



U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
Washington, DC 20515

James L. Oberstar
Chairman

John L. Mica
Ranking Republican Member

David Heysfeld, Chief of Staff
Ward W. McCarragher, Chief Counsel

James W. Coon II, Republican Chief of Staff

October 28, 2008

SUMMARY OF SUBJECT MATTER

TO: Members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
FROM: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Staff
SUBJECT: Hearing on “Investing in Infrastructure: The Road to Recovery”

PURPOSE OF HEARING

On Wednesday, October 29, 2008, at 9:30 a.m., in room 2167 Rayburn House Office Building, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will hold a hearing to examine how infrastructure investment contributes to job creation and economic recovery. The hearing will address infrastructure across the Committee’s jurisdiction, including highways, bridges, public transportation, rail, aviation, ports, waterways, wastewater treatment facilities, and Federal buildings.

BACKGROUND

Adequate investment in our transportation and other public infrastructure is critical to our nation’s economic growth, our competitiveness in the world marketplace, and the quality of life in our communities. Despite the importance of these investments, many of our nation’s infrastructure needs are going unmet.

At the same time, unemployment in the construction sector is skyrocketing and almost one million construction workers are currently unemployed and looking for work. In addition, the construction market is shrinking dramatically. The construction market is experiencing the biggest sustained decline in construction in at least four decades.

Unemployment in the construction sector has increased dramatically over the past year. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (“BLS”), the construction sector lost more than 600,000 jobs in 2007 and 2008, including 261,000 jobs in 2007 and 340,000 jobs during the first nine months of 2008 (through September). The unemployment rate in construction was 9.9 percent in September 2008 – up 4.1 points compared to a year ago. This is the highest unemployment rate of

any industrial sector. As of September 2008, there are 970,000 unemployed construction workers in the nation – a 60 percent increase over the past year.

Within the overall construction sector, seasonally adjusted employment in heavy and civil engineering construction¹ has fallen in each of the past 11 months, from 999,500 in October 2007, to 944,600 in September 2008, a loss of 54,900 jobs. Heavy and civil engineering construction employment is now the lowest it has been since April 2005.

A report released last week by McGraw-Hill Construction estimates the value of new construction projects will fall to \$515 billion next year, down seven percent from this year, and 25 percent below its peak of \$690 billion in 2006.² This estimate includes a four percent decline in highway and bridge construction, to an estimated \$50 billion in new projects. Until recently, construction of hospitals, roads, schools and offices had remained relatively strong, despite a decline in residential housing construction. However, according to the report, States are suffering lower tax revenue, and financing for projects has become prohibitively expensive or unavailable at any cost as banks restrict lending. The result is the biggest sustained decline in construction in at least four decades.

On October 17, 2008, Bloomberg News reported that municipal borrowers had postponed more than 200 debt offerings totaling at least \$14 billion since mid-September. In the area of transportation, the North Carolina Turnpike Authority postponed plans to raise \$600 million to begin work on a toll road. Similarly, the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority held off borrowing \$350 million after investors demanded yields of about six percent, a full percentage point more than anticipated.

Many have argued that including infrastructure investment in a jobs creation and economic recovery initiative addresses both the skyrocketing construction unemployment and our crumbling infrastructure simultaneously. Infrastructure investment creates family-wage, construction jobs that are needed in the near-term. It also helps address our infrastructure investment needs and produces long-term benefits in terms of economic productivity and growth to increase the United States' global competitiveness.

I. Infrastructure Investment Needs

The National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission recently examined investment needs for all modes of surface transportation (highways, bridges, public transit, freight rail, and intercity passenger rail). The Commission's report identifies a significant surface transportation investment gap, and calls for an annual investment level of between \$225 and \$340 billion -- by all levels of government and the private sector -- over the next 50 years to upgrade all modes of surface transportation to a state of good repair. The current annual capital investment from all sources in all modes of surface transportation is \$85 billion.

¹ This term includes highway, street, and bridge construction; utility system construction; land subdivision construction; and other heavy and civil engineering construction.

² This forecast is based on McGraw-Hill's tracking of new construction projects, including the issuance of building permits.

For highways and bridges, the Department of Transportation's 2006 Conditions and Performance Report indicates that a total investment by all levels of government 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.³

According to DOT's 2006 Conditions and Performance Report:

- Only 42.2 percent of travel on roads for which data are available occurred on pavements with "good" ride quality;
- 13.1 percent of highway bridges are classified as structurally deficient; and
- 13.6 percent of highway bridges are classified as functionally obsolete.

For transit, DOT's 2006 Conditions and Performance Report indicates that a total investment by all levels of government 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.⁴

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 are substandard;
- 13 percent of underground transit tunnels are substandard; and
- 8 percent of transit track is substandard.

For 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 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 Class I freight railroads' share is projected to be \$135 billion and the short line and regional freight railroads' share is projected to be \$13 billion. Without this investment, 30 percent of the rail miles in the primary corridors will be operating above capacity by 2035, causing severe congestion that will affect every region of the country and potentially shift freight to an already heavily congested highway system.

³ 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.

⁴ According to DOT's 2006 Conditions and Performance report, Federal, State, and local capital expenditure for transit totaled \$12.6 billion in 2004. This 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.

The railroad industry is extraordinarily capital intensive. The Class I railroads anticipate that they will be able to generate approximately \$96 billion of their \$135 billion share through increased earnings from revenue growth, higher volumes, and productivity improvements, while continuing to renew existing infrastructure and equipment. This would leave a gap of \$39 billion or about \$1.4 billion per year.

Demand for intercity passenger rail has also increased due to soaring gas prices. The Passenger Rail Working Group for the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission reported in 2007 that the total capital cost estimate for re-establishing the national intercity passenger rail network between now and 2050 is \$357.2 billion (in 2007 dollars), for an annualized cost of \$8.1 billion.

