

The original documents are located in Box C12, folder “Presidential Handwriting, 2/8/1975” of the Presidential Handwriting File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 8, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: PAUL H. O'NEILL
SUBJECT: Highway Fund Release

As a result of a nationwide telephone survey yesterday afternoon and last night, we have compiled a state-by-state estimate of the added amounts that could be obligated by each State, between now and July 1, 1975, if you were to release more highway funds. The amounts identified in the survey total \$1.1 billion. (Dick Cheney has a copy of the State list.)

Release of a greater (or lesser) amount would be difficult to rationalize and would necessitate some arbitrary criteria for allocating funds. The virtue of using the \$1.1 billion list is two fold; it reflects the State's own estimates of the amount of design work that can be quickly converted to contract projects and, the quick contracting is consistent with the intent of added economic stimulus.

Therefore, I recommend you adopt the \$1.1 billion release option.

Since this work has been pulled together very fast, I think it is important that you indicate some flexibility on the precision of the total number. When the individual State numbers are released we are sure to have some States that will come in with claims that they can do more. Some of those claims may be legitimate and you should preserve the flexibility to respond to them.

90 \$ 1.5 B
Don't

THE PRESIDENT HAS SIGNED *de*

FOR COMMCENTER USE ONLY

FMM
PRECEDENCE

UNCLAS
CLASSIFICATION

FROM: PAUL O'NEILL
TO: DICK CHENEY
(C.D.)

DEX _____

DAC _____

LDX 004

TTY _____

GPS _____

PAGES 1

CITE _____

INFO:

DTG: 081922Z

RELEASED BY: *DA*

TOR: 081937Z *[Signature]*

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:

go 4.5 B

IMM
PRECEDENCE

UNCLAS
CLASSIFICATION

FOR COMMCENTER USE ONLY

DEX _____

DAC _____

GPS _____

LDX 004

PAGES 1

TTY _____

CITE _____

DTG: 081922Z

TOR:

RELEASED BY: DA

FROM: PAUL O'NEILL
TO: DICK CHENEY
(C.D.)

INFO:

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:

75 FEB 8 PM 2:29

WHITE HOUSE
SITUATION ROOM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 8, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: PAUL H. O'NEILL
SUBJECT: Highway Fund Release

As a result of a nationwide telephone survey yesterday afternoon and last night, we have compiled a state-by-state estimate of the added amounts that could be obligated by each State, between now and July 1, 1975 if you were to release more highway funds. The amounts identified in the survey total \$1.1 billion. (Dick Cheney has a copy of the State list.)

Release of a greater (or lesser) amount would be difficult to rationalize and would necessitate some arbitrary criteria for allocating funds. The virtue of using the \$1.1 billion list is two fold; it reflects the State's own estimates of the amount of design work that can be quickly converted to contract projects and, the quick contracting is consistent with the intent of added economic stimulus.

Therefore, I recommend you adopt the \$1.1 billion release option.

Since this work has been pulled together very fast, I think it is important that you indicate some flexibility on the precision of the total number. When the individual State numbers are released we are sure to have some States that will come in with claims that they can do more. Some of those claims may be legitimate and you should preserve the flexibility to respond to them.

D -

File -

The f

decided to

release up to

\$2B

J

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Dick Cheney -

We will DECS up
to Camp David Saturday
morning additional
information from DOT
which will show what
individual states could
spend if funds are
released.

Wally



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN *def.*

2/8/75

MEMORANDUM FOR DICK CHENEY

FROM: WALLY SCOTT *Wally*

SUBJECT: Federal Highway Assistance Acceleration

Attached is a revised Tab B of our memo to the President of February 7, 1975, showing by state: Federal Highway Funds currently available for obligation, funds released but not obligated as of December 31, 1974; amounts currently deferred for major programs; and an estimate of the amount that the states could obligate in FY 1975 with no deferral. The estimate of the amounts that states could obligate was prepared by field staff of the Federal Highway Administration this afternoon and was not included in the original memo.

