110TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPT. 110–727
2d Session } { Part 1

SAVING ENERGY THROUGH PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2008

JUNE 20, 2008.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. OBERSTAR, from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 6052]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 6052) to promote increased public transportation use, to promote increased use of alternative fuels in providing public transportation, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

H.R. 6052, the "Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008", promotes increased public transportation use and increased use of alternative fuels in providing public transportation, and for other purposes.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

According to the U.S. Department of Energy ("DOE"), the transportation sector accounts for 68 percent of the total U.S. petroleum consumption, and Americans used almost 14 million barrels of oil each day for transportation purposes in 2006.

In addition, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") estimates that 27.7 percent of the total greenhouse gas emissions produced by the United States come from the transportation sector, second only to electricity generation. DOE reports that the carbon dioxide emissions from the transportation sector grew 25.4 percent between 1990 and 2006, an average of 1.4 percent each year. The most recent DOE data show that transportation produces more metric tons of energy-related carbon dioxide than the residential and commercial sectors, and almost as much as the industrial sector. Nearly all of these transportation-related emissions come from the use of petroleum products.

In response to these adverse energy and emissions effects of transportation, the Federal Government has implemented a wide array of initiatives, including support for public transit and non-motorized transportation, alternative fuels research and implementation, programs to improve air quality and to reduce congestion, and programs to increase the number of Federal employees who use public transportation for their commute. While these initiatives assist Americans in reducing their transportation-related emissions, energy consumption, and reliance on foreign oil, improvements to these programs in addition to new Federal initiatives are needed in order to move the United States toward greater energy independence.

Increasing public transportation use in America is one of the most promising ways to meet our energy and emissions reduction goals. As such, the primary objective of H.R. 6052, the "Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008", is to reduce the United States' dependence on foreign oil by encouraging more people to use public transportation. By increasing incentives for commuters to choose transit options, the Federal Government can strengthen its role in partnering with the American public in reducing our transportation-related energy consumption and reliance on foreign oil.

The energy savings and emissions reductions generated by public transportation use in the United States are well documented. According to two recent studies, the direct petroleum savings attributable to current public transportation use in the United States is 1.4 billion gallons per year. When the secondary effects of transit availability on travel are also taken into account, public transportation saves the equivalent of 4.2 billion gallons of gasoline annually—more than 11 million gallons of gasoline per day. Moreover, if Americans used transit at the same rate as Europeans—for roughly 10 percent of their daily travel needs—the United States could reduce its dependence on imported oil by more than 40 percent, nearly equal to the 550 million barrels of crude oil that we import from Saudi Arabia each year.

Public transportation use is also estimated to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 37 million metric tons annually. When a solo commuter switches from a single occupancy vehicle to a transit commute, this single mode shift can reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 20 pounds per day—more than 4,800 pounds in a year.

To a great degree, public transportation use is already experiencing a renaissance in many American cities and towns. In 2007, Americans took over 10.3 billion trips on public transportation, the highest level in 50 years. Public transportation use is up 32 percent since 1995, a figure that is more than double the growth rate of the population and is substantially greater than the growth rate of vehicle miles traveled on our nation's highways for that same period. Around the country, voters continue to approve state and local ballot initiatives to support public transportation, even when it means local taxes will be raised or continued.

As the average price of regular gasoline has reached $4 per gallon, even more commuters are choosing to ride the train or the bus to work rather than drive alone in their cars. Transit systems in metropolitan areas are currently reporting increases in ridership of five, ten, and even 15 percent over last year's figures. In the first quarter of 2008, commuters took more than 2.6 billion trips on trains, subways, light rail, and buses nationwide, an increase of 3.3 percent over the first quarter of 2007. Light rail saw the greatest increase in ridership—light rail ridership increased 10 percent to 110 million trips in the first quarter of 2008. During the same timeframe, highway vehicle miles traveled declined by 2.3 percent. In Denver, for example, ridership was up eight percent in the first three months of 2008 compared with last year, while Minneapolis, Seattle, Dallas-Fort Worth and San Francisco all reported similar increases.

Some of the largest increases in transit ridership are occurring in many areas in the South and West where new bus and light rail lines have been built in recent years. The Charlotte Area Transit System, which recently opened a new light rail line, has increased ridership more than 34 percent from February 2007 to February 2008. Caltrain, the commuter rail line that serves the San Francisco Peninsula and the Santa Clara Valley, set a record for average weekday ridership in February with a 9.3 percent increase over 2007. The South Florida Regional Transportation Authority, which operates a commuter rail system from Miami to Fort Lauderdale and West Palm Beach, posted a rise of more than 20 percent in ridership in March and April compared to the same time last year.

Meeting this impressive demand for public transportation services is no small task for local transit agencies. The cost of fuel and power for public transportation has sharply increased in recent years. In 2005, approximately 911 million gallons of fossil fuels and six billion kilowatt-hours of electricity were used to move transit vehicles. These figures represent an increase of 50 million gallons of fuels and 400 million kilowatt-hours during only a three-year period. Moreover, the slowing economy means less state and local funding is available to cover the costs of the increased fuel and electricity needed to maintain transit services. Some transit agencies are facing service cuts and fare increases as a result of the high cost of fuel, which may result in less—rather than more—Americans riding transit.

In addition to increasing transit ridership, increasing the amount of alternative fuels and clean technologies that transit agencies use in providing public transportation can significantly further our energy and emissions reduction goals. By switching to non-petroleum-based or cleaner burning fuel, transit vehicles can reduce the amount of carbon-based pollutants they emit. On average, alternative fuels burn cleaner than traditional petroleum fuels, and in some cases burn up to 90 percent cleaner. Alternative fuels help reduce emissions of carbon monoxide, organic compounds, nitrogen oxide, sulfur and particulate matter. Cleaner fuels, along with better engineered engines, have helped reduce air pollution levels in most urban communities over the past 10 years, although widespread use of alternative fuels across all transit modes has yet to be achieved. In 2005, only 6.3 percent of paratransit vehicles and only 19.1 percent of buses used an alternative form of power, compared with 49.6 percent of commuter rail cars, 98.8 percent of light rail cars, and 100 percent of heavy rail and streetcars.

Currently, the Federal Government provides a Federal share of 90 percent for clean fuel and alternative fuel transit bus, ferry or locomotive-related equipment or facilities. However, given the way in which the Federal Transit Administration administers this provision, the average Federal share for these types of clean fuel projects is only 83 percent. As such, it is important to further increase the Federal share for clean and alternative fuel transit projects, thereby assisting transit agencies in reducing their transportation-related emissions and reliance on foreign oil.

Another approach to meeting our energy and emissions reduction goals is to increase the number of transit commuters within the Federal workforce. For more than 20 years, laws have been in place to encourage Federal employees to commute by means other than single-occupancy vehicles in order to improve air quality and reduce congestion. The most commonly used program to achieve these goals at the Federal level has been the Federal Transit Benefits Program, but current law does not require that all Federal agencies implement the program. Rather, participation is only required in certain regions and by certain agencies, thereby limiting an otherwise successful initiative.

Transit benefits programs create incentives for commuters to switch from driving alone to work to taking public transportation. These programs have reduced Federal employees' contribution to traffic congestion and air pollution and expanded their commuting alternatives. The Department of Transportation has called for the nationwide expansion of the Federal Transit Benefits Program, an action which will provide more Federal employees with the option to choose transit for their commute, thereby reducing their transportation-related energy consumption and reliance on foreign oil.

