



Federal Funding 201

*How the Money Gets Spent:
Obligation and Obligation Authority/Limitations*

Safe Routes to School National Partnership



Housekeeping

- If you called in, your phone line is muted
- Chat feature in bottom left side of your screen
- Q&A after speakers: Chat your questions to us
- Recording and slides online in one week at:
saferoutespartnership.org/resourcecenter/National-Partnership-Webinars
- If you need technical help with this iLinc tool, please
call 1-800-799-4510.





Robert Ping

Technical Assistance Director

- ✦ Technical Assistance – CPPW, CTG, TARC, National Learning Network, fee-based TA
- ✦ State and Regional Network Projects - Policy Change in 20 States and Five Metropolitan Regions
- ✦ Congressional SRTS Task Force
- ✦ Portland SRTS Program Manager
- ✦ Oregon SRTS Technical Assistance
- ✦ Bicycle Safety Education - Oregon and CA Bay Area
- ✦ SF Bay Area: Policy, Bicycle Advocacy, Earn-a-Bike, Youth Mentoring, Youth Education, Environmental Advocacy, Diversity/Lower-Income focus
- ✦ Various committees: School Siting, Diversity, Childhood Obesity, National Physical Activity Plan, National Bicycle Education Network, Portland SRTS





Safe Routes to School National Partnership



**SAFE ROUTES
to School**
NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP



- Founded in 2005
- Over 600 organizations, agencies and schools
- Works to advance policies that support Safe Routes to School at national, state and local levels
- Provides best practices, technical assistance, policy change, and builds leadership

saferoutespartnership.org



Federal Transportation Funding: 101

- Safe Routes to School National Partnership

www.saferoutespartnership.org

- Transportation Enhancements Clearinghouse:

www.enhancements.org





Federal-Aid Funding

- Infrastructure projects must be programmed in a metropolitan planning organization's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)





Federal-Aid Funding

- Project agreement between DOT and local agency
- Authorization to proceed required prior to incurring costs
- Competitive bidding and other contracting requirements





Federal-Aid Funding

❶ NEPA Review Process for Infrastructure

Most SRTS projects qualify for Categorical Exclusion (Environmental Assessment report not needed). All environmental coordination, approvals and permit requirements still apply.

❷ Infrastructure project designed in accordance with Federal standards, policies and specifications





Potential Project Potholes

❶ Unrealistic Cost Estimates

⚡ Right of Way

⚡ Environmental issues

⚡ Railroad

⚡ Incompatible in-kind match

⚡ Expectation of use of local workforce or
volunteer labor





LOCAL AGENCY PROJECT DELIVERY LIFECYCLE

PROGRAM
DEVELOPMENT

START

Transportation
Planning
MPO
Local TSP

Management
Systems
Analysis

Identify
Potential
Projects

Draft Scope,
Schedule,
Cost Estimate -
Draft STIP
MTIP TSP

Prospectus

Project
Selection
- Final STIP

Project
Initiation

FHWA
Obligates
PE Funds

Survey, Maps,
Engineering &
Environmental
Reports

Design
Acceptance
Phase

NEPA
Clearance

FHWA
Obligates
R/W Funds

Financial Plan and Program Management
Public Input and Involvement
Reviews

Intergovernmental Agreements

Reviews

FINISH

Project
In-Service

Acceptance
of Project

On-Site Work
Completed

On-Site Work
Begins

Before
On-Site Work
Begins

Award
Contract

Advertise & Bid
Opening for
Design/Bid/Build

FHWA
Obligates
Construction
Funds

Plans,
Specifications
&
Estimates for
Construction

Final Plans &
Special
Provisions
for Construction
to OPL

Preliminary
Plans for
Construction
Initiation of
QC/QA

Permits

CONSTRUCTION
MANAGEMENT

AWARD CONSTRUCTION
CONTRACT

PROJECT
DEVELOPMENT



Let Your DOT Staff Be Your Guide



Safe Routes to School Federal Program - State of the States

As of March 31, 2012

This chart details each state's progress on implementing the federal Safe Routes to School program. All dollar figures cited are as of March 31, 2012.