Increased investment in our airport infrastructure is also necessary to maintain a safe and efficient aviation system. The Federal Aviation Administration's recently-released National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (2009-2013) estimates that there will be \$49.7 billion of 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.

Estimates of the nation's clean water infrastructure needs over the next 20 years exceed \$400 billion. The needs are especially urgent for areas trying to remedy the problem of combined sewer overflows and sanitary sewer overflows and for small communities lacking sufficient independent financing ability. Drinking water infrastructure needs are estimated at nearly \$500 billion over the next 20 years. Current spending by all levels of government is one-half of the estimated 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 of an 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 between \$3 billion and \$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 billion 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 address combined sewer overflow problems, and an additional \$88.5 billion to address sanitary sewer overflows.

With trade expanding and highways and railways congested, efficient water navigation must be provided and maintained through the ports and waterways constructed and maintained by the Army Corps of Engineers. The vast array of navigation and flood damage reduction infrastructure is important to the nation's economy, but this infrastructure has suffered from many years of inadequate funding for maintenance and replacement. The capital stock value of Corps water

resources infrastructure has been decreasing since the late 1970s. Significant increases in investment for maintenance of existing facilities and the construction of modern ones are urgently needed.

II. Impact of Inadequate Investment

The impact of inadequate infrastructure investment is being felt in a variety of ways, most notably through a significant increase in congestion.

Road congestion has become a major national problem. According to the Texas Transportation Institute's 2007 Urban Mobility Study, traffic congestion in the nation's 437 urban areas continues to increase. Congestion now occurs during longer portions of the day and delays more travelers and goods than ever before.

As congestion increases, so does the cost it imposes both on our economy and on motorists. In 2005, traffic congestion cost urban motorists \$78.2 billion in terms of wasted time and fuel, compared to \$73.1 billion in 2004, and just \$14.9 billion in 1982.⁵ This level of congestion equates to an average annual cost per traveler of about \$710 in 2005, up from \$680 in 2004, and \$260 in 1982. The hours of delay and gallons of fuel consumed due to congestion are only the elements that are easiest to estimate. The effect of uncertain or longer delivery times, missed meetings, business relocations, and other congestion impacts are not included in this estimate.

Congestion has increased in the air, as well. In 2007, air travelers experienced the highest number of delayed flights – 1.8 million – in the 13 years since DOT has collected such data. The Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”) predicts that, absent needed improvements to the aviation system, including the modernization of the air traffic control system, delays will increase by 62 percent by FY 2014.

According to the Commission on the Future of the U.S. Aerospace Industry, estimates of the cost of aviation delays to the U.S. economy range from \$9 billion in 2000 to more than \$30 billion annually by 2015. Without improvement, the combined economic cost of delays from 2000-2012 will total an estimated \$170 billion.

Delays are also increasing on our inland waterways, which contain a series of outdated and antiquated locks and dams that, unless rehabilitated, replaced or expanded, will continue to hinder the movement of coal, grain, and other bulk products. Fifty-three percent of the lock chambers on the system have exceeded their 50-year design lives. With trade expected to increase, delays are likely to continue to rise with increased traffic using the aging inland waterway system.

Inadequate infrastructure investment is also putting our environment at risk. Communities throughout the United States continue to struggle financially to meet their ever-increasing wastewater treatment infrastructure needs. The Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) has reported that a failure to increase investment in wastewater treatment infrastructure would erode many of the water quality achievements of the past 30 years.

⁵In constant 2005 dollars.

III. Job Creation and Unemployment Relief Act of 2008 (H.R. 7110)

To create jobs while at the same time meeting important infrastructure investment needs, the House passed the Job Creation and Unemployment Relief Act of 2008 (H.R. 7110) on September 26, 2008, by a vote of 264-158. The Senate has not taken action on the bill.

H.R. 7110 provides \$61 billion in additional funding, including \$30 billion for programs within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, as follows:

➤	Highways and Bridges	\$12.8 billion
➤	Transit:	\$4.6 billion
	Including Transit Capital	\$3.6 billion
	And Transit Energy Funding	\$1.0 billion
➤	Rail (Amtrak):	\$500 million
➤	Aviation:	\$600 million
	(Airport Improvement Program)	
➤	Environmental Infrastructure:	\$6.5 billion
	(Clean Water State Revolving Fund)	
➤	Army Corps of Engineers:	\$5.0 billion
	Including Construction	\$2.5 billion
	Operation & Maintenance	\$2.0 billion
	Mississippi River & Tributaries	\$500 million

Under H.R. 7110, the funds for highways, bridges, transit, and environmental infrastructure would be distributed based on the existing statutory formulas that are used by each of these programs. Tables showing the State-by-State distribution of highway, transit, and clean water investments provided under H.R. 7110 are attached. The funds for AIP and the Corps of Engineers would be distributed through existing competitive project selection processes.

Transportation and Infrastructure Committee staff estimates that this \$30 billion would create or sustain more than 834,000 jobs.⁶

In contrast to tax cuts or rebate checks, virtually all of the economic stimulus effect from these investments will be experienced 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. These infrastructure programs are subject to Buy America laws which require that the steel, iron, and manufactured goods for projects funded with Federal funds be produced in the United States. In addition, vehicles, such as transit buses or rail cars, must be assembled in the United States.

⁶ The estimate is based on Federal Highway Administration's model on the correlation between highway infrastructure investment and employment, and assumes waiver of State matching share of project costs for most programs, as proposed in H.R. 7110.

In general, under H.R. 7110, priority in the use of funds shall be given to projects that can award contracts based on bids within 120 days of enactment. 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 120 days or less.

IV. Ready-To-Go Projects

A. Highways and Bridges

State Departments of Transportation (“DOTs”) have a tremendous backlog of highway projects that could be implemented quickly if additional funds were made available. For example, State DOTs often have open-ended contracts in place for resurfacing projects, which means that work could begin immediately upon receipt of additional funds. In addition, many State DOTs have projects already in process that could be accelerated if additional funding were provided.