As Congress begins to more fully address the negative consequences of energy dependence and climate change, the role that public transportation plays in lessening our carbon footprint should be rightfully recognized. The Federal Government should continue to provide incentives for commuters to choose transit options, especially those commuters within the Federal workforce, and encourage transit agencies to increase their use of clean and alternative fuels. Each of these initiatives will help increase public transportation use nationwide, thereby reducing the United States' transportation-related energy consumption and reliance on foreign oil and decreasing our greenhouse gas emissions. Providing more Americans with the opportunity to choose transit options over driving alone is one of the most promising ways to meet our energy and emissions reduction goals.

H.R. 6052 authorizes $1.7 billion in immediate funding to increase public transportation use across the United States. Transit agencies may use these funds to reduce transit fares or expand transit services in order to provide incentives for commuters to choose transit options. These funds will allow transit agencies to provide incentives for commuters to choose transit options, thereby reducing their transportation-related energy consumption and reliance on foreign oil, as well as decreasing their greenhouse gas emissions.

H.R. 6052, the "Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008"
Additional Funding for Fiscal Year 2008 and Fiscal Year 2009

State	Urbanized Formula	Rural Formula	Total
Alabama	$6,750,106	$5,127,950	$11,878,056
Alaska	$8,990,494	$2,611,066	$11,601,560
American Samoa	$0	$102,908	$102,908
Arizona	$22,084,556	$3,701,172	$25,785,728
Arkansas	$3,370,610	$3,923,702	$7,294,312
California	$257,306,252	$8,839,714	$266,145,966
Colorado	$22,056,088	$3,330,770	$25,386,858
Connecticut	$17,873,936	$1,034,046	$18,907,982
Delaware	$2,825,406	$472,650	$3,298,056
District of Columbia	$30,473,236	$0	$30,473,236
Florida	$75,930,720	$5,125,452	$81,056,172
Georgia	$28,838,216	$6,394,574	$35,232,790
Guam	$0	$278,158	$278,158
Hawaii	$10,917,098	$752,676	$11,669,774
Idaho	$2,425,670	$2,347,844	$4,773,514
Illinois	$94,403,766	$5,485,088	$99,888,854
Indiana	$15,001,184	$5,211,760	$20,212,944
Iowa	$5,495,404	$3,974,260	$9,469,664
Kansas	$4,212,468	$3,737,594	$7,950,062
Kentucky	$7,942,162	$4,931,166	$12,873,328
Louisiana	$12,753,386	$4,014,012	$16,767,398
Maine	$1,325,986	$2,125,466	$3,451,452
Maryland	$30,644,496	$1,887,996	$32,532,492
Massachusetts	$51,594,636	$1,339,922	$52,934,558
Michigan	$28,379,808	$6,708,788	$35,088,596
Minnesota	$19,441,588	$4,966,136	$24,407,724
Mississippi	$2,098,094	$4,481,076	$6,579,170
Missouri	$15,975,806	$5,372,202	$21,348,008
Montana	$1,118,022	$3,164,060	$4,282,082
N. Mariana Islands	$292,770	$15,842	$308,612
Nebraska	$3,453,570	$2,652,022	$6,105,592
Nevada	$10,915,586	$2,058,894	$12,974,480
New Hampshire	$2,013,914	$1,332,486	$3,346,400
New Jersey	$92,401,374	$1,239,280	$93,640,654
New Mexico	$3,980,980	$3,344,844	$7,325,824
New York	$230,952,140	$6,770,700	$237,722,840
North Carolina	$17,951,528	$8,253,096	$26,204,624
North Dakota	$1,323,640	$1,667,696	$2,991,336
Ohio	$36,466,862	$7,700,970	$44,167,832
Oklahoma	$5,590,330	$4,421,700	$10,012,030
Oregon	$16,064,226	$3,865,844	$19,930,070
Pennsylvania	$62,317,258	$7,799,490	$70,116,748
Puerto Rico	$19,093,758	$636,758	$19,730,516
Rhode Island	$4,499,086	$222,938	$4,722,024
South Carolina	$6,109,240	$4,192,908	$10,302,148
South Dakota	$1,016,980	$2,026,286	$3,043,266
Tennessee	$12,280,418	$5,379,852	$17,660,270
Texas	$82,871,302	$12,758,840	$95,630,142
Utah	$13,265,938	$1,971,020	$15,236,958
Vermont	$452,052	$1,020,106	$1,472,158
Virgin Islands	$354,076	$0	$354,076
Virginia	$23,966,852	$4,716,888	$28,683,740
Washington	$42,017,688	$3,708,282	$45,725,970
West Virginia	$2,143,516	$2,622,540	$4,766,056
Wisconsin	$16,127,320	$5,205,822	$21,333,142
Wyoming	$598,402	$1,972,688	$2,571,090
Total Apportioned	**$1,488,750,000**	**$199,000,000**	**$1,687,750,000**
Oversight	**$11,250,000**	**$1,000,000**	**$12,250,000**
Grand Total	**$1,500,000,000**	**$200,000,000**	**$1,700,000,000**

Source: Federal Transit Administration

H.R. 6052, the "Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008"

State Apportionments by Urbanized Areas for Fiscal Year 2008 and Fiscal Year 2009

Alabama	
Anniston, AL	$260,992
Auburn, AL	$244,186
Birmingham, AL	$2,208,206
Columbus, GA--AL	$741,790
Decatur, AL	$233,634
Dothan, AL	$221,004
Florence, AL	$279,214
Gadsden, AL	$216,924
Huntsville, AL	$617,270
Mobile, AL	$1,018,882
Montgomery, AL	$910,690
Pensacola, FL--AL	$1,019,358
Tuscaloosa, AL	$479,078
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$5,127,950
State Total	**$11,878,056**

Alaska	
Anchorage, AK	$8,797,644
Fairbanks, AK	$192,850
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$2,611,066
State Total	**$11,601,560**

American Samoa	
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$102,908
State Total	**$102,908**

Arizona	
Avondale, AZ	$338,406
Flagstaff, AZ	$248,322
Phoenix--Mesa, AZ	$16,682,470
Prescott, AZ	$257,816
Tucson, AZ	$4,063,128
Yuma, AZ--CA	$494,412
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$3,701,172
State Total	**$25,785,726**

Arkansas	
Fayetteville--Springdale, AR	$716,926
Fort Smith, AR--OK	$475,166
Hot Springs, AR	$188,478
Jonesboro, AR	$197,962
Little Rock, AR	$1,372,340
Memphis, TN--MS--AR	$4,547,844
Pine Bluff, AR	$247,760
Texarkana, TX--Texarkana, AR	$94,716
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$3,923,702
State Total	**$7,294,312**

