



*AMERICAN
PUBLIC
TRANSPORTATION
ASSOCIATION*

An Analysis of Proposed U.S. House of Representatives Actions and Their Impact on Public Transportation

September 20, 2011

**APTA
1666 K St. NW
Washington, DC 20006
www.apta.com**

Executive Summary

Actions in the U.S. House of Representatives would reduce public transportation investment by more than 30 percent and eliminate funds for high-speed rail.

On September 8 the House Transportation and Housing and Urban Development (THUD) Appropriations Subcommittee reported out of committee an FY 2012 THUD Appropriations bill that included a 38% cut in federal funding for public transportation. Also, on July 7 the leadership of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee outlined a proposal that would cut more than a third in federal funding for public transportation for the entire duration of the six year authorization of the transportation bill. Problems are exacerbated by a federal Highway Trust Fund which is unable to sustain FY 2011 funding levels without new trust-fund revenues or other support.

The September 8 action by the House THUD Subcommittee would severely cut funding for Amtrak, and includes no funding for high-speed and intercity rail corridor initiatives. On June 15, leadership of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee rolled out a new direction for high-speed and intercity passenger rail, calling for reduced federal funding.

This analysis reveals the significant impacts on transit capital replacement, ability to meet state-of-good repair schedules (estimated by the Federal Transit Administration at \$77 billion) and ability to provide service to communities across the nation. Over a six-year authorization period, 620,000 private and public sector jobs would be lost, and \$17.2 billion in transportation projects would be foregone. Such estimates are conservative, and do not factor in the additional impact of local matching funds.

A survey of APTA members was conducted in July and many transit systems and businesses have indicated that the jolt of such a cutback, with many transit systems and local governments already operating on very thin margins, would cause the possibility of drastic cutbacks in service. As we look beyond the next fiscal year this paper examines the dollar impact of the federal funding cut as well as the responses from specific agencies about the effect such a drastic cut over a six-year period will have on their ability to provide safe and reliable service for communities and their citizens.

Cuts Would Eliminate 620,000 Jobs Over Six Years

Economist Glenn Weisbrod of the Economic Development Research Group has estimated that 36,000 jobs are created and supported per \$1 billion of public transportation spending. A cut of over \$17.2 billion over six years would result in nearly 620,000 lost jobs in the public and private sectors. It should be noted that the majority of these jobs are in the private sector. That includes jobs involving public transportation manufacturing, construction, and operations, jobs at suppliers of transit parts and services, and jobs supported when transportation sector workers spend their wages on goods and services.

More Waiting, More Crowding for Public Transit Riders

The proposed federal funding cuts would result in transit agencies purchasing 12,000 fewer buses; 6,000 fewer small vehicles (most for paratransit); and 2,000 fewer rail vehicles during the six year authorization period. In the first year alone, 2,000 fewer buses and 380 fewer rail vehicles would be made in the USA. Renewal of the transit vehicle fleet is essential for

agencies to maintain a state of good repair. Older vehicles break down more often, leading to longer waits for transit customers, and more crowded vehicles when they do arrive.

These cuts could also be devastating to America's private sector transit manufacturing industry. Current "Made in America" legislation means that these vehicles are assembled and a large portion of their components are manufactured in the U.S.

Less Service, Fewer Options for Americans

The proposed federal funding cuts would have an impact on public transit agencies' ability to operate transit service, leading to service cuts for many people who depend on public transit to get around. In small urbanized areas with populations less than 200,000, federal revenue was over one-quarter of all operating expenses. A one-third cut to that revenue would mean a reduction of service in places with limited public transit options already. This would include service cutbacks, elimination of routes, and reduced frequency of service.

In communities across the country, plans to expand services would be jeopardy as a result of this proposal. A total of 46 major expansion projects in 18 states, projects that would provide transportation into the next century, could be reduced and underfunded. This could extend a project schedule, reduce the scope of a project or eliminate it.