Attachment



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: JAMES T. LYNN
SUBJECT: Federal Highway Assistance Acceleration

Background

- ... Currently, \$11.1 billion of Federal-aid highway funds are deferred. This includes \$6.7 billion of FY 1976 funds which are technically now available for obligation.
- ... The 1976 Budget Request provides for release of \$5.2 billion of the deferred amount for 1976 program. The 1975 program was estimated at \$4.6 billion in the Budget Request.
- ... The Administration has also announced a legislative proposal that would eliminate the backlog of deferred funds by: not requesting additional authorizations for 1976 and the transition quarter, eliminating "advanced" availability of interstate funds, and rescinding all unobligated amounts in 1977. Key portions of this legislation were reflected in the Budget. A chart showing availability of funds is included as Attachment A.
- ... All of the \$11.1 billion of deferred funds could be immediately released. With this action, states would have obligational authority for \$6.0B of interstate funds and \$7.4B of non-interstate funds (including \$2.3 billion of funds presently released.)
- ... Attachment B shows for major programs by state the amount that the states can obligate in FY 1975, the unobligated portion of this amount as of December 31, and the amount of deferred funds.

Project Timing

- ... It is very difficult to estimate the speed with which states could initiate projects with additional release of funds. There is no doubt that states can technically obligate a considerable amount of

additional funds, but there are serious questions about the ability of states to rapidly accelerate actual construction starts. Initiation of construction is the key factor in determining employment impact.

- ... Highway groups have indicated that over \$2B of "ready to go" projects are now "sitting on the shelf" awaiting additional obligational release. It is doubtful, however, that over \$500 million of additional construction could be underway by June 30.
- ... The principal factor delaying construction is the inability of the states to accelerate more rapidly the contract approval and award process.
- ... In some states, there may be some problem with securing state matching funds. Given the relatively small portion of state highway receipts that are used to match Federal grants, this should not be a constraining influence in most states. The Federal Highway Administration is currently attempting to assess the impact of this problem.
- ... No major material shortages have been identified that would slow construction.

Employment Impact

- ... Over all types of Federally assisted construction, it is estimated that 28 additional direct man years of employment are generated by each million dollars of aid, as well as an additional 28 man years of indirect induced employment. These are not the number of jobs available at the start of construction, but the number of man years of labor over the life of the project. Thus, the average cost per man year of direct and indirect employment would be close to \$20,000.
- ... With \$500M of additional construction, on the average 14,000 direct and 14,000 indirect man years of employment would be generated. If the more optimistic industry estimates of \$2B are correct, this could increase to over 100,000 total man years.
- ... Employment impact varies significantly by type of project. Many safety and bridge construction projects, for example, are labor intensive. If we restrict the use of funds to particular types of projects, this would significantly lower the rate of expenditure, but could substantially increase the employment impact per dollar released.

- ... Funds can also be channeled to states with particular employment problems without legislative changes. Again, added analysis would be required to review these alternatives which could better match our money with the employment problem. This analysis is now underway.

Congressional Reaction

- ... Legislation calling for the release of additional highway funds was introduced today in the Senate. Hearings before the Senate Public Works Committee are scheduled in two weeks to be followed by Appropriation Committee hearings in early March.
- ... Congressional staff sources have informally indicated that most members do not wish to overturn the entire \$11 billion of deferred funds, and would be satisfied with release of an additional \$1-2 billion of funds. It is likely that Congressional action will force release of some of these deferred funds.
- ... Release of some portion of the deferred funds might help in the passage of the new highway legislative proposal if discussions were undertaken and agreements reached with key Congressional leaders before action is taken. At a very minimum, it would appear strongly desirable to reach at least agreement on the deferral and rescission issue prior to release of additional funds.

Summary

- ... It appears that present contract authority is sufficient to provide all the fund release that any state can reasonably absorb. Therefore, no authorizing legislation is required.
- ... Although there have been some discussions concerning state matching problems, there is no solid evidence that increases in Federal matching share from present 70% and 90% are required.
- ... Optimistic highway sources indicate that over \$2 billion of projects are "on the shelf", but more conservative analysis and past experience indicate that probably only about \$500 million of additional new projects could get underway in the next few months.
- ... These estimates translate into a range of 28,000 - 100,000 additional man years of employment over the next 18 months.
- ... Release of funds could be tied to highway legislation if agreement with key Congressional leaders is secured prior to the release of funds.

Recommendation

We recommend that before you make a decision on the amount and method of released highway funds that we reach an understanding with the leaders of the Congress and the involved committees (Public Works, Appropriations). Assuming agreement, insofar as possible, funds will be targeted to those highway projects which can create the maximum number of jobs in areas with highest level of unemployment.

Specifically, I recommend that we meet with the key Congressmen and Senators to get their assurance on the following points:

- ... Their active support for the Administration's highway legislation, especially with regard to reducing contract authority for highways to a level consistent with other national priorities.
- ... Their agreement on funding levels for both 1975 and 1976.