California	
Antioch, CA	$2,269,582
Atascadero--El Paso de Robles (Paso Robles), CA	$239,692
Bakersfield, CA	$2,134,144
Camarillo, CA	$359,444
Chico, CA	$470,390
Concord, CA	$7,570,810
Davis, CA	$522,796
El Centro, CA	$319,248
Fairfield, CA	$826,890
Fresno, CA	$2,950,092
Gilroy--Morgan Hill, CA	$412,508
Hanford, CA	$381,628
Hemet, CA	$651,608
Indio--Cathedral City--Palm Springs, CA	$1,216,442
Lancaster--Palmdale, CA	$2,768,906
Livermore, CA	$487,600
Lodi, CA	$538,576
Lompoc, CA	$188,804
Los Angeles--Long Beach--Santa Ana, CA	$102,835,570
Madera, CA	$306,734
Manteca, CA	$341,100
Merced, CA	$648,592
Mission Viejo, CA	$3,494,700
Modesto, CA	$1,434,426
Napa, CA	$498,660
Oxnard, CA	$2,698,204
Petaluma, CA	$364,036
Porterville, CA	$338,798
Redding, CA	$425,610
Riverside--San Bernardino, CA	$9,608,984
Sacramento, CA	$7,842,006
Salinas, CA	$1,242,038
San Diego, CA	$21,035,150
San Francisco--Oakland, CA	$47,973,112
San Jose, CA	$14,695,062
San Luis Obispo, CA	$347,122
Santa Barbara, CA	$1,200,000
Santa Clarita, CA	$1,013,810
Santa Cruz, CA	$886,274
Santa Maria, CA	$749,560
Santa Rosa, CA	$1,425,582
Seaside--Monterey--Marina, CA	$739,088
Simi Valley, CA	$799,286
Stockton, CA	$2,762,480
Temecula--Murrieta, CA	$1,007,678
Thousand Oaks, CA	$1,025,542
Tracy, CA	$452,148
Turlock, CA	$460,470

California (continued)	
Vacaville, CA	$581,194
Vallejo, CA	$1,228,852
Victorville--Hesperia--Apple Valley, CA	$875,808
Visalia, CA	$695,846
Watsonville, CA	$421,652
Yuba City, CA	$538,150
Yuma, AZ--CA	$3,768
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$8,839,714
State Total	**$266,145,966**

Colorado	
Boulder, CO	$703,876
Colorado Springs, CO	$2,208,988
Denver--Aurora, CO	$16,029,484
Fort Collins, CO	$874,446
Grand Junction, CO	$390,290
Greeley, CO	$519,780
Lafayette--Louisville, CO	$274,916
Longmont, CO	$440,598
Pueblo, CO	$613,710
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$3,330,770
State Total	**$25,386,858**

Connecticut	
Bridgeport--Stamford, CT--NY	$6,631,134
Danbury, CT--NY	$2,231,812
Hartford, CT	$5,178,066
New Haven, CT	$5,368,670
New York--Newark, NY--NJ--CT	$281,099,820
Norwich--New London, CT	$683,512
Waterbury, CT	$2,527,876
Worcester, MA--CT	$1,922,476
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$1,034,046
State Total	**$18,907,982**

Delaware	
Dover, DE	$263,584
Philadelphia, PA--NJ--DE--MD	$47,042,342
Salisbury, MD--DE	$8,074
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$472,650
State Total	**$3,298,056**

District of Columbia	
Washington, DC--VA--MD	$53,726,898
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$0
State Total	**$30,473,236**

Florida	
Bonita Springs--Naples, FL	$793,906
Brooksville, FL	$381,428
Cape Coral, FL	$1,479,352
Daytona Beach--Port Orange, FL	$1,584,126
Deltona, FL	$624,526
Fort Walton Beach, FL	$633,788
Gainesville, FL	$749,752
Jacksonville, FL	$5,659,940
Kissimmee, FL	$817,684
Lady Lake, FL	$177,244
Lakeland, FL	$844,348
Leesburg--Eustis, FL	$381,020
Miami, FL	$36,985,062
North Port--Punta Gorda, FL	$477,998
Ocala, FL	$394,830
Orlando, FL	$6,858,162
Palm Bay--Melbourne, FL	$1,567,564
Panama City, FL	$506,634
Pensacola, FL--AL	$1,019,358
Port St. Lucie, FL	$761,498
Sarasota--Bradenton, FL	$2,238,888
St. Augustine, FL	$219,848
Tallahassee, FL	$859,160
Tampa--St. Petersburg, FL	$8,376,318
Titusville, FL	$225,526
Vero Beach--Sebastian, FL	$488,370
Winter Haven, FL	$620,206
Zephyrhills, FL	$206,960
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$5,125,452
State Total	**$81,056,172**

Georgia	
Albany, GA	$381,398
Athens-Clarke County, GA	$411,828
Atlanta, GA	$23,099,154
Augusta-Richmond County, GA--SC	$810,354
Brunswick, GA	$191,598
Chattanooga, TN--GA	$1,166,580
Columbus, GA--AL	$741,790
Dalton, GA	$204,510
Gainesville, GA	$306,408
Hinesville, GA	$224,788
Macon, GA	$576,022
Rome, GA	$231,422
Savannah, GA	$1,144,532
Valdosta, GA	$235,074
Warner Robins, GA	$328,764
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$6,394,574
State Total	**$35,232,790**

Guam	
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$278,158
State Total	**$278,158**

Hawaii	
Honolulu, HI	$10,152,798
Kailua (Honolulu County)--Kaneohe, HI	$764,298
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$752,676
State Total	**$11,669,774**

Idaho	
Boise City, ID	$887,306
Coeur d'Alene, ID	$327,052
Idaho Falls, ID	$322,768
Lewiston, ID--WA	$138,940
Nampa, ID	$453,580
Pocatello, ID	$295,860
Spokane, WA--ID	$2,713,298
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$2,347,844
State Total	**$4,773,514**

Illinois	
Alton, IL	$358,310
Beloit, WI--IL	$55,642
Bloomington--Normal, IL	$653,702
Champaign, IL	$720,136
Chicago, IL--IN	$88,555,974
Danville, IL	$229,390
Davenport, IA--IL	$1,331,204
Decatur, IL	$438,220
DeKalb, IL	$330,764
Dubuque, IA--IL	$11,268
Kankakee, IL	$328,344
Peoria, IL	$1,072,674
Rockford, IL	$936,768
Round Lake Beach--McHenry--Grayslake, IL--WI	$1,493,982
Springfield, IL	$668,922
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$5,485,088
State Total	**$99,888,854**

Indiana	
Anderson, IN	$397,048
Bloomington, IN	$444,300
Chicago, IL--IN	$88,555,974
Cincinnati, OH--KY--IN	$6,614,380
Columbus, IN	$229,300
Elkhart, IN--MI	$554,080
Evansville, IN--KY	$726,388
Fort Wayne, IN	$1,020,796
Indianapolis, IN	$4,056,258
Kokomo, IN	$280,310
Lafayette, IN	$625,878
Louisville, KY--IN	$4,601,956
Michigan City, IN--MI	$304,100
Muncie, IN	$431,436
South Bend, IN--MI	$1,472,176
Terre Haute, IN	$352,654
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$5,211,760
State Total	**$20,212,944**

Iowa	
Ames, IA	$305,992
Cedar Rapids, IA	$830,432
Davenport, IA--IL	$1,331,204
Des Moines, IA	$2,015,952
Dubuque, IA--IL	$302,976
Iowa City, IA	$432,698
Omaha, NE--IA	$2,521,320
Sioux City, IA--NE--SD	$401,476
Waterloo, IA	$508,294
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$3,974,260
State Total	**$9,469,664**