Now is Not the Time to Cut Critical Public Transportation Funding

With public transportation agencies already facing budget pressures, the proposed one-third cut in federal public transportation spending would place even more strain on transit agencies. Hundreds of thousands of jobs would be lost, both at public agencies as well as the private sector businesses in the transit industry and beyond. Thousands of transit vehicles would not be purchased by agencies, and the vehicles that remained in service would be less well maintained and more likely to break down. The effects of this proposal would mean more waiting, less service, fewer options for public transportation riders nationwide and fewer jobs for America.

Introduction: House Proposes Over One-Third Percent Cut in Federal Transit Program Resulting in Estimated Six-Year Loss of \$17.2 Billion in Federal Funds and 620,000 Jobs

Proposed actions in the U.S. House of Representatives would significantly reduce public transportation funding. In April, the House of Representatives passed a FY 2012 budget resolution (H. Con Res. 34) which assumes that a multi-year transportation authorization bill would need to be funded with existing trust fund revenues or general fund increases that would need to be offset by cuts in other domestic programs. Consistent with this direction, on September 8 the House Transportation and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Subcommittee (THUD) reported out of committee an FY 2012 THUD Appropriations bill that included a 38% cut in federal funding for public transportation.

On July 7, leadership of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure released "A New Direction Transportation Reauthorization Proposal" which proposed a six-year authorization of surface transportation legislation.¹ The proposal states that "In 2010, The [Highway] Trust Funds brought in \$35 billion in revenue, but \$50 billion in spending was authorized." A six-year \$230 billion authorization was proposed equal to the amount of revenue the Highway Trust Fund is projected to collect over the next six years. The \$35 billion revenue compared to the \$50 billion in spending noted in the Proposal is a 30 percent cut. These funding cuts, based on the calculations in this report, could result in a six-year loss of over \$17.2 billion in federal financial assistance to public transit and a resultant six-year loss of 620,000 jobs from the American economy due to the federal funding loss.

With these and other scenarios playing out, APTA surveyed its members to obtain their expectations of the impact of a 30 percent funding cut to the transit program as could be projected from the House authorization proposal. Many transit systems indicated that the jolt of such a cutback, with transit systems and local governments already operating on very thin margins, would cause the possibility of drastic cutbacks in service (possibly to include shutdown.) Public transportation-related businesses would also be negatively impacted by these proposed cuts. Responses from transit agencies and public transportation businesses are included throughout this paper.

The Highway Trust Fund (HTF) funds 4 major programs: the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). The Proposal does not clarify whether funding reductions will be proportionate among those agencies or will be greater or lesser for some agencies. The Proposal also does not address funds from General Revenues. About 20 percent of federal transit funding is from General Revenues.

Estimating the funding and jobs impact of the proposed cuts requires several assumptions. The percent that Contract Authority (CA, the authorization of HTF amounts), will be cut is 33.57 percent, (rounded to 34 percent in general statements). The actual CA for the four surface transportation programs in FY 2011 is \$52.687 billion, slightly more than the \$50 billion cited in the Proposal. The reduction of \$52.687 billion to \$35 billion is 33.57 percent. The assumption is made that the cut will be across the board; the same proportion of cuts will be made in CA for all programs. If transit CA is cut more than CA for other programs the impact will be greater, if it

¹ "A New Direction: Transportation Reauthorization Proposal." Washington: House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, July 7, 2011. at http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/Media/file/112th/Highways/Reauthorization_document.pdf

is cut less, the impact will be less. Other estimates, based on alternative funding to the HTF have projected a cut as high as 37 percent which would result in greater funding cuts and job losses than estimated in this report.

It is also assumed that budget authority (BA, the authorization of general revenues for transit), will also be cut by 33.57 percent. BA funds the FTA Administrative expenses for the transit program, transit research programs, and the New Starts program which builds new rail and bus rapid transit (BRT) lines and extends existing rail and BRT systems.