Each year, the Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) and State DOTs go through a process known as “August redistribution”. In this process, FHWA surveys each State to find out if it is going to be able to use all of its obligation authority before the authority expires at the end of the fiscal year on September 30. If a State cannot use all of its obligation authority, it returns the unused amount to FHWA, so that it can be redistributed to another State that can use it before it expires. During the August 2008 redistribution process, States indicated an ability to obligate an additional \$8 billion prior to September 30, but only \$1.16 billion was redistributed to meet this need. This FHWA August 2008 redistribution illustrates the States’ pent-up demand of ready-to-go projects and their ability to obligate large amounts of additional funding very quickly.

A January 2008 survey of State Departments of Transportation by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (“AASHTO”) identified 3,071 ready-to-go highway and bridge projects at a total cost of \$17.9 billion. The summary table of the AASHTO survey is attached.

Specific examples of ready-to-go highway and bridge projects provided by AASHTO are discussed below. These are illustrative of the types of projects States could choose to fund if additional Federal-aid Highway funds are apportioned to the States.

- Brownville Bridge, U.S. Route 136, Atchison County, Missouri: According to the Missouri Department of Transportation, this project would accelerate necessary repair work on the bridge over the Missouri River at Brownville, Nebraska. The 1,903-foot bridge is 70 years old and is structurally deficient. The bridge has a rating of 3 (serious condition), which is lower than the rating of the I-35W Bridge which collapsed in Minnesota. This rating reflects such a serious condition that if its rating drops to 2, the bridge will be closed. If the bridge has to be closed, residents will have to make a 123-mile detour. Work that needs to be completed on this bridge includes joint repair, substructure repair, painting and redecking. Cost: \$13,200,000.

- Osage River Bridge, Route 17, Tuscumbia, Missouri: According to the Missouri Department of Transportation, this project would accelerate the replacement of a structurally deficient and functionally obsolete bridge with the construction of a new bridge over the Osage River at Tuscumbia. Tuscumbia is the county seat of Miller County, one of four counties in the Lake of the Ozarks region, which the U.S. Census Bureau estimates show saw a greater than seven percent population growth between 2000 and 2006. The current bridge is a two-lane, 1,083-foot structure that is 75 years old and rated a 3 (serious condition). If the bridge has to be closed, residents will have to make a 40-mile detour. Cost: \$9,270,000.
- I-5/I-205 Interchange, Portland, Oregon: According to the Oregon Department of Transportation (“ODOT”), the I-5/I-205 interchange, which connects two of Oregon’s most heavily traveled freight and passenger corridors, was recognized by Portland metropolitan area residents as one of the region’s worst congestion chokepoints in a recent poll as well as noted in the State’s “Federal Bottleneck Report”. ODOT would like to address congestion at this interchange by building an acceleration/auxiliary lane that would allow traffic from the I-205 southbound ramp additional time to safely merge onto I-5 without slowing traffic in the travel lanes. This lane could significantly improve traffic flow on I-5 and I-205 at a relatively small cost. ODOT could quickly put this project out for contract and get construction underway in 2009. Cost: \$15,000,000.
- U.S. Route 20, Pioneer Mountain to Eddyville, Oregon: According to ODOT, this design/build project is currently under construction. The project will build seven miles of new alignment between Corvallis and the Oregon coast on U.S. Route 20. Currently, this segment of highway narrowly winds through the Coast Range. It is not updated to modern highway standards, experiences high crash rates, and has freight mobility restrictions. These restrictions cause significant out-of-direction travel for trucks. Improvements to the west end tie-in section, which are designed and ready to go to construction, had to be modified to stay within budget. Additional Federal funding would allow this project to move forward immediately. Cost: \$12,000,000.

B. Transit

Due to high gas prices, transit agencies across the country are experiencing increased demand for transit services. In 2007, 10.3 billion trips were taken on public transportation – the highest number of trips taken in 50 years. Ridership has continued to climb in 2008, with a 4.4 percent increase in trips taken during the first half of 2008 compared to the same period last year, putting 2008 on track to beat last year’s modern record ridership numbers.

Additional funds could be put to immediate use to meet this demand and, at the same time, create and sustain good-paying jobs and economic activity. An October 2008 survey of public transportation agencies by the American Public Transportation Association (“APTA”) identified 559 ready-to-go transit projects at a total cost of \$8.03 billion. Typically, these projects involve purchasing buses and rail cars by exercising existing contract options, and accelerating existing construction and maintenance projects. Specific examples, provided by APTA, are discussed below. These are illustrative of the types of projects that transit agencies could choose to fund if additional funds are apportioned to urbanized and nonurbanized areas.