Kansas	
Kansas City, MO--KS	$5,145,088
Lawrence, KS	$507,682
St. Joseph, MO--KS	$4,132
Topeka, KS	$664,454
Wichita, KS	$1,739,826
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$3,737,594
State Total	**$7,950,062**

Kentucky	
Bowling Green, KY	$243,182
Cincinnati, OH--KY--IN	$6,614,380
Clarksville, TN--KY	$106,280
Evansville, IN--KY	$726,388
Huntington, WV--KY--OH	$217,844
Lexington-Fayette, KY	$1,272,420
Louisville, KY--IN	$4,601,956
Owensboro, KY	$294,370
Radcliff--Elizabethtown, KY	$260,278
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$4,931,166
State Total	**$12,873,328**

Louisiana	
Alexandria, LA	$304,346
Baton Rouge, LA	$2,009,410
Houma, LA	$530,534
Lafayette, LA	$707,454
Lake Charles, LA	$531,656
Mandeville--Covington, LA	$244,374
Monroe, LA	$455,056
New Orleans, LA	$6,466,946
Shreveport, LA	$1,186,642
Slidell, LA	$316,968
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$4,014,012
State Total	**$16,767,398**

Maine	
Bangor, ME	$240,726
Dover--Rochester, NH--ME	$25,252
Lewiston, ME	$260,524
Portland, ME	$766,738
Portsmouth, NH--ME	$32,748
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$2,125,466
State Total	**$3,451,452**

Maryland	
Aberdeen--Havre de Grace--Bel Air, MD	$750,498
Baltimore, MD	$15,607,360
Cumberland, MD--WV--PA	$208,024
Frederick, MD	$485,158
Hagerstown, MD--WV--PA	$376,606
Philadelphia, PA--NJ--DE--MD	$47,042,342
Salisbury, MD--DE	$224,918
St. Charles, MD	$313,340
Washington, DC--VA--MD	$53,726,898
Westminster, MD	$242,434
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$1,887,996
State Total	**$32,532,492**

Massachusetts	
Barnstable Town, MA	$1,236,320
Boston, MA--NH--RI	$40,657,788
Leominster--Fitchburg, MA	$497,480
Nashua, NH--MA	$98
New Bedford, MA	$738,504
Pittsfield, MA	$217,632
Providence, RI--MA	$8,417,310
Springfield, MA--CT	$2,832,378
Worcester, MA--CT	$1,922,476
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$1,339,922
State Total	**$52,934,558**

Michigan	
Ann Arbor, MI	$1,697,748
Battle Creek, MI	$325,166
Bay City, MI	$331,120
Benton Harbor--St. Joseph, MI	$240,372
Detroit, MI	$15,045,206
Elkhart, IN--MI	$7,256
Flint, MI	$2,248,736
Grand Rapids, MI	$2,615,850
Holland, MI	$416,988
Jackson, MI	$377,968
Kalamazoo, MI	$815,320
Lansing, MI	$1,853,850
Michigan City, IN--MI	$1,938
Monroe, MI	$233,694
Muskegon, MI	$636,854
Port Huron, MI	$356,370
Saginaw, MI	$638,748
South Bend, IN--MI	$1,472,176
South Lyon--Howell--Brighton, MI	$383,406
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$6,708,788
State Total	**$35,088,596**

Minnesota	
Duluth, MN--WI	$391,108
Fargo, ND--MN	$194,964
Grand Forks, ND--MN	$41,698
La Crosse, WI--MN	$23,726
Minneapolis--St. Paul, MN	$17,883,196
Rochester, MN	$450,940
St. Cloud, MN	$455,960
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$4,966,136
State Total	**$24,407,724**

Mississippi	
Gulfport--Biloxi, MS	$643,484
Hattiesburg, MS	$254,690
Jackson, MS	$867,392
Memphis, TN--MS--AR	$4,547,844
Pascagoula, MS	$225,420
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$4,481,076
State Total	**$6,579,170**

Missouri	
Columbia, MO	$448,100
Jefferson City, MO	$212,086
Joplin, MO	$272,148
Kansas City, MO--KS	$5,145,088
Lee's Summit, MO	$283,746
Springfield, MO	$765,974
St. Joseph, MO--KS	$353,354
St. Louis, MO--IL	$11,575,314
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$5,372,202
State Total	**$21,348,008**

Montana	
Billings, MT	$486,942
Great Falls, MT	$316,404
Missoula, MT	$314,676
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$3,164,060
State Total	**$4,282,082**

N. Mariana Islands	
Saipan, MP	$292,770
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$15,842
State Total	**$308,612**

Nebraska	
Lincoln, NE	$967,186
Omaha, NE--IA	$2,521,320
Sioux City, IA--NE--SD	$78,360
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$2,652,022
State Total	**$6,105,592**

Nevada	
Carson City, NV	$274,936
Las Vegas, NV	$8,778,210
Reno, NV	$1,862,440
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$2,058,894
State Total	**$12,974,480**

New Hampshire	
Boston, MA--NH--RI	$40,657,788
Dover--Rochester, NH--ME	$279,320
Manchester, NH	$668,272
Nashua, NH--MA	$783,822
Portsmouth, NH--ME	$155,220
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$1,332,486
State Total	**$3,346,400**

New Jersey	
Allentown--Bethlehem, PA--NJ	$2,717,114
Atlantic City, NJ	$3,067,678
Hightstown, NJ	$351,552
New York--Newark, NY--NJ--CT	$281,099,820
Philadelphia, PA--NJ--DE--MD	$47,042,342
Trenton, NJ	$3,205,798
Vineland, NJ	$353,704
Wildwood--North Wildwood--Cape May, NJ	$204,274
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$1,239,280
State Total	**$93,640,654**

New Mexico	
Albuquerque, NM	$2,937,294
Farmington, NM	$199,962
Las Cruces, NM	$437,486
Santa Fe, NM	$350,798
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$3,344,844
State Total	**$7,325,824**

New York	
Albany, NY	$3,037,164
Binghamton, NY--PA	$736,078
Bridgeport--Stamford, CT--NY	$6,631,134
Buffalo, NY	$4,998,062
Danbury, CT--NY	$17,182
Elmira, NY	$306,520
Glens Falls, NY	$242,314
Ithaca, NY	$235,714
Kingston, NY	$222,190
Middletown, NY	$219,044
New York--Newark, NY--NJ--CT	$281,099,820
Poughkeepsie--Newburgh, NY	$5,618,068
Rochester, NY	$3,231,898
Saratoga Springs, NY	$200,808
Syracuse, NY	$2,038,940
Utica, NY	$533,724
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$6,770,700
State Total	**$237,722,840**

North Carolina	
Asheville, NC	$612,422
Burlington, NC	$377,358
Charlotte, NC--SC	$5,502,280
Concord, NC	$434,892
Durham, NC	$2,230,548
Fayetteville, NC	$814,192
Gastonia, NC	$522,728
Goldsboro, NC	$223,054
Greensboro, NC	$1,287,262
Greenville, NC	$376,858
Hickory, NC	$629,392
High Point, NC	$525,140
Jacksonville, NC	$386,178
Raleigh, NC	$2,252,268
Rocky Mount, NC	$250,856
Wilmington, NC	$626,422
Winston-Salem, NC	$962,388
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$8,253,096
State Total	**$26,204,624**