2 Attachments

Action

- No release of additional funds. _____
- ✓ Immediate release of \$500M of additional funds. _____
- ~~Immediate release of \$2B of additional funds.~~ _____
- Immediate release of all funds. _____
- ✓ Congressional negotiations to achieve compromise on legislation and funding (assumes eventual release of \$1-\$2 billion). _____

b 2 B
Announce - Houston.
start consultations w/Hill
mon. A.M.

Federal-aid Highway Program
Analysis of Deferred Funds

Deferral Analysis

Presently Deferred:		
1976 Advance Construction ^{1/}		\$6.7B
1975 & Prior Years		<u>4.4B</u>
Total		<u>11.1B*</u>
 New Authority during 1976		
Emergency Relief	0.1B	
Bridge Replacement	0.1B	
Interstate	3.2B	
Proposed Legislation: Shift Advanced	<u>-3.2B</u>	
Funds to 1978		+0.2B
 Release for obligation July 1, 1975 for FY 1976		<u>-5.2B*</u>
 Deferred as of June 30, 1976		-6.1B
 Release for obligation July 1, 1976 for transitional period July - September 1976		<u>-1.3B*</u>
 Deferred as of September 30, 1976		\$4.8B
 Proposed Legislation: Blanket Rescission		<u>-4.8B</u>
 Amount deferred in fiscal year 1977 and beyond:		<u><u>0</u></u>

^{1/} Shown for illustrative purposes only as some states have obligated 1976 funds.

* Per 1976 Budget Request

Federal Highway Programs^{1/}
(Millions of dollars)

<u>State</u>	<u>Total obligations released FY 1975</u>	<u>Released but unobligated A/O Dec. 31, 1974</u>	<u>Deferred Funds^{2/}</u>
Alabama	80	42	112
Alaska	66	34	148
Arizona	69	36	169
Arkansas	40	15	107
California	315	116	546
Colorado	75	53	162
Connecticut	87	91	328
Delaware	20	19	47
Florida	125	22	223
Georgia	99	22	217
Hawaii	32	16	139
Idaho	29	1	70
Illinois	199	134	619
Indiana	72	32	188
Iowa	58	20	150
Kansas	58	19	128
Kentucky	63	38	105
Louisiana	99	15	222
Maine	24	19	58
Maryland	114	67	449
Massachusetts	110	105	400
Michigan	152	76	313
Minnesota	96	67	226
Mississippi	45	20	102
Missouri	91	10	162
Montana	47	19	146
Nebraska	35	4	92
Nevada	25	13	47
New Hampshire	20	12	49
New Jersey	115	105	348
New Mexico	41	20	82
New York	223	145	836
North Carolina	86	38	201
North Dakota	28	10	67
Ohio	152	35	415
Oklahoma	47	20	110
Oregon	84	56	226
Pennsylvania	201	58	449
Rhode Island	30	27	92
South Carolina	42	25	82
South Dakota	30	10	71
Tennessee	69	14	150
Texas	216	59	419
Utah	42	25	98
Vermont	18	15	28
Virginia	137	63	184

Federal Highway Programs^{1/}

2

<u>State</u>	<u>Total obligations released FY 1975</u>	<u>Released but unobligated A/O Dec. 31, 1974</u>	<u>Deferred Funds</u> ^{2/}
Washington	113	87	250
West Virginia	68	45	136
Wisconsin	70	56	165
Wyoming	28	11	80
Dist. of Col.	59	25	226
Puerto Rico	16	16	48
Reserve	<u>337</u>	<u>201</u>	--
Total	<u>4,600</u>	<u>2,302</u>	<u>10,487</u> ^{1/}

^{1/} Funds from principal Federal-aid programs -- not all Federal-aid funds are included.

^{2/} Includes funds authorized for FY 1976 program. but "apportioned to the states in December 1975, and currently available for obligation within the obligation ceiling.

Federal Highway Programs^{1/}
(Millions of dollars)