Over \$3.5 Billion Proposed to Be Cut From Federal Transit Budget in First Year; \$17.2 Billion Over Six Years

The FY 2011 transit authorization level was \$10.53 billion. A 33.57 percent cut would reduce that amount by \$3.54 billion down to \$6.99 billion. The six year cut below FY 2011 authorization frozen and extended would be \$17.22 billion. The six-year cut is estimated by subtracting the authorizations stated for the out years of the Proposal from \$52.687 billion CA for all transportation programs and summing the differences for six years. The proposal calls for program growth in the out years to \$36 billion in FY 2013, \$37 billion in FY 2014, \$39 billion in FY 2015, \$41 billion in FY 2016, and \$42 billion in FY 2017. At a constant \$52.687 billion annual CA would be \$316.122 billion for six years. The six-year funding level in the Proposal is \$230 billion, a six-year total cut of \$86.12 billion, for a total cut of 27.24 percent in CA for six years.

A six-year extension of the transit program frozen at the FY 2011 funding level would authorize \$63.14 billion. Using the methodology for estimating one-year transit losses and the overall CA cut above, the transit program would have a six-year authorization of \$45.96 billion, a total cut of \$17.22 billion below a frozen FY 2011 level for six years.

Table 1 shows the annual total surface transportation CA and funding for public transit based on the six-year funding proposal compared to a frozen FY 2011 CA or authorization. This estimate is made following all the assumptions of distribution of CA among programs and authorization of transit BA used for the one-year estimate of transit funding cuts. Even with the annual funding increases in the Proposal, transit funding would only reach 80 percent of its FY 2011 level by FY 2017.

Table 1: Six-Year Cuts Below FY 2011 Transit Funding

Year	Contract Authority for All Surface Transportation Programs			Authorizations for Transit Program		
	FY 2011 Contract Authority (Millions of Dollars)	Proposed Contract Authority (Millions of Dollars)	Percent Below FY 2011 Levels	Transit FY 2011 Authorization (Millions of Dollars)	Estimated Proposal Transit Authorization (Millions of Dollars)	Transit Funding Cut (Millions of Dollars)
FY 2012	52,687	35,000	-33.57%	10,529	6,994	3,536
FY 2013	52,687	36,000	-31.67%	10,529	7,194	3,336
FY 2014	52,687	37,000	-29.77%	10,529	7,394	3,136
FY 2015	52,687	39,000	-25.98%	10,529	7,794	2,736
FY 2016	52,687	41,000	-22.18%	10,529	8,193	2,337
FY 2017	52,687	42,000	-20.28%	10,529	8,393	2,137
Six-Year Total	316,122	230,000	-27.24%	63,174	45,963	17,217

Table 2 shows transit funding cuts based on these assumptions for one-year and six-years by funding program below FY 2011 authorization levels. The cuts compound recent federal funding trends. FY 2011 authorization levels for transit were frozen at FY 2010 levels and are only 1.8 percent higher than FY 2009 levels. The amount of the authorization that was appropriated in FY 2011 is actually less than the appropriation in FY 2009.

Table 2: Estimated Proportional Cuts to Federal Transit Funding Programs Under House Authorization Proposal

Funding Program	Actual FY 2011 Authorization Funds (Millions of Dollars)	Estimated House Proposal Funding Level First Year (Millions of Dollars)	Estimated Amount Cut First Year (Millions of Dollars)	Estimated Amount Cut Six-Years (Millions of Dollars)
Transportation Planning	113.5	75.4	38.1	185.6
Urbanized Area Formula	4,160.4	2,763.8	1,396.6	6,802.7
Clean Fuels Formula	51.5	34.2	17.3	84.3
Fixed-Guideway Modernization	1,666.5	1,107.1	559.4	2,724.8
Bus and Bus Facilities Capital	984.0	653.7	330.3	1,608.9
Elderly and Disabled	133.5	88.7	44.8	218.2
Rural Area Formula	465.0	308.9	156.1	760.3
Job Access and Reverse Commute	164.5	109.3	55.2	268.9
New Freedom	92.5	61.4	31.1	151.5
Alternative Transportation in Parks	26.9	17.9	9.0	43.8
National Transit database	3.5	2.3	1.2	5.8
Alternatives Analysis	25.0	16.6	8.4	40.9
Growing/High Density States	465.0	308.9	156.1	760.3
Over-the-Road Bus	8.8	5.8	3.0	14.6
New Starts	2,000.0	1,328.6	671.4	3,270.3
Research	69.8	46.4	23.4	114.0
FTA Operations	98.9	65.7	33.2	161.7
Total	10,529.2	6,994.5	3,534.7	17,216.7