- State SRTS Coordinators are required within each State DOT. State Coordinators administer the program and provide leadership to SRTS.
- State Advisory Committee, which are not required by law, often help craft the application process, promote the program to communities, and review grant applications to ensure a responsible and effective use of the federal funds.
- Announced columns measure the amount of funding each state has announced for local grants and statewide spending—not including administrative expenses. These are the funds that will ultimately help local communities create safer routes to school.
- Obligated columns reflect the amount that the state has expended or contracted to expend on Safe Routes to School, including local grants, statewide spending, and administrative expenses. Obligation is important as it demonstrates what level of funding has been or will soon be spent to date to build infrastructure projects, support non-infrastructure activities, and implement the program.

State	SRTS State Coordinator in Place?	Advisory Committee	Funding Available (FY05-Mar FY12)*	Total announced**	Percent Announced	Change in amount announced since prior quarter	Total obligated*	Percent Obligated	Change in amount obligated since prior quarter
ALABAMA	Yes	Yes	\$16,031,114	\$14,286,240	89%	\$0	\$10,307,697	64%	\$3,078,913
ALASKA	Yes	No	\$8,011,447	\$2,669,717	33%	\$1,531,596	\$4,990,000	62%	\$0
ARIZONA	Yes	Yes	\$20,327,361	\$12,479,000	61%	\$0	\$5,834,940	29%	\$452,378
ARKANSAS	Yes	Yes	\$10,228,027	\$6,774,235	66%	\$1,500,000	\$5,889,999	58%	\$232,829
CALIFORNIA	Yes	Yes	\$126,614,749	\$157,514,967	124%	\$0	\$60,248,825	48%	\$4,760,723
COLORADO	Yes	Yes	\$15,636,964	\$12,492,533	80%	\$2,650,000	\$7,549,769	48%	\$103,978
CONNECTICUT	Yes	Yes	\$12,180,870	\$5,767,324	47%	\$0	\$4,852,499	40%	\$277,000
DELAWARE	Yes	Yes	\$7,678,540	\$3,223,667	42%	\$50,881	\$4,980,621	65%	\$68,782
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	Yes	Yes	\$7,673,717	\$4,010,209	52%	\$0	\$4,392,500	57%	\$0
FLORIDA	Yes	No	\$53,699,629	\$86,361,408	161%	\$121,044	\$44,524,264	83%	\$2,535,213
GEORGIA	Yes	Yes	\$31,483,174	\$20,059,080	64%	\$0	\$10,389,435	33%	\$0
HAWAII	Yes	No	\$7,655,878	\$922,580	12%	\$373,447	\$2,046,624	27%	\$198,900
IDAHO	Yes	Yes	\$7,566,892	\$5,125,770	68%	\$0	\$4,828,593	64%	\$308,765
ILLINOIS	Interim	Yes	\$43,483,761	\$43,832,069	101%	\$21,792,998	\$11,542,824	27%	\$1,602,015
INDIANA	Yes	Yes	\$21,622,589	\$18,633,885	86%	\$0	\$5,468,561	25%	\$272,352
IOWA	Yes	Yes	\$10,629,022	\$9,925,661	93%	\$1,262,885	\$7,020,016	66%	\$85,852
KANSAS	Yes	Yes	\$10,262,665	\$8,611,074	84%	\$0	\$4,929,052	48%	(\$35,139)
KENTUCKY	Yes	Yes	\$13,966,431	\$11,057,692	79%	\$1,531,527	\$5,706,509	41%	\$96,995
LOUISIANA	Yes	Yes	\$15,789,571	\$10,960,261	69%	\$0	\$6,861,732	43%	\$174,720
MAINE	Interim	Yes	\$7,719,833	\$5,568,594	72%	\$199,094	\$3,184,798	41%	\$204,704
MARYLAND	Yes	Yes	\$18,442,052	\$16,972,302	92%	\$0	\$14,219,214	77%	\$0
MASSACHUSETTS	Yes	Yes	\$20,147,171	\$6,517,020	32%	\$1,424,022	\$11,697,753	58%	\$314,993
MICHIGAN	Yes	Yes	\$34,119,716	\$27,294,725	80%	\$3,158,823	\$21,672,148	64%	\$1,262,108