- Virginia Railway Express, Alexandria, Virginia: This project would allow the Virginia Railway Express (“VRE”) to exercise options to purchase 15 locomotives, which will allow the transit agency to increase capacity by deploying longer eight- and 10-car trains. In February, VRE signed a contract with MotivePower, Inc. to purchase as many as 20 replacement locomotives. At present, VRE has been able to purchase only five locomotives due to a lack of funding. If Federal resources were made available, the railroad could immediately execute options to purchase as many as 15 locomotives. MotivePower locomotives are manufactured in Boise, Idaho. Cost: \$63,000,000.
- Muncie Indiana Transit System, Muncie, Indiana: This project would allow the Muncie Indiana Transit System to exercise existing options to purchase four replacement hybrid electric buses. The Muncie Indiana Transit System is in the final year of an existing bus procurement contract with Gillig Corporation, and it has the option to purchase four diesel-electric hybrid buses. The buses would be Muncie’s first deployment of hybrid technology, and they would replace vehicles purchased in 1994 that are well past their expected service life. Diesel-electric hybrid buses reduce fuel consumption by as much as 40 percent, and regenerative braking technology reduces maintenance costs for transit agencies. If Federal resources were made available, the agency could immediately exercise options to purchase the four hybrid buses. Gillig buses are manufactured in Hayward, California. Cost: \$2,100,000.
- Regional Transportation District, Denver Colorado: These projects would finance transit station improvements to meet increased demand for transit services. Regional Transportation District (“RTD”) ridership has been growing rapidly, increasing by 13.1 percent in 2007 compared to the previous year, and it has continued growing rapidly in 2008 as more commuters switch to transit to minimize their commuting costs. RTD is ready to begin construction on the renovation of Denver’s Union Station, but the \$478 million project needs \$230 million in additional funding. The project has completed all necessary environmental reviews and construction could start in spring 2009 with additional federal funding. The station renovation will incorporate an at-grade, eight-track commuter rail station, relocation of RTD’s regional bus facility below grade under 17th Street; and relocation of the light rail station at-grade to the Consolidated Mail Line. RTD’s other ready-to-go passenger facility projects include improvements for the Belleview light rail station (\$3 million) and a design-build contract for a new park-and-ride facility in the southwest corner of the District with 200 spaces (\$2 million). Cost: \$235 million.
- New York City Transit, New York, New York: These projects would finance station rehabilitation, rail track improvements, and customer information screens. New York City Transit has identified three projects that are currently under development in anticipation of future funding. If Federal funding were made available, each of the projects could be advanced quickly. Total Cost: \$680,000,000.
 - Station Rehabilitation: More than two dozen subway stations with deteriorated conditions are in need of rehabilitation to address structural, architectural, and electrical needs and provide improvements to passenger circulation. Cost: \$550,000,000.
 - Welded rail: New York City Transit (“NYCT”) would replace obsolete rail and plates with new continuous welded rail and resilient fasteners. This investment will reduce rail

breaks and cracks, which in turn will improve safety and reduce service delays. Cost: \$30,000,000.

- Public Address/Customer Information Screens: NYCT's current capital program includes funding to implement communications infrastructure at 44 stations and to develop designs for all 87 stations. With additional funding, the remaining 43 stations could be addressed. Cost: \$100,000,000.

C. Passenger Rail

With record ridership and revenues in FY 2008, demand is growing across Amtrak's entire system for intercity passenger rail service. The following examples of ready-to-go projects were provided by Amtrak, and are illustrative of how additional Federal funding could be used if it is made available.

- Amfleet Rail Car Overhaul: This project would enable Amtrak, to meet increasing passenger demand, to refurbish and return to service all Amfleet I and II rail cars currently in storage. Amtrak currently has a total of 81 Amfleet I and II rail cars in storage. Amfleet I cars are single-level coach and lounge cars manufactured in 1975-1977, for use mainly in short-distance service. Amfleet II cars are similar in design, but were manufactured in 1981-1983, for use mainly in long-distance service. These rail cars are needed to meet increased passenger demand, but must be refurbished before they can be returned to service. This refurbishment work includes new interiors, rebuilt air conditioners, Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA")-compliant restroom modules, rebuilt air brakes, and rebuilt trucks (wheel assemblies).

Amtrak is in the process of refurbishing and reactivating the Amfleet I coaches, as funding permits. In 2008, a total of five coaches have been refurbished, of which two were wreck-damaged. Amtrak plans to bring an additional 12 Amfleet coaches back into service in 2009 and has already budgeted for this expense. However, if additional capital funds are made available, returning stored cars to service would be Amtrak's highest priority. An additional \$85.9 million would permit Amtrak to refurbish all 81 stored vehicles. Cost: \$85,900,000.

- Other Equipment Overhaul: This project would enable Amtrak to refurbish other Amtrak vehicles and facilities. In addition to the Amfleet vehicles discussed above, Amtrak has a variety of other rail cars and equipment that must be refurbished, but Amtrak lacks the funds to do so. Cost: \$58,500,000.

- Amtrak Engineering Projects: These projects would enable Amtrak to finance facility improvement projects that are ready-to-go, but lack funding. These projects include:

- ADA Station Upgrades: Amtrak is obligated to make stations accessible and compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act by July 26, 2010. Although many of the stations that serve the majority of Amtrak's customers offer full or barrier-free access, much work remains at many stations across the country for full compliance. Such work includes improvements to parking, entryways, ticketing, restrooms, boarding platforms, lighting, and signage. Amtrak's progress in meeting the ADA access requirements has been limited in large part because of funding constraints, and the total cost for this

program is estimated to be several hundred million dollars for full compliance. Funding will allow Amtrak to proceed with design and construction for select stations with the highest priority. Cost: \$25,000,000.

- Emergency Back-up Power Systems for Penn Station, 30th Street Station, and Washington Union Terminal: Currently when local electric utility power failures occur, Penn Station (New York, New York), 30th Street Station (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania), Washington Union Terminal (Washington, DC) have insufficient back-up systems for station concourse and platform lighting, elevators and escalators, HVAC systems, passenger ticketing, signaling and switching operations, dispatching operations, and police and security protection. The project will enable Amtrak to install back-up generators, uninterrupted power supply systems, wiring and automatic disconnect switchgear for all three locations. Cost: \$11,000,000.
- 30th Street Station Façade Preservation: 30th Street Station in Philadelphia was built in the early 1930s and is Amtrak's third busiest station. The entire exterior façade of this historical landmark building is constructed of limestone panels which are supported by attachment to brick walls. Over the past 70 years, weather infiltration has caused deterioration and movement of the façade, its attachments, and the brick walls that provide support. To halt further deterioration, prevent damage and safety hazards for Amtrak customers and the general public, and to preserve the integrity of the station building, a phased rehabilitation and repair program needs to be undertaken. Cost: \$40,000,000.
- Ivy City Car Shop Roof Replacement: The Ivy City car shop (Washington, DC) was built in 1984 and serves as the primary car repair and maintenance facility for conventional rolling stock at the south end of the Northeast Corridor. The roof of this large building is beyond its useful life and allows water to leak into the interior working areas, equipment, and office space causing advanced deterioration and poor working conditions for employees. This project will enable Amtrak to replace the roof. Cost \$5,000,000.