<u>State</u>	<u>Total obligations released FY 1975</u>	<u>Released but unobligated as of Dec. 31, 1974</u>	<u>Deferred Funds ^{2/}</u>	<u>Est. added obligations with no deferral FY 1975</u>
Alabama	80	42	112	25
Alaska	66	34	148	--
Arizona	69	36	169	5
Arkansas	40	15 x	107	48
California	315	116 x	546	85.
Colorado	75	53	162	18
Connecticut	87	91	328	--
Delaware	20	19	47	--*
Florida	125	22 ✓	223	104
Georgia	99	22 ✓	217	73
Hawaii	32	16 x	139	51
Idaho	29	1 ✓	70	31
Illinois	199	134	619	101
Indiana	72	32 x	188	74
Iowa	58	20 x	150	34.
Kansas	58	19 x	128	62
Kentucky	63	38	105	28
Louisiana	99	15 ✓	222	50
Maine	24	19	58	--
Maryland	114	67	449	94.
Massachusetts	110	105	400	25
Michigan	152	76	313	88
Minnesota	96	67	226	32
Mississippi	45	20 x	102	30
Missouri	91	10 ✓	162	65.
Montana	47	19 x	146	25
Nebraska	35	4 ✓	92	13
Nevada	25	13	47	--
New Hampshire	20	12	49	16
New Jersey	115	105	348	--
New Mexico	41	20 x	82	17
New York	223	145	836	12
North Carolina	86	38 x	201	77
North Dakota	28	10 x	67	30
Ohio	152	35 x	415	21.
Oklahoma	47	20 x	110	--*
Oregon	84	56	226	--
Pennsylvania	201	58 ✓	449	27.
Rhode Island	30	27	92	--
South Carolina	42	25	82	10.
South Dakota	30	10 ✓	71	15
Tennessee	69	14 ✓	150	63
Texas	216	59 ✓	419	96
Utah	42	25	98	36
Vermont	18	15	28	4
Virginia	137	63 x	184	--*

Federal Highway Programs^{1/}

<u>State</u>	<u>Total obligations released FY 1975</u>	<u>Released but unobligated A/O Dec. 31, 1974</u>	<u>Deferred Funds</u> ^{2/}	<u>Est. added obligations with no deferral FY 1975</u>
Washington	113	87	250	27
West Virginia	68	45	136	16
Wisconsin	70	56	165	27
Wyoming	28	11 ^λ	80	7
Dist. of Col.	59	25 [*]	226	--
Puerto Rico	16	16	48	--
Reserve	<u>337</u>	<u>201</u>	--	--
Total	<u><u>4,600</u></u>	<u><u>2,302</u></u>	<u><u>10,497</u></u> ^{1/}	<u><u>1,171</u></u> ^{3/}

^{1/} Funds from principal Federal-aid programs -- not all Federal-aid funds are included.

^{2/} Includes funds authorized for FY 1976 program. but apportioned to the states in December 1975, and currently available for obligation within the obligation ceiling.

^{3/} Does not add because reserve allocation is included in state totals and some states will obligate less than their present obligational release (these funds would be reapportioned in June).

* If relief were provided from state matching requirements, it is estimated that Delaware would obligate an additional \$3M; Oklahoma, an additional \$21M; and Virginia an additional \$50M.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JAMES T. LYNN

SUBJECT: Federal Highway Assistance Deferrals

The Saturday memorandum on this subject spelled out the status and impact of release of deferred highway funds. The principal pros and cons of release at this time are as follows:

Pros

- Responds to high unemployment rate by creating approximately 56 man years of employment for each one million dollars released.
- Addresses concerns expressed by Governors.
- Accelerates completion of interstate system.
- May reduce Congressional pressure for release of additional highway deferrals.
- May facilitate Congressional agreement on funding levels for new highway legislation.

Cons

- Will increase budget deficit and result in greater Federal borrowing pressure on already overcrowded capital markets.
- May increase pressure to release additional deferred funds for highway and other programs.
- May be perceived as piecemeal effort to deal with unemployment problem.

- Many may believe increased spending should be directed toward human resource programs, or even public transit programs and not highway construction.
- States may endeavor to obtain waiver of matching requirements.
- May increase pressure for higher funding levels in 1976 and subsequent years.

If the decision is made to proceed with release of these funds, I would recommend the announcement be made to the National Governors' Conference in Washington on February 18-20. This timing would provide:

- An important announcement in a national forum with all Governors attending.
- Additional time to negotiate and obtain commitments from Congressional leadership on funding levels and the substance of new highway legislation. With Congress largely in recess this week few commitments will be possible on Monday.
- Time for the Department of Transportation to improve the quality of the State allocation figures.