Proposed Federal Transit Spending Cuts Could Eliminate 127,000 Jobs the First Year and 620,000 Jobs Over Six Years

The number of jobs that would be lost is calculated from the number of jobs supported per \$1 billion in transit spending is reported the *Economic Impact of Public Transportation Investment*.² That report estimated the number of direct, indirect, and induced jobs created per \$1 billion in transit spending under alternative distributions. For the distribution of funding uses for all transit expenditures, 36,000 jobs were supported per \$1 billion in expenditure. A job is employment of

² Weisbrod, Glen and Arlee Reno. *Economic Impact of Public Development Investment*. Washington: American Public Transportation Association; Economic Development Research group, Inc.; Cambridge Systematics, Inc., October 2009. at http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/economic_impact_of_public_transportation_investment.pdf

one person for one year. Direct jobs are those involving public transportation manufacturing, construction, and operations. Indirect jobs are those at suppliers of transit parts and services. Induced jobs are those that result from direct and indirect job workers re-spending their wages.

As a result of the \$3.53 billion estimated funding cut to transit in the first year, 127,000 jobs could be lost. Over the six-year authorization period, 620,000 jobs could be lost.

Table 3: Estimated Jobs Lost from Proposed Cuts to Federal Transit Funding

Category	First-Year	Six-Years
Funds Cut First Year (Millions of Dollars)	3,534.7	17,216.7
Total Jobs per \$ 1 Billion	36,000	36,000
Estimated Total Jobs Lost	127,250	619,800

Proposed Cuts Would Reduce Funds for Preventive Maintenance for All Systems and Operations for System in Small Urbanized Areas and Rural Areas

For many transit agencies the proposed cuts would affect programs used to maintain transit equipment and operate transit service. According to the 2009 National Transit Database³, \$3.09 billion in operating revenues were from the federal government. Although federal operating revenues are not spent solely on preventive maintenance, the federal funds were equal to 45.2 percent of vehicle maintenance expenses and 8 percent of all operating funds for all transit agencies. But for small urbanized areas with populations less than 200,000, federal revenue was 26 percent of all operating expenses. The proposed cuts would impact agencies of any size, but will clearly have a major impact on the operation of small systems. Drastic cuts to transit routes and the shuttering of transit systems in smaller urbanized areas means fewer options for public transportation riders.

Northwest Indiana Regional Bus Authority, Hammond, IN:

A 30% cut would probably eliminate our service. Under the present political environment a 30% loss in federal support is just another nail in the coffin.

City of Las Cruces RoadRUNNER Transit, Las Cruces, NM:

We use nearly 100% of our 5307 funds for operations. Given that we have no state funding for transit operations and our City would unlikely be able to offset a loss of federal funds, we would have to cut service. Our Transit Advisory Board has already started looking at prioritizing cuts. If our 5307 funding were cut by 30%, it would amount to a loss of about \$360,000. About the only way this can be made up without additional revenues is to eliminate all holiday service and Saturday service (we have never operated on Sundays). Our paratransit service would also no longer operate on holidays and Saturdays. We operate a combination ADA and Senior transportation on paratransit; we would also have to look at more limitations on the Senior transportation component. Of course, with these cuts we would also have to lay off operators and other staff.

³ National Transit Database. Washington, Federal Transit Administration, annual. See <http://www.apta.com/resources/statistics/Pages/NTDDDataTables.aspx> for 2009 data and <http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/> for home page.