Find It At: saferoutespartnership.org/state/federal_funding_for_states

State	SRTS State Coordinator in Place?	Advisory Committee	Funding Available (FY05-Mar FY12)*	Total announced***	Percent Announced	Change in amount announced since prior quarter	Total obligated*	Percent Obligated	Change in amount obligated since prior quarter
MINNESOTA	Yes	Yes	\$17,216,121	\$15,206,670	88%	\$0	\$7,055,087	41%	\$374,436
MISSISSIPPI	Yes	Yes	\$11,370,615	\$9,344,660	82%	\$479,191	\$4,232,705	37%	\$750,052
MISSOURI	Yes	Yes	\$19,449,511	\$17,830,549	92%	\$0	\$9,330,202	48%	\$1,331,396
MONTANA	Yes	Yes	\$7,689,445	\$5,953,379	77%	\$1,729,827	\$4,698,825	61%	\$54,526
NEBRASKA	Yes	Yes	\$7,679,400	\$5,249,704	68%	\$252,530	\$3,549,289	46%	\$419,651
NEVADA	Yes	Yes	\$9,703,736	\$2,209,127	23%	\$0	\$5,484,183	57%	\$0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Yes	Yes	\$7,540,683	\$5,227,898	69%	\$0	\$2,260,540	30%	\$213,001
NEW JERSEY	Yes	Yes	\$28,929,259	\$15,195,900	53%	\$0	\$10,595,427	37%	\$321,161
NEW MEXICO	Yes	Yes	\$7,996,947	\$3,710,787	46%	\$0	\$2,936,894	37%	(\$608)
NEW YORK	Yes	No	\$58,227,267	\$27,956,276	48%	\$0	\$21,121,586	36%	\$386,686
NORTH CAROLINA	Yes	No	\$28,342,591	\$10,205,335	36%	\$481,141	\$7,366,167	26%	\$853,709
NORTH DAKOTA	Yes	Yes	\$7,607,961	\$6,744,540	89%	\$1,203,678	\$4,685,353	62%	\$290,545
OHIO	Yes	Yes	\$37,351,693	\$33,920,000	91%	\$0	\$11,943,876	32%	\$582,834
OKLAHOMA	Yes	Yes	\$12,701,475	\$6,454,970	51%	\$0	\$6,086,300	48%	\$0
OREGON	Yes	Yes	\$12,100,739	\$12,653,513	105%	\$0	\$7,954,585	66%	\$786,045
PENNSYLVANIA	Yes	Yes	\$38,117,174	\$21,079,402	55%	\$66,066	\$7,456,718	20%	\$624,445
RHODE ISLAND	Yes	Yes	\$7,730,047	\$4,650,000	60%	\$50,000	\$2,776,078	36%	\$12,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	Yes	Yes	\$14,370,354	\$5,152,000	36%	\$0	\$7,218,918	50%	\$0
SOUTH DAKOTA	Interim	Yes	\$7,668,404	\$3,317,615	43%	\$0	\$2,211,202	29%	\$81,112
TENNESSEE	Yes	Yes	\$19,664,832	\$10,980,530	56%	\$2,144,278	\$6,248,627	32%	\$439,649
TEXAS	Yes	Yes	\$82,962,514	\$79,901,883	96%	\$0	\$38,243,028	46%	\$2,353,179
UTAH	Yes	Yes	\$10,697,991	\$10,692,292	100%	\$0	\$8,860,620	83%	\$241,724
VERMONT	Yes	Yes	\$7,894,119	\$5,465,338	69%	\$0	\$4,429,992	56%	\$226
VIRGINIA	Yes	Yes	\$24,448,735	\$18,077,842	74%	\$6,018,950	\$15,377,393	63%	\$550,440
WASHINGTON	Yes	Yes	\$20,799,509	\$21,133,086	102%	\$0	\$10,848,490	52%	\$1,476,342
WEST VIRGINIA	Yes	Yes	\$7,623,907	\$6,769,087	89%	\$0	\$5,463,204	72%	\$1,501
WISCONSIN	Yes	Yes	\$18,092,564	\$13,617,768	75%	\$0	\$11,112,297	61%	\$207,794
WYOMING	Yes	Yes	\$7,540,765	\$7,605,095	101%	\$997,599	\$6,210,911	82%	\$113,909
TOTAL ***			\$1,062,489,531	\$812,504,273	76%	\$49,019,577	\$498,896,869	47%	\$28,461,834



Find It At: www.enhancements.org/download/Spending_Report/TE_Spending_Report_FY11.pdf

FY 1992 - FY 2011

Transportation Enhancements Spending Report



MAY 2012
Prepared by
National Transportation
Enhancements Clearinghouse

This report supersedes all previously published editions

Table 1: State TE Program Benchmarks for FY 1992 through FY 2011 (in thousands of \$)