D. Aviation

According to the FAA, if additional Federal funds were made available, the types of AIP projects that are ready-to-go include runway or taxiway rehabilitations, extensions, and widening; obstruction removal; apron construction, expansion or rehabilitation; Airport Rescue and Firefighting equipment and facilities; and airside service or public access roads. Identifying specific projects to receive funding would pre-judge the FAA's discretionary grant decisions. However, according to the FAA, a supplemental appropriation of approximately \$600 million, over and above the assumed fiscal year 2009 obligation limitation of \$3.5 billion, could be put to immediate use to fund AIP projects that are ready-to-go.

E. Water Quality Infrastructure

While the demand for Clean Water State Revolving Fund ("CWSRF") funds is increasing, appropriations have declined significantly. This 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). In addition, aging infrastructure must be replaced or repaired. The CWSRF 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.

Additional funds could be put to immediate use in many States, creating much-needed jobs and economic activity. A recent survey by the Council of Infrastructure Financing Authorities and the Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators ("ASIWPCA") identified \$9.12 billion in ready-to-go CWSRF projects in 25 States that cannot be funded within existing appropriation levels. In addition, most wastewater treatment utilities have small capital-related projects on the shelf that could be carried very quickly, such as pumps, compressors, bar screens, trucks, security measures, and polishing pond expansions.

Specific examples, provided by ASIWPCA, are discussed below. These are illustrative of the types of projects States could choose to fund if additional Federal funds are apportioned to the State Revolving Funds.

- Village of Cuba, New York: This project improves a wastewater treatment system. The Village of Cuba is served by a sanitary sewer collection system constructed in the 1920s that utilizes mainly vitrified clay tile piping. The collection system is prone to significant amounts of inflow and infiltration during wet weather. Because of these increases in flow, the Village's wastewater treatment plant frequently exceeds its permitted flow discharge, affecting the water quality of Olean Creek, which supplies the City of Olean, New York, with drinking water. Upgrades to the Village wastewater treatment plant will protect the water quality of Olean Creek and achieve acceptable wastewater treatment for the Town and Village of Cuba. These communities have median household incomes (\$30,000 - \$35,000) that are well below the New York State median household income. Cost: \$2,100,000.
- Westchester County, New York: Westchester County is required, by Order of Consent, to make wastewater treatment and disinfection improvements to its treatment facilities. Westchester County proposes Biological Nitrogen Removal ("BNR") projects at four wastewater treatment facilities that discharge into the Long Island Sound Estuary. These projects are required by the Long Island Sound Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan. Under the Plan, New York must remove 58.5 percent of the effluent nitrogen from each of these facilities to reduce the frequency, intensity and duration of hypoxia in the bottom waters of Long Island Sound. New York State has executed an Order of Consent with the County of Westchester to govern the BNR upgrades for each of these facilities, as well as improvements to their disinfection systems to prevent acute and chronic toxicity in marine water from chlorine. Cost: \$103,000,000.
- North Little Rock, Arkansas: This project improves the White Oak Bayou wastewater treatment plant. North Little Rock has experienced considerable population growth and is seeking to upgrade the White Oak Bayou treatment facility to meet demand. The project will involve increasing the level of treatment and capacity at the White Oak Bayou facility and rehabilitation of the collection system. The project will facilitate the extension of service to new customers. Cost: \$14,000,000.

- Moore Public Works Authority, Moore, Oklahoma: This project improves the existing wastewater treatment facility. The city's current three-million-gallon-per-day wastewater treatment plant was constructed in 1986. The community has experienced rapid population growth within the last few years. To meet existing and future capacity needs as well as recent changes in discharge permit limits for ammonia as required by the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality Consent Order, the city would construct improvements to its existing wastewater treatment plant. The project will replace the Rotating Biological Contractor-type treatment process with a Sequential Batch Reactor process and increase treatment capacity to approximately 9.0 MGD, with 12.0 MGD total build-out capacity at a future date. Cost: \$30,000,000.
- Pueblo Wastewater Department, Pueblo, Colorado: This project improves the water reclamation facility. Pueblo's existing water reclamation facility was only designed for basic secondary treatment plus disinfection and dechlorination. The 2008 discharge permit renewal contains effluent ammonia limits and a compliance schedule for meeting the limits. It is anticipated that a total phosphorous standard will be imposed by a 2010 nutrient quality rule. The project will convert the water reclamation facility from the existing trickling filter/solids contact process to a three-stage activated sludge system for nitrification, first-stage denitrification, and biological phosphorous removal. To construct the new facilities and maintain existing ones, a new site dewatering system will be installed. Cost: \$22,200,000.

F. Corps of Engineers

Due to relatively flat funding for the Army Corps of Engineers' ("Corps") over the last 20 years, there has been an ever increasing backlog of important flood control, navigation, and environmental restoration projects. This backlog has caused project schedules to lengthen and costs to increase due to inflation. The current total for the backlog of projects is estimated to be \$60 billion.

According to the Corps, \$5 billion of additional Corps funding would create 139,000 new jobs. These jobs would include almost 37,000 new, private-sector jobs with an average income for workers in these jobs between \$38,000 and \$42,500. An additional 102,000 new jobs are estimated to be created in industries supplying the construction and O&M activities and the industries that sell goods and services to these new workers and their families.