North Dakota	
Bismarck, ND	$365,654
Fargo, ND--MN	$647,706
Grand Forks, ND--MN	$310,280
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$1,667,696
State Total	**$2,991,336**

Ohio	
Akron, OH	$2,256,372
Canton, OH	$1,368,950
Cincinnati, OH--KY--IN	$6,614,380
Cleveland, OH	$10,763,818
Columbus, OH	$4,162,806
Dayton, OH	$5,671,818
Huntington, WV--KY--OH	$144,540
Lima, OH	$308,806
Lorain--Elyria, OH	$943,698
Mansfield, OH	$329,780
Middletown, OH	$433,152
Newark, OH	$322,402
Parkersburg, WV--OH	$102,146
Sandusky, OH	$219,072
Springfield, OH	$420,100
Toledo, OH--MI	$2,307,054
Weirton, WV--Steubenville, OH--PA	$174,036
Wheeling, WV--OH	$125,794
Youngstown, OH--PA	$1,229,962
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$7,700,970
State Total	**$44,167,832**

Oklahoma	
Fort Smith, AR--OK	$8,928
Lawton, OK	$375,848
Norman, OK	$486,494
Oklahoma City, OK	$2,543,344
Tulsa, OK	$2,175,714
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$4,421,700
State Total	**$10,012,030**

Oregon	
Bend, OR	$238,630
Corvallis, OR	$270,336
Eugene, OR	$1,664,054
Longview, WA--OR	$6,370
Medford, OR	$625,400
Portland, OR--WA	$13,387,190
Salem, OR	$1,429,990
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$3,865,844
State Total	**$19,930,070**

Pennsylvania	
Allentown--Bethlehem, PA--NJ	$2,717,114
Altoona, PA	$400,936
Binghamton, NY--PA	$14,412
Cumberland, MD--WV--PA	$54
Erie, PA	$1,008,590
Hagerstown, MD--WV--PA	$4,882
Harrisburg, PA	$1,779,828
Hazleton, PA	$227,268
Johnstown, PA	$333,146
Lancaster, PA	$1,326,214
Lebanon, PA	$304,990
Monessen, PA	$232,192
Philadelphia, PA--NJ--DE--MD	$47,042,342
Pittsburgh, PA	$13,107,864
Pottstown, PA	$284,728
Reading, PA	$1,098,098
Scranton, PA	$1,458,784
State College, PA	$439,988
Uniontown--Connellsville, PA	$224,140
Weirton, WV--Steubenville, OH--PA	$1,054
Williamsport, PA	$283,814
York, PA	$810,464
Youngstown, OH--PA	$1,229,962
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$7,799,490
State Total	**$70,116,748**

Puerto Rico	
Aguadilla--Isabela--San Sebastian, PR	$1,454,358
Arecibo, PR	$608,036
Fajardo, PR	$347,458
Florida--Barceloneta--Bajadero, PR	$270,504
Guayama, PR	$353,356
Juana Diaz, PR	$237,352
Mayaguez, PR	$549,964
Ponce, PR	$1,210,528
San German--Cabo Rojo--Sabana Grande, PR	$425,452
San Juan, PR	$13,174,914
Yauco, PR	$461,838
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$636,758
State Total	**$19,730,516**

Rhode Island	
Boston, MA--NH--RI	$40,657,788
Providence, RI--MA	$8,417,310
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$222,938
State Total	**$4,722,024**

South Carolina	
Anderson, SC	$246,788
Augusta-Richmond County, GA--SC	$810,354
Charleston--North Charleston, SC	$1,573,094
Charlotte, NC--SC	$5,502,280
Columbia, SC	$1,374,732
Florence, SC	$239,970
Greenville, SC	$733,458
Mauldin--Simpsonville, SC	$305,962
Myrtle Beach, SC	$458,746
Rock Hill, SC	$255,070
Spartanburg, SC	$513,606
Sumter, SC	$256,266
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$4,192,908
State Total	**$10,302,148**

South Dakota	
Rapid City, SD	$324,616
Sioux City, IA--NE--SD	$13,082
Sioux Falls, SD	$679,284
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$2,026,286
State Total	**$3,043,266**

Tennessee	
Bristol, TN--Bristol, VA	$134,166
Chattanooga, TN--GA	$1,166,580
Clarksville, TN--KY	$393,672
Cleveland, TN	$216,190
Jackson, TN	$277,362
Johnson City, TN	$371,286
Kingsport, TN--VA	$324,330
Knoxville, TN	$1,454,984
Memphis, TN--MS--AR	$4,547,844
Morristown, TN	$201,480
Murfreesboro, TN	$556,816
Nashville-Davidson, TN	$2,916,738
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$5,379,852
State Total	**$17,660,270**

Texas	
Abilene, TX	$526,876
Amarillo, TX	$917,818
Austin, TX	$6,443,130
Beaumont, TX	$598,788
Brownsville, TX	$938,724
College Station--Bryan, TX	$720,298
Corpus Christi, TX	$1,660,626
Dallas--Fort Worth--Arlington, TX	$22,978,514
Denton--Lewisville, TX	$964,934
El Paso, TX--NM	$3,933,628
Galveston, TX	$413,642
Harlingen, TX	$496,866
Houston, TX	$23,596,410
Killeen, TX	$898,794
Lake Jackson--Angleton, TX	$354,582
Laredo, TX	$1,245,364
Longview, TX	$320,428
Lubbock, TX	$974,090
McAllen, TX	$1,106,890
McKinney, TX	$253,204
Midland, TX	$481,622
Odessa, TX	$527,848
Port Arthur, TX	$597,336
San Angelo, TX	$400,280
San Antonio, TX	$8,139,500
Sherman, TX	$244,744
Temple, TX	$311,626
Texarkana, TX--Texarkana, AR	$177,182
Texas City, TX	$407,314
The Woodlands, TX	$429,314
Tyler, TX	$442,714
Victoria, TX	$228,586
Waco, TX	$744,514
Wichita Falls, TX	$450,554
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$12,758,840
State Total	**$95,630,142**

Utah	
Logan, UT	$351,686
Ogden--Layton, UT	$2,359,018
Provo--Orem, UT	$1,832,988
Salt Lake City, UT	$8,442,040
St. George, UT	$280,208
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$1,971,020
State Total	**$15,236,958**

Vermont	
Burlington, VT	$452,052
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$1,020,106
State Total	**$1,472,158**

Virgin Islands	
Virgin Islands	$354,076
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$0
State Total	**$354,076**

Virginia	
Blacksburg, VA	$276,702
Bristol, TN--Bristol, VA	$78,944
Charlottesville, VA	$393,662
Danville, VA	$209,980
Fredericksburg, VA	$392,150
Harrisonburg, VA	$242,172
Kingsport, TN--VA	$6,120
Lynchburg, VA	$380,302
Richmond, VA	$3,659,754
Roanoke, VA	$860,550
Virginia Beach, VA	$6,389,894
Washington, DC--VA--MD	$53,726,898
Winchester, VA	$224,342
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$4,716,888
State Total	**$28,683,740**

Washington	
Bellingham, WA	$427,234
Bremerton, WA	$726,942
Kennewick--Richland, WA	$679,800
Lewiston, ID--WA	$81,180
Longview, WA--OR	$291,072
Marysville, WA	$471,012
Mount Vernon, WA	$214,176
Olympia--Lacey, WA	$593,804
Portland, OR--WA	$13,387,190
Seattle, WA	$33,445,792
Spokane, WA--ID	$2,713,298
Wenatchee, WA	$261,928
Yakima, WA	$553,868
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$3,708,282
State Total	**$45,725,970**