State	Apportioned		Rescinded		Available		Programmed		Obligated			Reimbursed	
	FY 92-11	FY 92-11	Rate	FY 92-11	Rate	FY 92-11	Rate	FY 92-11	Apport.	Avail.	FY 92-11	Rate	
Alabama	\$272,143	-\$78,848	-29%	\$194,680	72%	\$193,863	71%	\$194,294	71%	100%	\$167,533	86%	
Alaska	\$169,104	-\$26,066	-15%	\$139,998	83%	\$126,161	75%	\$139,998	83%	100%	\$135,222	97%	
Arizona	\$247,240	-\$22,306	-9%	\$227,720	92%	\$189,082	76%	\$197,657	80%	87%	\$157,253	80%	
Arkansas	\$182,097	-\$62,609	-34%	\$116,585	64%	\$109,456	60%	\$103,893	57%	89%	\$98,713	95%	
California	\$1,194,696	-\$282,141	-24%	\$903,829	76%	\$1,035,689	87%	\$860,070	72%	95%	\$751,728	87%	
Colorado	\$191,860	-\$43,574	-23%	\$156,581	82%	\$144,857	76%	\$135,118	70%	86%	\$123,719	92%	
Connecticut	\$176,814	-\$53,502	-30%	\$119,696	68%	\$122,014	69%	\$116,168	66%	97%	\$103,885	89%	
Delaware	\$66,302	-\$2,000	-3%	\$64,844	98%	\$48,799	74%	\$62,051	94%	96%	\$55,677	90%	
Dist. Of Col.	\$56,257	-\$17,966	-32%	\$39,798	71%	\$39,798	71%	\$38,447	68%	97%	\$27,910	73%	
Florida	\$744,611	-\$135,224	-18%	\$628,124	84%	\$556,220	75%	\$619,706	83%	99%	\$501,240	81%	
Georgia	\$508,439	-\$142,533	-28%	\$371,813	73%	\$351,841	69%	\$288,551	57%	78%	\$257,916	89%	
Hawaii	\$88,629	-\$11,141	-13%	\$78,587	89%	\$56,699	64%	\$68,712	78%	87%	\$53,288	78%	
Idaho	\$98,989	-\$34,960	-35%	\$59,619	60%	\$56,762	57%	\$59,612	60%	100%	\$57,061	96%	
Illinois	\$490,304	-\$76,744	-16%	\$440,997	90%	\$409,724	84%	\$290,317	59%	66%	\$263,069	91%	
Indiana	\$353,121	-\$24,356	-7%	\$340,852	97%	\$296,836	84%	\$298,240	84%	87%	\$266,865	89%	
Iowa	\$175,854	-\$16,916	-10%	\$168,856	96%	\$127,757	121%	\$156,625	89%	93%	\$137,134	88%	
Kansas	\$174,894	-\$12,738	-7%	\$169,447	97%	\$163,045	93%	\$146,816	84%	87%	\$141,686	97%	
Kentucky	\$220,327	-\$28,318	-13%	\$207,141	94%	\$196,429	89%	\$160,640	73%	78%	\$148,858	93%	
Louisiana	\$198,207	-\$72,393	-37%	\$117,995	60%	\$190,264	96%	\$114,084	58%	97%	\$90,155	79%	
Maine	\$66,883	-\$9,877	-15%	\$56,457	84%	\$65,683	98%	\$55,489	83%	98%	\$50,129	90%	
Maryland	\$199,693	-\$18,036	-9%	\$179,953	90%	\$203,788	102%	\$141,960	71%	79%	\$129,634	91%	
Massachusetts	\$208,639	-\$51,701	-25%	\$157,150	75%	\$94,112	45%	\$77,836	37%	50%	\$52,310	67%	
Michigan	\$428,945	-\$100,358	-23%	\$344,744	80%	\$336,002	78%	\$328,149	77%	95%	\$308,345	94%	
Minnesota	\$258,648	-\$29,896	-12%	\$204,740	79%	\$265,152	103%	\$219,651	85%	107%	\$198,493	90%	
Mississippi	\$174,450	-\$15,584	-9%	\$166,638	96%	\$144,585	83%	\$132,617	76%	80%	\$112,200	85%	
Missouri	\$304,884	-\$29,885	-10%	\$279,857	92%	\$242,564	80%	\$224,932	74%	80%	\$195,632	87%	