Additional funds could be used for the following purposes:

- to substantially reduce the backlog of critical maintenance and repairs at approximately 360 multiple purpose projects, flood control, hydropower, recreation, water supply and navigation projects and upgrade recreation facilities;
- to repair several high-risk dam safety projects;
- to rehabilitate and upgrade hydropower plants to achieve an industry standard of 98 percent plant availability;

- to recapitalize the oldest and most at-risk projects on our inland waterways system;
- to 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;
- to 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;
- to 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 for domestic steel plants, coal for power plants and fertilizer, and bulk road construction materials; and
- to repair and upgrade critical coastal protection projects that serve as a defense to key population centers.

G. Public Buildings

According to the General Services Administration ("GSA"), if additional Federal funds were made available, the types of projects that would be ready-to-go include major repair and alteration projects to modernize and upgrade aging Federal buildings nationwide and construction of border stations at both the northern and southern borders of the United States. These projects include critical energy conservation and efficiency initiatives, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing upgrades, and life safety and security projects. Investments in energy conservation and efficiency projects in Federal buildings will significantly lower Federal consumption of electricity.

WITNESSES

PANEL I

The Honorable Jon S. Corzine
Governor
State of New Jersey

The Honorable Jerry E. Abramson
Mayor of Louisville, KY
Former President, U.S. Conference of Mayors

Mr. Gary L. Gallegos
Executive Director
San Diego Association of Governments

The Honorable John Engler
Former Governor of Michigan
President and Chief Executive Officer, National Association of Manufacturers

Dr. John Irons
Research and Policy Director
Economic Policy Institute

PANEL II

The Honorable John D. Porcari
Secretary of Transportation
State of Maryland
On Behalf of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials

Dr. Beverly A. Scott
Chair, American Public Transportation Association
General Manager, Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA)

The Honorable Judith Enck
Deputy Secretary for the Environment
State of New York

Mr. William R. Decota
Director of Aviation
Port Authority of New York and New Jersey

Mr. William L. Crosbie
Chief Operating Officer
National Railroad Passenger Corporation - AMTRAK

Mr. Andrew Herrmann, P.E.
Senior Partner, Hardesty & Hanover, LLP
Member, Board of Directors, American Society for Civil Engineers

Mr. Thomas C. Kiernan
President
National Parks Conservation Association

PANEL III

Mr. Terence M. O'Sullivan
General President
Laborers' International Union of North America

Mr. Doug Black
Chief Executive Officer
Oldcastle Materials, Inc.

Dr. William R. Buechner
Vice President, Economics and Research
American Road and Transportation Builders Association

Mr. Brian Burgett
President and Chief Executive Officer
Kokosing Construction Co., Fredericktown, OH
On Behalf of the Associated General Contractors of America

Mr. Terry Dillon
President
National Utility Contractors Association
Chief Operations Officer of Atlas Excavating, Inc., West Lafayette, IN

Mr. Peter G. Drakos
President
Coastal Connect LLC, Stamford, CT

Mr. Thomas Leyden
Managing Director
SunPower Corporation, Systems
On Behalf of the Solar Energy Industries Association

**Additional Infrastructure Investment Funding Provided by
H.R. 7110, the Job Creation and Unemployment Act of 2008**

Highway and Bridge Investment

State	Total Funding
Alabama	\$244,079,051
Alaska	\$103,936,177
Arizona	\$255,805,535
Arkansas	\$161,494,988
California	\$1,219,803,804
Colorado	\$180,050,950
Connecticut	\$170,675,654
Delaware	\$52,706,365
District of Columbia	\$54,310,321
Florida	\$637,506,760
Georgia	\$456,134,713
Hawaii	\$56,448,561
Idaho	\$94,451,058
Illinois	\$436,846,619
Indiana	\$325,490,477
Iowa	\$153,968,663
Kansas	\$138,349,956
Kentucky	\$199,439,959
Louisiana	\$205,257,556
Maine	\$60,473,997
Maryland	\$208,749,202
Massachusetts	\$220,833,506
Michigan	\$381,674,348
Minnesota	\$208,303,492
Mississippi	\$153,959,952
Missouri	\$300,187,209
Montana	\$121,001,484
Nebraska	\$100,420,358
Nevada	\$94,958,032
New Hampshire	\$59,977,219
New Jersey	\$339,214,682
New Mexico	\$122,617,856
New York	\$590,887,773
North Carolina	\$349,877,680
North Dakota	\$84,823,555
Ohio	\$451,853,828
Oklahoma	\$202,457,379
Oregon	\$152,357,753
Pennsylvania	\$547,005,569
Rhode Island	\$67,289,397
South Carolina	\$209,274,183
South Dakota	\$86,651,396
Tennessee	\$267,388,539
Texas	\$1,055,707,098
Utah	\$96,523,460
Vermont	\$56,491,460
Virginia	\$325,140,335
Washington	\$230,944,035
West Virginia	\$106,182,633
Wisconsin	\$245,873,132
Wyoming	\$86,890,314
American Samoa	\$1,686,862
Guam	\$8,434,312
Northern Marianas	\$1,686,862
Puerto Rico	\$47,009,629
Virgin Islands	\$8,434,312
Total	\$12,800,000,000