West Virginia	
Charleston, WV	$766,072
Cumberland, MD--WV--PA	$8,832
Hagerstown, MD--WV--PA	$115,850
Huntington, WV--KY--OH	$390,960
Morgantown, WV	$236,172
Parkersburg, WV--OH	$264,436
Weirton, WV--Steubenville, OH--PA	$120,206
Wheeling, WV--OH	$240,988
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$2,622,540
State Total	**$4,766,056**

Wisconsin	
Appleton, WI	$992,750
Beloit, WI--IL	$207,666
Duluth, MN--WI	$127,356
Eau Claire, WI	$380,072
Fond du Lac, WI	$258,422
Green Bay, WI	$928,496
Janesville, WI	$324,956
Kenosha, WI	$594,902
La Crosse, WI--MN	$416,714
Madison, WI	$2,492,412
Milwaukee, WI	$7,607,272
Oshkosh, WI	$384,628
Racine, WI	$723,536
Round Lake Beach--McHenry--Grayslake, IL--WI	$1,493,982
Sheboygan, WI	$370,308
Wausau, WI	$302,384
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	$5,205,822
State Total	**$21,333,142**

Wyoming	
Casper, WY	$281,370
Cheyenne, WY	$317,032
Statewide Rural Formula Funds	1,972,688
State Total	**$2,571,090**

Source: Federal Transit Administration

Summary of the Legislation

Sec. 1. Short title

This section designates the short title of the Act as the “Energy Savings Through Public Transportation Act of 2008”.

Sec. 2. Findings

This section details findings made by Congress regarding the ways in which public transportation use helps Americans reduce their transportation-related energy consumption and reliance on foreign oil, as well as decrease their greenhouse gas emissions.

Sec. 3. Grants to improve public transportation services

This section authorizes $1.7 billion in immediate funding to increase public transportation use across the United States. Transit agencies may use these funds to reduce transit fares or expand transit services in order to provide incentives for commuters to choose transit options. This section provides $850 million for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009 for these grants. The funds are distributed by the urbanized area formula (section 5307) and the rural formula (section 5311) of title 49, United States Code. The funds are available to expand transit services and reduce transit fares. The funds are available for two years and have a 100 percent Federal share.

These funds will allow transit agencies to provide incentives for commuters to choose transit options, thereby reducing their transportation-related energy consumption and reliance on foreign oil, as well as decreasing their greenhouse gas emissions.

Sec. 4. Increased Federal share for clean air act compliance

This section increases the Federal share for clean fuel and alternative fuel transit bus, ferry or locomotive-related equipment or facilities from 90 percent to 100 percent of the net project cost for fiscal years 2008 and 2009, unless the grant recipient requests a lower grant percentage.

The increased Federal share creates incentives for transit agencies to purchase alternative fuel transit equipment.

Sec. 5. Federal agency transit benefits

This section establishes a nationwide Federal transit pass benefits program and requires all Federal agencies in the United States to offer transit passes to Federal employees working in urbanized areas with fixed route transit systems. It also requires that specific guidelines be followed in implementing the nationwide program to avoid the possibility of fraud and abuse.

Section 3049 of P.L. 109–59, the “Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users”, currently requires that all Federal agencies within the National Capital Region implement a transit pass fringe benefits program and offer employees transit passes. This requirement originated from Executive Order 13150, signed by President Clinton on April 21, 2000. The Executive Order also required the Department of Transportation, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Energy to implement a nationwide three-year pilot transit pass benefit program for all qualified Federal employees of those agencies.

The Department of Transportation ("DOT") has determined that both the National Capital Region program and the nationwide pilot program are a success, and recommends that the transit pass benefits program be extended to all Federal employees nationwide.

Data from the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Authority covering the first three years of the National Capital Region transit pass program show that more than 15,500 automobiles were eliminated from roads in the Washington, D.C., area as a result of Federal employees shifting their travel mode away from single occupancy vehicle ("SOV") use to public transportation use for commuting to work. The Department of Transportation estimated that emissions and energy savings from this mode shift included the reduction of more than eight million gallons of gasoline, nearly 40,000 tons of carbon dioxide, and over 675 tons of carbon monoxide for each of the three years that they studied. DOT also studied the results of the nationwide pilot and found that, within the three covered agencies, 11 percent of the participants shifted their travel mode away from SOV use to public transportation use for commuting to work, again producing marked energy and emissions savings, reduced congestion and cleaner air.

This program will allow Federal agencies nationwide to provide incentives for commuters to choose transit options, thereby reducing their transportation-related energy consumption and reliance on foreign oil, as well as decreasing their greenhouse gas emissions.

FULL-TIME FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT IN 27 METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS

Metropolitan area	Number of Federal employees
Washington-Baltimore, DC–MD–VA–WV	312,854
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island	65,083
Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA	46,432
Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, PA	39,242
Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA	38,630
Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA	34,432
Atlanta, GA	31,798
San Diego, CA	29,212
Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA–NH–ME–CT	29,015
Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL–IN–WI	28,687
San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA	27,652
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	24,411
Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT	23,088
Oklahoma City, OK	22,144
Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO	21,240
Kansas City, MO–KS	19,868
San Antonio, TX	19,572
Honolulu, HI	19,509
Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL	15,787
Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, MI	15,531
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX	14,353
Portland-Salem, OR–WA	12,442
Cleveland-Akron-Lorain, OH	11,077
Cincinnati-Hamilton, OH–KY–IN	10,709
San Juan-Caguas-Arecibo, PR	8,967
Sacramento-Yolo, CA	7,033
Milwaukee-Racine, WI	4,855

FULL-TIME FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT IN 27 METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS—Continued

Metropolitan area	Number of Federal employees
Total	933,623

Source: U.S. Office of Personnel Management, March 31, 2004

Sec. 6. Capital cost of contracting vanpool pilot program

This provision creates a pilot program to allow the amount expended by private providers of public transportation by vanpool for the acquisition of vans to be used as the non-Federal share for matching Federal transit funds in five communities. Under current law, only local public funds may be used as local match, and this pilot program allows private funds to be used in limited circumstances. This section requires the private providers of vanpool services to use revenues they receive in providing public transportation, in excess of its operating costs, for the purpose of acquiring vans, excluding any amounts the providers may have received in Federal, state, or local government assistance for such acquisition. The Department of Transportation will implement and oversee the vanpool pilot projects, and will report to Congress on the costs, benefits, and efficiencies of the vanpool projects.

This program will encourage expanded partnering of local communities with private vanpool providers to provide commuters with additional transit options, thereby reducing their transportation-related energy consumption and reliance on foreign oil, as well as decreasing their greenhouse gas emissions.

Sec. 7. Increased Federal share for end-of-line fixed guideway stations

This provision increases the Federal share for right-of-way acquisition, design, engineering, and construction of additional parking facilities at end-of-line fixed guideway stations from 80 percent to 100 percent of the net project cost for fiscal years 2008 and 2009, unless the grant recipient requests a lower grant percentage. Suburban commuters are more likely to use transit options, such as commuter rail or heavy rail, if there is adequate parking at the station.