Montana	\$111,638	-\$17,551	-16%	\$95,089	85%	\$81,651	73%	\$81,740	73%	86%	\$72,333	88%	
Nebraska	\$120,675	-\$46,530	-39%	\$74,110	61%	\$101,112	84%	\$72,003	60%	97%	\$63,762	89%	
Nevada	\$102,394	-\$37,837	-37%	\$67,293	66%	\$78,046	76%	\$67,089	66%	100%	\$62,143	93%	
New Hampshire	\$68,869	-\$6,019	-9%	\$65,620	95%	\$83,299	121%	\$56,618	82%	86%	\$53,747	95%	
New Jersey	\$288,053	-\$59,582	-21%	\$216,153	75%	\$134,903	47%	\$171,259	59%	79%	\$145,840	85%	
New Mexico	\$133,292	-\$33,920	-25%	\$100,371	75%	\$150,126	113%	\$93,149	70%	93%	\$81,461	87%	
New York	\$504,371	-\$99,714	-20%	\$427,100	85%	\$407,763	81%	\$324,931	64%	76%	\$258,710	80%	
North Carolina	\$386,346	-\$100,446	-26%	\$309,474	80%	\$261,302	68%	\$277,021	72%	90%	\$246,386	89%	
North Dakota	\$86,129	-\$20,010	-23%	\$67,804	79%	\$59,762	69%	\$67,111	78%	99%	\$64,111	96%	
Ohio	\$455,629	-\$71,636	-16%	\$350,920	77%	\$354,210	78%	\$323,793	71%	92%	\$296,778	92%	
Oklahoma	\$234,182	-\$86,611	-37%	\$152,772	65%	\$147,284	63%	\$146,445	63%	96%	\$133,243	91%	
Oregon	\$157,946	-\$50,869	-32%	\$109,552	69%	\$124,211	79%	\$100,529	64%	92%	\$88,115	88%	
Pennsylvania	\$410,035	-\$41,070	-10%	\$384,051	94%	\$436,681	106%	\$361,487	88%	94%	\$328,014	91%	
Rhode Island	\$61,793	-\$2,784	-5%	\$59,940	97%	\$56,406	91%	\$56,830	92%	95%	\$52,218	92%	
South Carolina	\$241,999	-\$68,533	-28%	\$171,134	71%	\$109,899	45%	\$154,997	64%	91%	\$141,396	91%	
South Dakota	\$97,968	-\$49,642	-51%	\$47,821	49%	\$44,879	46%	\$47,707	49%	100%	\$44,890	94%	
Tennessee	\$295,073	-\$66,631	-23%	\$245,690	83%	\$247,345	84%	\$196,058	66%	80%	\$165,474	84%	
Texas	\$1,164,860	-\$428,419	-37%	\$699,191	60%	\$656,165	56%	\$570,527	49%	82%	\$484,171	85%	
Utah	\$103,402	-\$12,957	-13%	\$95,703	93%	\$77,481	75%	\$87,945	85%	92%	\$83,886	95%	
Vermont	\$61,571	-\$3,337	-5%	\$60,489	98%	\$59,895	97%	\$48,833	79%	81%	\$42,967	88%	
Virginia	\$335,847	-\$35,489	-11%	\$296,986	88%	\$302,861	90%	\$273,559	81%	92%	\$175,258	64%	
Washington	\$216,785	-\$41,476	-19%	\$152,279	70%	\$146,622	99%	\$166,779	77%	110%	\$149,701	90%	
West Virginia	\$105,857	-\$6,748	-6%	\$100,118	95%	\$94,924	90%	\$98,501	93%	98%	\$70,426	71%	
Wisconsin	\$312,526	-\$161,741	-52%	\$155,997	50%	\$187,794	60%	\$152,471	49%	98%	\$135,207	89%	
Wyoming	\$70,226	-\$974	-1%	\$70,184	100%	\$54,698	78%	\$66,701	95%	95%	\$61,924	93%	
Total to States	\$13,395,018	-\$2,950,199	-22%	\$10,512,543	78%	\$10,378,936	77%	\$9,295,717	69%	88%	\$8,087,817	87%	

* Denominator is Apportioned.
† Minnesota and Washington figures have been adjusted for STP Pilot.
‡ Reimbursement rates are calculated from obligated funds.