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

**Additional Infrastructure Investment Funding Provided by
H.R. 7110, the Job Creation and Unemployment Act of 2008**

Transit Capital Investment

State	Urban Formula	Rural Formula	Total Funding
Alabama	\$14,690,408	\$9,276,694	\$23,967,102
Alaska	\$19,566,214	\$4,723,536	\$24,289,750
Arizona	\$48,063,115	\$6,695,588	\$54,758,703
Arkansas	\$7,335,535	\$7,098,155	\$14,433,690
California	\$559,981,363	\$15,991,442	\$575,972,805
Colorado	\$48,001,157	\$6,025,513	\$54,026,670
Connecticut	\$38,899,446	\$1,870,636	\$40,770,082
Delaware	\$6,148,995	\$855,047	\$7,004,042
District of Columbia	\$66,319,586	\$0	\$66,319,586
Florida	\$165,249,727	\$9,272,175	\$174,521,902
Georgia	\$62,761,256	\$11,568,073	\$74,329,329
Hawaii	\$23,759,124	\$1,361,624	\$25,120,748
Idaho	\$5,279,039	\$4,247,355	\$9,526,394
Illinois	\$205,453,032	\$9,922,772	\$215,375,804
Indiana	\$32,647,415	\$9,428,310	\$42,075,725
Iowa	\$11,959,772	\$7,189,618	\$19,149,390
Kansas	\$9,167,689	\$6,761,478	\$15,929,167
Kentucky	\$17,284,703	\$8,920,702	\$26,205,405
Louisiana	\$27,755,478	\$7,261,529	\$35,017,007
Maine	\$2,885,773	\$3,845,063	\$6,730,836
Maryland	\$66,692,302	\$3,415,471	\$70,107,773
Massachusetts	\$112,286,562	\$2,423,978	\$114,710,540
Michigan	\$61,763,612	\$12,136,500	\$73,900,112
Minnesota	\$42,311,164	\$8,983,964	\$51,295,128
Mississippi	\$4,566,128	\$8,106,468	\$12,672,596
Missouri	\$34,768,503	\$9,718,556	\$44,487,059
Montana	\$2,433,177	\$5,723,928	\$8,157,105
Nebraska	\$7,516,083	\$4,797,629	\$12,313,712
Nevada	\$23,755,834	\$3,724,631	\$27,480,465
New Hampshire	\$4,382,927	\$2,410,529	\$6,793,456
New Jersey	\$201,095,181	\$2,241,913	\$203,337,094
New Mexico	\$8,663,895	\$6,050,972	\$14,714,867
New York	\$502,626,325	\$12,248,503	\$514,874,828
North Carolina	\$39,068,312	\$14,930,223	\$53,998,535
North Dakota	\$2,880,669	\$3,016,938	\$5,897,607
Ohio	\$79,363,647	\$13,931,404	\$93,295,051
Oklahoma	\$12,166,358	\$7,999,056	\$20,165,414
Oregon	\$34,960,935	\$6,993,486	\$41,954,421
Pennsylvania	\$135,622,447	\$14,109,630	\$149,732,077
Rhode Island	\$9,791,463	\$403,303	\$10,194,766
South Carolina	\$13,295,677	\$7,585,159	\$20,880,836
South Dakota	\$2,213,278	\$3,665,645	\$5,878,923
Tennessee	\$26,726,149	\$9,732,396	\$36,458,545
Texas	\$180,354,672	\$23,081,315	\$203,435,987
Utah	\$28,870,957	\$3,565,665	\$32,436,622
Vermont	\$983,812	\$1,845,420	\$2,829,232
Virginia	\$770,582	\$8,533,064	\$9,303,646
Washington	\$91,444,038	\$6,708,450	\$98,152,488
West Virginia	\$4,664,981	\$4,744,294	\$9,409,275
Wisconsin	\$35,098,250	\$9,417,567	\$44,515,817
Wyoming	\$1,302,316	\$3,568,683	\$4,870,999
American Samoa	\$0	\$186,167	\$186,167
Guam	\$0	\$503,201	\$503,201
Northern Marianas	\$637,164	\$28,659	\$665,823
Puerto Rico	\$41,554,175	\$1,151,923	\$42,706,098
Virgin Islands	\$52,159,598	\$0	\$52,159,598
Total	\$3,240,000,000	\$360,000,000	\$3,600,000,000

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

**Additional Infrastructure Investment Funding Provided by
H.R. 7110, the Job Creation and Unemployment Act of 2008**

Transit Energy Investment

State	Urban Formula	Rural Formula	Total Funding
Alabama	\$3,627,261	\$5,153,719	\$8,780,980
Alaska	\$4,831,164	\$2,624,186	\$7,455,350
Arizona	\$11,867,436	\$3,719,771	\$15,587,207
Arkansas	\$1,811,243	\$3,943,419	\$5,754,662
California	\$138,267,003	\$8,884,135	\$147,151,138
Colorado	\$11,852,137	\$3,347,507	\$15,199,644
Connecticut	\$9,604,801	\$1,039,242	\$10,644,043
Delaware	\$1,518,270	\$475,026	\$1,993,296
District of Columbia	\$16,375,206	\$0	\$16,375,206
Florida	\$40,802,402	\$5,151,208	\$45,953,610
Georgia	\$15,496,606	\$6,426,707	\$21,923,313
Hawaii	\$5,866,450	\$756,458	\$6,622,908
Idaho	\$1,303,466	\$2,359,642	\$3,663,108
Illinois	\$50,729,144	\$5,512,651	\$56,241,795
Indiana	\$8,061,090	\$5,237,950	\$13,299,040
Iowa	\$2,953,030	\$3,994,232	\$6,947,262
Kansas	\$2,263,627	\$3,756,376	\$6,020,003
Kentucky	\$4,267,828	\$4,955,946	\$9,223,774
Louisiana	\$6,853,204	\$4,034,183	\$10,887,387
Maine	\$712,537	\$2,136,146	\$2,848,683
Maryland	\$16,467,235	\$1,897,484	\$18,364,719
Massachusetts	\$27,725,077	\$1,346,655	\$29,071,732
Michigan	\$15,250,275	\$6,742,500	\$21,992,775
Minnesota	\$10,447,201	\$4,991,091	\$15,438,292
Mississippi	\$1,127,439	\$4,503,593	\$5,631,032
Missouri	\$8,584,816	\$5,399,198	\$13,984,014
Montana	\$600,784	\$3,179,960	\$3,780,744
Nebraska	\$1,855,823	\$2,665,349	\$4,521,172
Nevada	\$5,865,638	\$2,069,239	\$7,934,877
New Hampshire	\$1,082,204	\$1,339,183	\$2,421,387
New Jersey	\$49,653,131	\$1,245,507	\$50,898,638
New Mexico	\$2,139,233	\$3,361,651	\$5,500,884
New York	\$124,105,270	\$6,804,724	\$130,909,994
North Carolina	\$9,646,497	\$8,294,568	\$17,941,065
North Dakota	\$711,276	\$1,676,077	\$2,387,353
Ohio	\$19,595,962	\$7,739,669	\$27,335,631
Oklahoma	\$3,004,039	\$4,443,920	\$7,447,959
Oregon	\$8,632,330	\$3,885,270	\$12,517,600
Pennsylvania	\$33,487,024	\$7,838,683	\$41,325,707
Rhode Island	\$2,417,645	\$224,057	\$2,641,702
South Carolina	\$3,282,883	\$4,213,977	\$7,496,860
South Dakota	\$546,488	\$2,036,469	\$2,582,957
Tennessee	\$6,599,049	\$5,406,887	\$12,005,936
Texas	\$44,532,018	\$12,822,956	\$57,354,974
Utah	\$7,128,631	\$1,980,925	\$9,109,556
Vermont	\$242,917	\$1,025,233	\$1,268,150
Virginia	\$12,878,913	\$4,740,591	\$17,619,504
Washington	\$22,578,775	\$3,726,917	\$26,305,692
West Virginia	\$1,151,847	\$2,635,719	\$3,787,566
Wisconsin	\$8,666,234	\$5,231,981	\$13,898,215
Wyoming	\$321,560	\$1,982,602	\$2,304,162
American Samoa	\$0	\$103,426	\$103,426
Guam	\$0	\$279,556	\$279,556
Northern Marianas	\$157,324	\$15,922	\$173,246
Puerto Rico	\$10,260,290	\$639,957	\$10,900,247
Virgin Islands	\$190,267	\$0	\$190,267
Total	\$800,000,000	\$200,000,000	\$1,000,000,000