Centre Area Transportation Authority, State College, PA:

A 30% cut in federal funding would mean that we would have to cut up to five of our 17 community routes. Our funding situation is already so precarious that our "neighborhood" routes only run four or five trips a day, Monday through Friday, so any further cutbacks would mean elimination of all service on these routes.

Transit Authority of River City, Louisville, KY:

We have been able to utilize CMAQ [Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program] dollars to boost the frequency of service to no more than 15 minutes between buses from 6am to 9pm Monday thru Friday on our most popular routes resulting in the first 4 months a 15% increase in ridership and similar results beginning to occur on the routes feeding those two. Cut funding and we will become a system of hour headways.

Hillsborough Area Regional Transit, Tampa, FL:

A 30% cut would result in restructured or eliminated routes, and thus a reduction in coverage area. An increase in average travel time is also likely, as lower frequencies would make connections more difficult. Reductions in coverage due to route restructuring or elimination would also reduce our paratransit coverage area.

San Diego Metropolitan Transit System, San Diego, CA:

MTS relies on federal funds to help with preventative maintenance costs within operations; any adjustment to the federal funding level would impact the level of service we provide. This proposed 30% cut in funding would cause an approximate \$7 million reduction in service, which equals almost 1 million revenue miles annually, affecting 3 million passengers. This would cause a loss of approximately 50 jobs within our agency. This would also limit the ability of passengers to get to and from their jobs.

Expansion of Fixed-Guideway Infrastructure Would be Put in Jeopardy

The Federal Transit Administration in its FY 2012 New Starts Report⁴ proposed that investment in rail and bus rapid transit infrastructure be increased to \$3.24 billion in FY 2012. These funds included \$0.84 billion for projects with existing Full Funding Grant Agreements, \$1.30 billion for projects with pending Full Funding Grant Agreements, and \$0.44 billion for projects recommended for Full Funding Grant Agreements which is \$2.58 for all FFGA commitments. The proposed cut, if applied to transit funding across the board, would reduce the New Starts program authorization to \$1.33 billion, only 41 percent of the level requested by the FTA to fund FFGA's and other proposed commitments. Forty-six major expansion projects in 18 states included in the FY 2012 New Starts Report, projects that could provide transportation into the next century, could be impacted.

Sound Transit, Seattle, WA:

We would have to delay completion of light rail segments to the University of Washington, Northgate, and Lynnwood if 30% of the executed grants and assumed grant funds were moved beyond the current six-year period. If six years of federal grants were reduced by 30%, the construction periods would have to be extended by an additional two years beyond the current project schedule.

⁴ *Annual Report on Funding Recommendations Fiscal Year 2012.* Washington, Federal Transit Administration, February 2011. at http://www.fta.dot.gov/publications/reports/reports_to_congress/publications_12561.html

Dallas Area Rapid Transit, Dallas, TX:

The potential reduction would impact our ability to add one new scheduled light rail line and would definitely curtail any initiatives to advance light rail service to earlier revenue service dates.

Table 4: Projects Rated or Recommended in the Federal Transit Administration *Annual Report on Funding Recommendations Fiscal Year 2012*