This provision will increase the total number of transit commuters who have access to transit facilities, thereby reducing their transportation-related energy consumption and reliance on foreign oil, as well as decreasing their greenhouse gas emissions.

Legislative History and Committee Consideration

On June 20, 2007, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure ordered reported H.R. 2701, the "Transportation Energy Security and Climate Change Mitigation Act of 2007," favorably to the House. Section 201 and section 202 of H.R. 2701 are the basis for sections 3 and 4 of H.R. 6052. H.R. 2701, as ordered reported was incorporated into H.R. 3221, the "New Direction for Energy Independence, National Security, and Consumer Protection Act." See sections 8201 and 8202 of H.R. 3221. Section 6 of this bill was adopted as an amendment to H.R. 3221 during Floor consideration of the bill. On August 4, 2007, the House passed H.R. 3221 by a recorded vote of 241–172. However, these provisions were not included in the final version of P.L. 110–140, the "Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007."

On May 14, 2008, Chairman James L. Oberstar introduced H.R. 6052, the "Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008."

On May 15, 2008, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met to consider H.R. 6052, and ordered the bill reported favorably to the House by voice vote with a quorum present.

Record Votes

Clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives requires each committee report to include the total number of votes cast for and against on each record vote on a motion to report and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, and the names of those members voting for and against. There were no recorded votes taken in connection with consideration of H.R. 6052 or ordering it reported. A motion to order H.R. 6052 reported favorably to the House was agreed to by voice vote with a quorum present.

Committee Oversight Findings

With respect to the requirements of clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee's oversight findings and recommendations are reflected in this report.

Cost of Legislation

Clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives does not apply where a cost estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 has been timely submitted prior to the filing of the report and is included in the report. Such a cost estimate is included in this report.

Compliance With House Rule XIII

1. With respect to the requirement of clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee references the report of the Congressional Budget Office included in the report.

2. With respect to the requirement of clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the performance goals and objectives of this legislation are to promote increased public transportation use and increased use of alternative fuels in providing public transportation.

3. With respect to the requirement of clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee has received the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 6052 from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 13, 2008.

Hon. JAMES L. OBERSTAR, *Chairman,*
Committee on Transportation, and Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 6052, the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Sarah Puro.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. SUNSHINE
(For Peter R. Orszag, Director).

Enclosure.

H.R. 6052—Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008

Summary: H.R. 6052 would authorize the appropriation of $850 million in 2009 for grants to public transportation authorities to reduce fares or expand services. The bill also would require all federal agencies in areas that meet certain criteria to offer their employees subsidies to take public transportation; however, almost all agencies currently offer such a benefit. CBO estimates that providing additional transit subsidies under this provision would cost about $5 million a year.

CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 6052 would cost $806 million over the 2009–2013 period, assuming the appropriation of the necessary funds. The legislation could also affect direct spending by agencies not funded through annual appropriations (such as the Tennessee Valley Authority). CBO estimates, however, that any net increase in spending by those agencies would not be significant.

The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 6052 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 400 (transportation).

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars					
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2009–2013
CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION						
Public Transportation Grants:						
Authorization Level	850	0	0	0	0	850
Estimated Outlays	128	255	170	128	102	782
Transit Benefits for Federal Employees:						
Estimated Authorization Level	5	5	5	5	5	25
Estimated Outlays	4	5	5	5	5	24
Total Changes:						
Estimated Authorization Level	855	5	5	5	5	875
Estimated Outlays	132	260	175	132	107	806

Note: Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Basis of estimate: For this estimate, CBO assumes that H.R. 6052 will be enacted near the start of fiscal year 2009 and that the authorized and necessary amounts will be appropriated each year beginning in fiscal year 2009. (H.R. 6052 also would authorize the appropriation of $850 million in 2008 for grants to public transportation authorities; however, those amounts are not included in this cost estimate because CBO assumes that no further appropriations will be provided in 2008 for such programs.) Estimates of spending are based on historical spending patterns of existing programs.

Public transportation grants

H.R. 6052 would direct the Department of Transportation to administer grants that would aid public transportation authorities to either reduce fares or to expand services, and it would authorize the appropriation of $850 million for fiscal year 2009. That amount includes $750 million for such programs in urban areas with populations over 50,000 and $100 million for areas with populations under 50,000. Based on spending patterns for similar programs, CBO estimates that implementing those grant programs would cost $782 million over the 2009–2013 period.

Transit benefits for Federal employees

H.R. 6052 would require all federal agencies with employees in urbanized areas served by public transportation systems that operate on fixed routes to offer their employees passes to be used on such transportation so that they may commute to work. About 40 metropolitan statistical areas have such transportation systems. Under current law, all employees in the National Capital Area are offered such a benefit, and about 35 percent of such employees currently take the benefit.

Although not required by current law, according to the Department of Transportation, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Environmental Protection Agency, almost all agencies with employees in urban areas outside of the National Capital Area offer their employees a subsidy to take public transportation as would be required by the provisions in H.R. 6052. Because most employees are already eligible for a subsidy, CBO estimates that no more than 5,000 additional employees would receive the subsidy under the bill. Nationwide, the average amount that employees receive for the transit benefit is a nearly $90 per month. Thus, CBO estimates that implementing this provision would cost about $5 million annually over the 2009–2013 period, assuming the availability of appropriated funds.

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: H.R. 6052 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA. The bill would benefit state, local, and tribal governments by authorizing grants for transportation projects.

Previous CBO estimate: On July 18, 2007, CBO provided an estimate for H.R. 2701, the Transportation Energy Security Climate Change Mitigation Act of 2007, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on June 20, 2007. That bill would also authorize grants to public transportation authorities to either reduce fares or to expand service. Because CBO now assumes that no further appropriations will be provided in 2008 for public transportation programs, the estimate for H.R. 2701 included more spending than our estimate for H.R. 6052. H.R. 2701 would not authorize transit benefits for additional federal employees, but it contains several other provisions with significant costs that are not contained in H.R. 6052. Neither bill contains intergovernmental or private-sector mandates.

Estimate prepared by: Federal costs: Sarah Puro; Impact on state, local, and tribal governments: Elizabeth Cove; Impact on the private sector: Jacob Kuipers.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, H.R. 6052, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause (3)(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, committee reports on a bill or joint resolution of a public character shall include a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the measure. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure finds that Congress has the authority to enact this measure pursuant to its powers granted under article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

FEDERAL MANDATES STATEMENT

The Committee adopts as its own the estimate of Federal mandates prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 423 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (Public Law 104–4).

PREEMPTION CLARIFICATION

Section 423 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 requires the report of any Committee on a bill or joint resolution to include a statement on the extent to which the bill or joint resolution is intended to preempt state, local, or tribal law. The Committee states that H.R. 6052 does not preempt any state, local, or tribal law.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE STATEMENT

No advisory committees within the meaning of section 5(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act are created by this legislation.

APPLICABILITY TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (Public Law 104–1) requires the report of any Committee on a bill or joint resolution relating to terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations to describe the manner in which the bill or joint resolution applies to the legislative branch.

Section 5 of H.R. 6052 establishes a nationwide Federal transit pass benefits program and requires all Federal agencies in the United States to offer transit passes to Federal employees working in urbanized areas with fixed route transit systems. It also requires that specific guidelines be followed in implementing the nationwide program to avoid the possibility of fraud and abuse.