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

2/7/75

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: JAMES T. LYNN *Quinn*
SUBJECT: Federal Highway Assistance Acceleration

Background

- ... Currently, \$11.1 billion of Federal-aid highway funds are deferred. This includes \$6.7 billion of FY 1976 funds which are technically now available for obligation.
- ... The 1976 Budget Request provides for release of \$5.2 billion of the deferred amount for 1976 program. The 1975 program was estimated at \$4.6 billion in the Budget Request.
- ... The Administration has also announced a legislative proposal that would eliminate the backlog of deferred funds by: not requesting additional authorizations for 1976 and the transition quarter, eliminating "advanced" availability of interstate funds, and rescinding all unobligated amounts in 1977. Key portions of this legislation were reflected in the Budget. A chart showing availability of funds is included as Attachment A.
- ... All of the \$11.1 billion of deferred funds could be immediately released. With this action, states would have obligational authority for \$6.0B of interstate funds and \$7.4B of non-interstate funds (including \$2.3 billion of funds presently released.)
- ... Attachment B shows for major programs by state the amount that the states can obligate in FY 1975, the unobligated portion of this amount as of December 31, and the amount of deferred funds.

Project Timing

- ... It is very difficult to estimate the speed with which states could initiate projects with additional release of funds. There is no doubt that states can technically obligate a considerable amount of

additional funds, but there are serious questions about the ability of states to rapidly accelerate actual construction starts. Initiation of construction is the key factor in determining employment impact.

- ... Highway groups have indicated that over \$2B of "ready to go" projects are now "sitting on the shelf" awaiting additional obligational release. It is doubtful, however, that over \$500 million of additional construction could be underway by June 30.
- ... The principal factor delaying construction is the inability of the states to accelerate more rapidly the contract approval and award process.
- ... In some states, there may be some problem with securing state matching funds. Given the relatively small portion of state highway receipts that are used to match Federal grants, this should not be a constraining influence in most states. The Federal Highway Administration is currently attempting to assess the impact of this problem.
- ... No major material shortages have been identified that would slow construction.

Employment Impact

- ... Over all types of Federally assisted construction, it is estimated that 28 additional direct man years of employment are generated by each million dollars of aid, as well as an additional 28 man years of indirect induced employment. These are not the number of jobs available at the start of construction, but the number of man years of labor over the life of the project. Thus, the average cost per man year of direct and indirect employment would be close to \$20,000.
- ... With \$500M of additional construction, on the average 14,000 direct and 14,000 indirect man years of employment would be generated. If the more optimistic industry estimates of \$2B are correct, this could increase to over 100,000 total man years.
- ... Employment impact varies significantly by type of project. Many safety and bridge construction projects, for example, are labor intensive. If we restrict the use of funds to particular types of projects, this would significantly lower the rate of expenditure, but could substantially increase the employment impact per dollar released.

- ... Funds can also be channeled to states with particular employment problems without legislative changes. Again, added analysis would be required to review these alternatives which could better match our money with the employment problem. This analysis is now underway.

Congressional Reaction

- ... Legislation calling for the release of additional highway funds was introduced today in the Senate. Hearings before the Senate Public Works Committee are scheduled in two weeks to be followed by Appropriation Committee hearings in early March.
- ... Congressional staff sources have informally indicated that most members do not wish to overturn the entire \$11 billion of deferred funds, and would be satisfied with release of an additional \$1-2 billion of funds. It is likely that Congressional action will force release of some of these deferred funds.
- ... Release of some portion of the deferred funds might help in the passage of the new highway legislative proposal if discussions were undertaken and agreements reached with key Congressional leaders before action is taken. At a very minimum, it would appear strongly desirable to reach at least agreement on the deferral and rescission issue prior to release of additional funds.

Summary

- ... It appears that present contract authority is sufficient to provide all the fund release that any state can reasonably absorb. Therefore, no authorizing legislation is required.
- ... Although there have been some discussions concerning state matching problems, there is no solid evidence that increases in Federal matching share from present 70% and 90% are required.
- ... Optimistic highway sources indicate that over \$2 billion of projects are "on the shelf", but more conservative analysis and past experience indicate that probably only about \$500 million of additional new projects could get underway in the next few months.
- ... These estimates translate into a range of 28,000 - 100,000 additional man years of employment over the next 18 months.
- ... Release of funds could be tied to highway legislation if agreement with key Congressional leaders is secured prior to the release of funds.

Recommendation

We recommend that before you make a decision on the amount and method of released highway funds that we reach an understanding with the leaders of the Congress and the involved committees (Public Works, Appropriations). Assuming agreement, insofar as possible, funds will be targeted to those highway projects which can create the maximum number of jobs in areas with highest level of unemployment.

Specifically, I recommend that we meet with the key Congressmen and Senators to get their assurance on the following points:

- ... Their active support for the Administration's highway legislation, especially with regard to reducing contract authority for highways to a level consistent with other national priorities.
- ... Their agreement on funding levels for both 1975 and 1976.