AZ	Mesa, Central Mesa LRT Extension
AZ	Tucson, Modern Streetcar
CA	Fresno, Fresno Area Express Blackstone/Kings Canyon BRT
CA	Los Angeles, Regional Connector Transit Corridor
CA	Los Angeles, Westside Subway Extension
CA	Oakland, East Bay BRT
CA	Riverside, Perris Valley Line
CA	Sacramento, South Sacramento Corridor Phase 2
CA	San Bernardino, E Street Corridor sbX BRT
CA	San Francisco, Third Street Light Rail Phase 2 - Central Subway
CA	San Francisco, Van Ness Avenue BRT
CA	San Jose, Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Project
CO	Denver, Eagle Commuter Rail
CO	Fort Collins, Mason Corridor BRT
CO	Roaring Fork Valley, VelociRFTA BRT
CT	Hartford, New Britain - Hartford Busway
CT	Stamford, Urban Transitway Phase II
DE	Wilmington, Wilmington to Newark Commuter Rail Improvements
FL	Jacksonville, JTA BRT North Corridor
FL	Orlando, Central Florida Commuter Rail Transit -- Initial Operating Segment
HI	Honolulu, High Capacity Transit Corridor Project
MA	Boston, Assembly Square Station
MI	Grand Rapids, Silver Line BRT
MN	St. Paul-Minneapolis, Central Corridor LRT
NC	Charlotte, LYNX Blue Line Extension - Northeast Corridor
NY	New York City, Nostrand Avenue BRT
NY	New York, Long Island Rail Road East Side Access
NY	New York, Second Avenue Subway Phase I
OR	Portland, Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project
RI	Pawtucket, Pawtucket/Central Falls Commuter Rail Station
RI	Providence, South County Commuter Rail
TX	Austin, MetroRapid BRT
TX	Dallas, Northwest/Southeast LRT MOS
TX	El Paso, Mesa Corridor BRT
TX	Houston, North Corridor LRT
TX	Houston, Southeast Corridor LRT
TX	Houston, University Corridor LRT
UT	Salt Lake City, Mid Jordan LRT FFGA
UT	Salt Lake City, Weber County to Salt Lake City Commuter Rail
UT	Salt Lake County, Draper Transit Corridor
VA	Northern Virginia, Dulles Corridor Metrorail Project Extension to Wiehle Ave.
WA	King County, RapidRide E Line BRT
WA	King County, RapidRide F Line BRT
WA	King County, West Seattle BRT (RapidRide)
WA	Seattle, University Link LRT Extension
WA	Vancouver, Columbia River Crossing Project

Bus Purchases and Rail Vehicle Purchases Would Be Reduced

In the six year life of the proposed authorization, an estimated 12,002 fewer buses would not be made in America, 6,113 vans and small vehicles would not be made in America, and 2,268 rail vehicles would not be made in America. In the first year of the proposed federal funding cuts, 2,000 fewer buses and 380 fewer rail vehicles, essential for agencies to maintain a state of good repair, would be funded by the federal government. Table 5 shows the average number of vehicles funded in part by federal grants from 2005 through 2009. If the number of vehicles funded by the federal government was reduced by the same 33.57 percent as the proposed federal funding cut, in the first year orders for buses would drop by 2,001; for vans and small vehicles by 1,019; for commuter rail cars and locomotives by 88, for heavy rail cars by 791, and for light rail cars by 75. These cuts could also be devastating to America's private sector transit manufacturing industry. Current "Made in America" legislation means that these vehicles are assembled and a large portion of their components are manufactured in the U.S.

Table 5: Impact of Proposed Federal Funding Cuts on Transit Vehicle Sales

Vehicle Type	Average Annual Number Vehicle Funded 2005 to 2009 ⁽⁵⁾	Decreased Number of Vehicles Purchased Reduced by Percent of Proposed Federal Funding Cut	
		First Year	Six-Years
Bus 35 feet or Longer	2,692	904	5,422
Bus 30 feet of less	3,267	1,097	6,580
Vans and Small Vehicles	3,035	1,019	6,113
Commuter Rail Cars	219	74	441
Commuter Rail Locomotives	41	14	83
Heavy Rail Cars	791	266	1,593
Light Rail Cars	75	25	151

Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Corridor, San Carlos, CA:

[We are] scheduled to replace a significant portion of [our] aging fleet of rail vehicles over the next three to five years. The cost of the replacement is in the \$450M range for about 100 vehicles. A 30% reduction in federal funding could mean deferral of replacement of up to 30 vehicles. Deferral of a sub-fleet that has reached the end of its service life would result in much higher maintenance and operating costs, greater risks of fleet reliability and availability, and in-service failures.

Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon, Portland, OR:

Intervals between buses on most lines have already been stretched as far as practical to accommodate passenger loads. Recent service cuts have focused on widening the intervals between buses on lines that run every 30 minutes or better. Most lines that used to run every 15 minutes will run every 20 minutes. Under this proposal, headways on 9 lines would have to be increased to hourly service.

⁵ FY 2009 Statistical Summary. Washington: Federal Transit Administration, 2011. at http://www.fta.dot.gov/funding/data/grants_financing_12739.html

Central New York Regional Transportation Authority, Syracuse, NY:

A 30% reduction would only allow us to maintain our current preventative maintenance program, and not be able to procure any capital projects at all. We would have to defer the purchase of a replacement radio system, the purchase of 92 replacement buses, and the purchase of 16 replacement paratransit vehicles.

Springfield Mass Transit District, Springfield, IL

Nearly 50% of our fixed-route fleet will be eligible for replacement. These vehicles range in age from 12 to 23 years. We currently use 48 of 56 buses during peak service hours. If we lost just one vehicle, it would impact peak service.

Impact of Federal Transit Funding Cuts Varies Among States

Table 6 shows the estimated impact on each state and other jurisdictions from the proposed federal funding cuts. These amounts are estimated by determining the percentage of total annual apportionments and allocations, as presented in the Federal Register annual apportionment of funds for the FTA, for the years FY 2006 through FY 2010. A five year period was selected to account for the annual variations of allocations for discretionary capital funds including Fixed-Guideway New Starts and Bus and Bus Capital. The apportionment provisions of SAFETEA-LU, the current authorization law, were fully in effect for the full year in FY 2006. FY 2011 apportionments were not used because they do not include all major capital funds.

The percentage of funds for all programs for each state for FY 2006 through FY 2010 was determined. That percentage was multiplied by the national total for federal funding cuts in the first year and for six-years, and the resultant job cuts in the first year and for six-years. Amounts for multi-state urbanized areas with populations of 200,000 or more are not separately apportioned for each of the states comprising those areas. The portion going to each state was estimated using a 50 percent population and 50 percent population density weighted by population factor. These factors were used to estimate state portions of multi-state urbanized areas for Urbanized Area Formula program, New Freedom program and Job Access and Reverse Commute program apportionments.

The estimated funding cuts are the amount of funds lost to each state as described in the previous paragraph. The jobs for each state are the estimated number of lost jobs that would have been funded by the money lost to each state. Those jobs, especially jobs manufacturing vehicles and providing materials and supplies, would not necessarily be in same state as the transit agency. No adjustment is made for this; but research that shows the wide geographic spread of companies manufacturing buses and rail cars are available.⁶ These amounts are for federal funding cuts only and do not include any effects from reductions in state and local matching funds. Inclusion of additional losses of state and local match would, of course, increase these amounts.

⁶ Lowe, Marcy, et al. *U.S. Manufacture of Rail Vehicles for Intercity Passenger Rail and Urban Transit*. Durham, NC: Duke University Center on Globalization Governances and Competitiveness, 2010. at <http://www.cggc.duke.edu/pdfs/U.S. Manufacture of Rail Vehicles for Intercity Passenger Rail and Urban Transit.pdf>

Lowe, Marcy, et al. *Manufacturing Climate Solutions, Carbon-Reducing Technologies and U.S. Jobs. Chapter 12: Public Transit Buses: A Green Choice Gets Greener*. Durham, NC: Duke University Center on Globalization Governances and Competitiveness, 2009. at http://www.cggc.duke.edu/environment/climatesolutions/greeneconomy_Ch12_TransitBus.pdf

Table 6: Estimated Funding Reduction and Job Loss from Federal Transit Funding Cuts by State