Pursuant to section 3049 of P.L. 109–59, the "Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users", current law requires all Federal agencies within the National Capital Region to implement a transit pass fringe benefits program and offer employees transit passes. The legislative branch is considered an agency for purposes of this requirement. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 7905, the term "agency" includes an entity of the legislative branch. An "entity of the legislative branch" means the House of Representatives, the Senate, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (including the Botanic Garden), the Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Copyright Royalty Tribunal, the Government Printing Office, and the Library of Congress. Therefore, under current law, the legislative branch is required to offer transit passes to employees in the National Capital Region. In addition, a legislative branch employee applying for the benefit must certify that the employee is eligible for the benefit, will use the benefit for his or her regular daily commute, will not transfer the benefit, and that the amount that the employee receives does not exceed the employee's average monthly commuting cost.

Section 5 of H.R. 6052 extends this requirement to all legislative branch employees working in urbanized areas with fixed route transit systems. The Committee understands that transit pass benefits are currently widely available to legislative branch employees.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

SECTION 3049 OF THE SAFE, ACCOUNTABLE, FLEXIBLE, EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS

SEC. 3049. TRANSPORTATION FRINGE BENEFITS.

(a) TRANSIT PASS TRANSPORTATION FRINGE BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—【Effective as of the first day of the next fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, each covered agency】 *Each agency* shall implement a program under which all qualified Federal employees serving in or under such agency *at a location in an urbanized area of the United States that is served by fixed route public transportation* shall be offered transit pass transportation fringe benefits, as described in paragraph (2).

* * * * * * *

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

【(A) the term "covered agency" means any agency, to the extent of its facilities in the National Capital Region;】

【(B)】 *(A)* the term "agency" means any agency (as defined by 7905(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code), the Postal Rate Commission, and the Smithsonian Institution;

⟦(C)⟧ *(B)* the term "National Capital Region" includes the District of Columbia and every county or other geographic area covered by section 2 of Executive Order No. 13150;

⟦(D)⟧ *(C)* the term "Executive Order No. 13150" refers to Executive Order No. 13150 (5 U.S.C. 7905 note);

⟦(E)⟧ *(D)* the term "Federal agency" is used in the same way as under section 2 of Executive Order No. 13150; and

⟦(F)⟧ *(E)* any determination as to whether or not one is a "qualified Federal employee" shall be made applying the same criteria as would apply under section 2 of Executive Order No. 13150.

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be considered to require that ⟦a covered agency⟧ *an agency—*

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) GUIDANCE.—

(A) ISSUANCE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary of Transportation shall issue guidance on nationwide implementation of the transit pass transportation fringe benefits program under this subsection.

(B) UNIFORM APPLICATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The guidance to be issued under subparagraph (A) shall contain a uniform application for use by all Federal employees applying for benefits from an agency under the program.

(ii) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—As part of such an application, an employee shall provide, at a minimum, the employee's home and work addresses, a breakdown of the employee's commuting costs, and a certification of the employee's eligibility for benefits under the program.

(iii) WARNING AGAINST FALSE STATEMENTS.—Such an application shall contain a warning against making false statements in the application.

(C) INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—The guidance to be issued under subparagraph (A) shall contain independent verification requirements to ensure that, with respect to an employee of an agency—

(i) the eligibility of the employee for benefits under the program is verified by an official of the agency;

(ii) employee commuting costs are verified by an official of the agency; and

(iii) records of the agency are checked to ensure that the employee is not receiving parking benefits from the agency.

(D) PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.—The guidance to be issued under subparagraph (A) shall contain program implementation requirements applicable to each agency to ensure that—

(i) benefits provided by the agency under the program are adjusted in cases of employee travel, leave, or change of address;

(ii) removal from the program is included in the procedures of the agency relating to an employee separating from employment with the agency; and

(iii) benefits provided by the agency under the program are made available using an electronic format (rather than using paper fare media) where such a format is available for use.

(E) ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES.—The guidance to be issued under subparagraph (A) shall contain a uniform administrative policy on enforcement and penalties. Such policy shall be implemented by each agency to ensure compliance with program requirements, to prevent fraud and abuse, and, as appropriate, to penalize employees who have abused or misused the benefits provided under the program.

(F) PERIODIC REVIEWS.—The guidance to be issued under subparagraph (A) shall require each agency, not later than September 1 of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every 3 years thereafter, to develop and submit to the Secretary a review of the agency's implementation of the program. Each such review shall contain, at a minimum, the following:

(i) An assessment of the agency's implementation of the guidance, including a summary of the audits and investigations, if any, of the program conducted by the Inspector General of the agency.

(ii) Information on the total number of employees of the agency that are participating in the program.

(iii) Information on the total number of single occupancy vehicles removed from the roadway network as a result of participation by employees of the agency in the program.

(iv) Information on energy savings and emissions reductions, including reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, resulting from reductions in single occupancy vehicle use by employees of the agency that are participating in the program.

(v) Information on reduced congestion and improved air quality resulting from reductions in single occupancy vehicle use by employees of the agency that are participating in the program.

(vi) Recommendations to increase program participation and thereby reduce single occupancy vehicle use by Federal employees nationwide.

(6) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than September 30 of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every 3 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report on nationwide implementation of the transit pass transportation fringe benefits program under this subsection, including a summary of the

*information submitted by agencies pursuant to paragraph (5)(**F**).*

* * * * * * *

COMMITTEE CORRESPONDENCE

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515–6143

MAJORITY (202) 225–5051
FACSIMILE (202) 225–4784
MINORITY (202) 225–5074

www.oversight.house.gov

June 3, 2007

The Honorable James L. Oberstar
Chairman
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
U.S. House of Representatives
2165 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Oberstar:

I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to the consideration of H.R. 6052, the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008, which was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on May 14, 2008.

In the interest of expediting consideration of H.R. 6052, the Oversight Committee will not separately consider this legislation. The Oversight Committee does so, however, with the understanding that this does not prejudice the Committee's jurisdictional interests and prerogatives regarding this bill or similar legislation.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Oversight Committee should H.R. 6052 or a similar Senate bill be considered in conference with the Senate. I also request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Report on H.R. 6052 or in the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

Henry A. Waxman
Chairman

cc: Tom Davis
Ranking Minority Member

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

James L. Oberstar
Chairman

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

John L. Mica
Ranking Republican Member

James W. Coon II, Republican Chief of Staff

June 3, 2008

The Honorable Henry A. Waxman
Chairman
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
U.S. House of Representatives
2157 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Chairman Waxman:

I write to you regarding H.R. 6052, the "Saving Energy through Public Transportation Act of 2008".

I appreciate your willingness to waive rights to further consideration of H.R. 6052, notwithstanding the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Of course, this wavier does not prejudice any further jurisdictional claims by your Committee over this legislation or similar language. Furthermore, I agree to support your request for appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform if a conference is held on this matter.

This exchange of letters will be placed in the Committee report and inserted in the Congressional Record as part of the consideration of H.R. 6052 on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

Jim Oberstar

James L. Oberstar, M.C.
Chairman

cc: The Honorable Nancy Pelosi, Speaker
The Honorable John L. Mica, Ranking Member
The Honorable Thomas M. Davis III, Ranking Member, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
The Honorable John Sullivan, Parliamentarian