2 Attachments

Action

No release of additional funds.

Immediate release of \$500M of additional funds.

Immediate release of \$2B of additional funds.

Immediate release of all funds.

Congressional negotiations to achieve compromise on legislation and funding (assumes eventual release of \$1-\$2 billion).

PR7

PR7

Federal-aid Highway Program
Analysis of Deferred Funds

Deferral Analysis

Presently Deferred:

1976 Advance Construction ^{1/}	\$6.7B
1975 & Prior Years	<u>4.4B</u>
Total	<u>11.1B*</u>

New Authority during 1976

Emergency Relief	0.1B	
Bridge Replacement	0.1B	
Interstate	3.2B	
Proposed Legislation: Shift Advanced Funds to 1978	<u>-3.2B</u>	+0.2B

Release for obligation July 1, 1975 for FY 1976	<u>-5.2B*</u>
----------------------------------------------------	---------------

Deferred as of June 30, 1976	+6.1B
------------------------------	-------

Release for obligation July 1, 1976 for transitional period July - September 1976	<u>-1.3B*</u>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------

Deferred as of September 30, 1976	\$4.8B
-----------------------------------	--------

Proposed Legislation: Blanket Rescission	<u>-4.8B</u>
------------------------------------------	--------------

Amount deferred in fiscal year 1977 and beyond:	<u><u>0</u></u>
-------------------------------------------------	-----------------

^{1/} Shown for illustrative purposes only as some states have obligated 1976 funds.

* Per 1976 Budget Request

Federal Highway Programs^{1/}
(Millions of dollars)

State	Total obligations released FY 1975	Released but unobligated as of Dec. 31, 1974	Deferred Funds ^{2/}	Est. added obligations with no deferral FY 1975
Alabama	80	42	112	25
Alaska	66	34	148	--
Arizona	69	36	169	5
Arkansas	40	15	107	48
California	315	116	546	85
Colorado	75	53	162	18
Connecticut	87	91	328	--
Delaware	20	19	47	--*
Florida	125	22	223	104
Georgia	99	22	217	73
Hawaii	32	16	139	51
Idaho	29	1	70	31
Illinois	199	134	619	101
Indiana	72	32	188	74
Iowa	58	20	150	34
Kansas	58	19	128	62
Kentucky	63	38	105	28
Louisiana	99	15	222	50
Maine	24	19	58	--
Maryland	114	67	449	94
Massachusetts	110	105	400	25
Michigan	152	76	313	88
Minnesota	96	67	226	32
Mississippi	45	20	102	30
Missouri	91	10	162	65
Montana	47	19	146	25
Nebraska	35	4	92	13
Nevada	25	13	47	--
New Hampshire	20	12	49	16
New Jersey	115	105	348	--
New Mexico	41	20	82	17
New York	223	145	836	12
North Carolina	86	38	201	77
North Dakota	28	10	67	30
Ohio	152	35	415	21
Oklahoma	47	20	110	--*
Oregon	84	56	226	--
Pennsylvania	201	58	449	27
Rhode Island	30	27	92	--
South Carolina	42	25	82	10
South Dakota	30	10	71	15
Tennessee	69	14	150	63
Texas	216	59	419	96
Utah	42	25	98	36
Vermont	18	15	28	4
Virginia	137	63	184	--*

Federal Highway Programs^{1/}

<u>State</u>	<u>Total obligations released FY 1975</u>	<u>Released but unobligated A/O Dec. 31, 1974</u>	<u>Deferred Funds</u> ^{2/}	<u>Est. added obligations with no deferral FY 1975</u>
Washington	113	87	250	27
West Virginia	68	45	136	16
Wisconsin	70	56	165	27
Wyoming	28	11	80	7
Dist. of Col.	59	25	226	--
Puerto Rico	16	16	48	--
Reserve	<u>337</u>	<u>201</u>	--	--
Total	<u>4,600</u>	<u>2,302</u>	<u>10,497</u> ^{1/}	<u>1,171</u> ^{3/}

^{1/} Funds from principal Federal-aid programs -- not all Federal-aid funds are included.

^{2/} Includes funds authorized for FY 1976 program. but apportioned to the states in December 1975, and currently available for obligation within the obligation ceiling.

^{3/} Does not add because reserve allocation is included in state totals and some states will obligate less than their present obligational release (these funds would be reapportioned in June).

* If relief were provided from state matching requirements, it is estimated that Delaware would obligate an additional \$3M; Oklahoma, an additional \$21M; and Virginia an additional \$50M.