State	Federal Funding Cut First Year (millions of Dollars)	Jobs Lost First-Year	Federal Funding Cut Six-Years (Millions of Dollars)	Jobs Lost Six-Years
United States Total	3,534.7	127,250	17,216.7	619,800
Alabama	22.4	805	108.9	3,921
Alaska	28.6	1,028	139.1	5,006
Arizona	69.2	2,491	337.0	12,134
Arkansas	10.4	373	50.5	1,818
California	472.0	16,993	2,299.1	82,767
Colorado	77.6	2,794	378.1	13,610
Connecticut	61.5	2,214	299.6	10,784
Delaware	8.0	286	38.7	1,395
District of Columbia	69.6	2,507	339.2	12,212
Florida	132.8	4,780	646.7	23,280
Georgia	62.0	2,231	301.8	10,865
Hawaii	23.5	848	114.7	4,128
Idaho	7.5	272	36.7	1,322
Illinois	210.3	7,570	1,024.3	36,873
Indiana	33.5	1,205	163.0	5,868
Iowa	15.7	565	76.4	2,752
Kansas	13.1	470	63.6	2,289
Kentucky	19.2	690	93.4	3,362
Louisiana	26.0	937	126.8	4,566
Maine	5.2	187	25.3	910
Maryland	82.4	2,966	401.4	14,449
Massachusetts	117.3	4,224	571.5	20,574
Michigan	56.7	2,042	276.3	9,946
Minnesota	48.6	1,751	236.9	8,530
Mississippi	11.0	396	53.6	1,931
Missouri	35.4	1,274	172.4	6,205
Montana	5.7	207	28.0	1,008
Nebraska	9.0	322	43.6	1,570
Nevada	18.2	654	88.5	3,187
New Hampshire	5.5	198	26.7	962
New Jersey	202.0	7,271	983.7	35,414
New Mexico	11.3	407	55.0	1,980
New York	628.6	22,630	3,061.7	110,222
North Carolina	54.2	1,952	264.1	9,508
North Dakota	4.5	163	22.0	792
Ohio	70.9	2,551	345.1	12,425
Oklahoma	13.0	469	63.5	2,285
Oregon	62.3	2,242	303.3	10,919
Pennsylvania	162.3	5,841	790.3	28,452
Rhode Island	17.4	626	84.7	3,050
South Carolina	15.3	551	74.5	2,683
South Dakota	5.1	182	24.7	888
Tennessee	28.9	1,040	140.7	5,064
Texas	179.3	6,455	873.3	31,440
Utah	60.3	2,170	293.7	10,572
Vermont	4.2	150	20.3	732
Virginia	68.8	2,478	335.2	12,068
Washington	116.1	4,179	565.5	20,356
West Virginia	10.3	372	50.3	1,810
Wisconsin	30.1	1,083	146.5	5,273
Wyoming	3.0	109	14.7	531
American Samoa	0.2	6	0.8	27
Guam	0.4	15	2.1	75
Northern Mariana Islands	0.4	15	2.0	71
Puerto Rico	27.6	993	134.3	4,835
Virgin Islands	0.6	21	2.8	102

ATS Consulting, Pasadena, CA:

We are a small company specializing in noise and vibration control for rail projects. Over the past 10 years we have accumulated substantial experience and have developed new procedures to help reduce noise and vibration in a cost-effective manner. The cut would certainly stop our growth and could mean that we would need to reduce our staff size.

New Flyer, St. Cloud, MN:

The impact would be felt six (6) times the amount of our layoffs. Therefore, of the 300 people that would be released, we would anticipate that 1,800 people from businesses that supply us with parts and components would also be affected.

Now is Not the Time to Cut Critical Public Transportation Funding

With public transportation agencies already facing budget pressures, the proposed one-third cut in federal public transportation spending would place even more strain on transit agencies. Hundreds of thousands of jobs would be lost, both at public agencies as well as the private sector businesses in the transit industry and beyond. Thousands of transit vehicles would not be purchased by agencies, and the vehicles that remained in service would be less well maintained and more likely to break down. The effects of this proposal would mean more waiting, less service and fewer options for public transportation riders nationwide and hundreds of thousands of fewer jobs for Americans.