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

Additional Infrastructure Investment Funding Provided by
H.R. 7110, the Job Creation and Unemployment Act of 2008

Clean Water State Revolving Fund Investment

State	Total Funding
Alabama	\$71,776,891
Alaska	\$38,417,497
Arizona	\$43,355,169
Arkansas	\$41,992,397
California	\$459,076,729
Colorado	\$51,341,648
Connecticut	\$78,635,121
Delaware	\$31,514,898
District of Columbia	\$31,514,898
Florida	\$216,668,091
Georgia	\$108,527,369
Hawaii	\$49,712,659
Idaho	\$31,514,898
Illinois	\$290,302,155
Indiana	\$154,696,821
Iowa	\$86,875,138
Kansas	\$57,940,000
Kentucky	\$81,696,604
Louisiana	\$70,559,904
Maine	\$49,687,306
Maryland	\$155,241,930
Massachusetts	\$217,935,786
Michigan	\$275,996,217
Minnesota	\$117,978,035
Mississippi	\$57,832,246
Missouri	\$177,940,009
Montana	\$31,514,898
Nebraska	\$32,833,301
Nevada	\$31,514,898
New Hampshire	\$64,145,367
New Jersey	\$262,305,111
New Mexico	\$31,514,898
New York	\$708,495,720
North Carolina	\$115,848,308
North Dakota	\$31,514,898
Ohio	\$361,356,460
Oklahoma	\$51,861,402
Oregon	\$72,512,154
Pennsylvania	\$254,261,586
Rhode Island	\$43,101,630
South Carolina	\$65,755,340
South Dakota	\$31,514,898
Tennessee	\$93,245,306
Texas	\$293,382,654
Utah	\$33,822,103
Vermont	\$31,514,898
Virginia	\$131,364,894
Washington	\$111,626,883
West Virginia	\$100,065,505
Wisconsin	\$173,528,430
Wyoming	\$31,514,898
American Samoa	\$5,761,674
Guam	\$4,170,717
Northern Marianas	\$2,674,836
Puerto Rico	\$83,718,578
Virgin Islands	\$3,346,715
Indian Tribes	\$96,525,000
Total	\$6,500,000,000

*Prepared by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure staff.

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

(With 47 State DOTs Reporting)

State	Number of Projects	Dollar Value (in Millions)
Alabama	128	\$671.1
Alaska	7	\$92.6
Arizona	39	\$790.0
Arkansas	107	\$728.3
California	28	\$800.0
Colorado	52	\$395.1
Connecticut	20	\$728.5
DC	1	\$50.0
Delaware		
Florida	5	\$675.0
Georgia	32	\$397.3
Hawaii	6	\$42.0
Idaho	11	\$174.8
Illinois	212	\$831.4
Indiana		
Iowa	40	\$152.0
Kansas	126	\$68.0
Kentucky	4	\$200.0
Louisiana	208	\$351.4
Maine	15	\$94.1
Maryland	32	\$94.6
Massachusetts	59	\$181.5
Michigan	43	\$257.0
Minnesota	30	\$217.8
Mississippi	33	\$176.2
Missouri	127	\$546.6
Montana	70	\$116.0
Nebraska	5	\$20.0
Nevada	4	\$120.0
New Hampshire	11	\$81.3
New Jersey	7	\$50.8
New Mexico	77	\$1,400.0
New York	40	\$200.0
North Carolina	44	\$231.4
North Dakota	90	\$71.0
Ohio	114	\$299.3
Oklahoma	73	\$146.4
Oregon	50	\$251.2
Pennsylvania	524	\$1,300.0
Rhode Island	41	\$102.0
South Carolina	58	\$510.0
South Dakota	142	\$181.0
Tennessee	74	\$184.1
Texas	44	\$1,800.0
Utah	84	\$425.1
Vermont	11	\$62.6
Virginia	1	\$101.9
Washington		
West Virginia	67	\$1,200.0
Wisconsin	20	\$35.0
Wyoming	55	\$287.2
Total	3071	\$17,891.6