I am committed to maintaining the integrity of the Highway Trust Fund and to establishing a separate and dependable funding mechanism for public transportation."

Secretary Adams stressed that the draft proposal released today should not be considered a final proposal.

"Before taking a final Surface Transportation Administration proposal to the President and Congress, I want the comments of state and local officials, members of the appropriate congressional committees and the constituent groups of both the Urban Mass Transportation and Federal Highway Administrations," Adams said.

While stating that he has an open mind in considering any reasonable recommendations, Adams said he rules out the option of doing nothing toward reorganization of the two agencies.

Of the two agencies proposed to be consolidated, the Federal Highway Administration is the senior, tracing its bureaucratic ancestry to the establishment in 1918 of the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Agriculture. In 1949, it was shifted to the Department of Commerce. It and other highway agencies in Commerce were moved to DOT to form the Federal Highway Administration when the department was officially activated in 1967.

The FHWA has a total employment of approximately 4,900 and has a program level of about \$8 billion.

Established in the Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1964, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration was transferred to DOT in 1968. UMTA employs nearly 600 persons and has a program level of approximately \$3 billion.

Of the total persons employed by FHWA, almost two-thirds are located in the field. Of the field force, about one-third staffs regional offices in the 10 federal regions. Most of the remaining field force is located in division offices at the 50 state capitals. The FHWA field force is represented by administrators, engineers, planners and other skilled technicians.

UMTA has a field force of slightly over 150 persons -- all at the regional level.

The consolidation of the two agencies will give the Surface Transportation Administration a highly professional field force, easily accessible to government at all levels, to which will be delegated authority and responsibility for all surface transportation programs on a gradually increasing basis.

The proposal released today calls for the Surface Transportation Administration to have its headquarters in Washington and to be directed by an administrator, assisted by a deputy administrator and assistant administrator.

The administrator and deputy will be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They will be expected to complement each other in terms of background and experience in the fields of highway and public transportation.

The Administrator will be supported by staff offices for legal, public affairs, civil rights and the National Surface Transportation Institute. Also, six associate administrators who will advise on administration, policy, planning and budget, program management, technical assistance, safety and research, development and demonstrations.

The primary responsibilities of the STA Washington headquarters will be to establish policy, to assure that programs are conducted effectively and uniformly at the regional and division levels and that federal assistance for highway and public transportation programs flows expeditiously to state and local governments.

The regional administrators, located in each of the 10 federal regions, and the division administrators, generally located in state capitals, will operate under maximum delegations of authority for the approval of most surface transportation programs and project applications.

The regional offices will assure the uniform application of surface transportation policy and coordinate STA programs with other federal programs and with regionwide transportation projects.

The division offices will be the first contact for all state and local Surface Transportation Administration financial assistance. They will provide technical assistance in the development, processing and management of surface transportation programs and projects.

Although routine program and project decisions will be made in Surface Transportation Administration field offices, approval authority for sensitive, controversial or major discretionary investments will be retained at the Washington headquarters.

In soliciting comments on the Surface Transportation Administration proposal, Secretary Adams requested that interested parties submit them by Dec. 31, 1978. They should be addressed to:

STA Working Group
Office of the Secretary of Transportation
Washington, D.C. 20590
Phone: (202) 426-4494

Copies of the proposal may be obtained from the same office.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Washington, D.C. 20590

Official Business

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION
DOT 518

FIRST CLASS

