United States General Accounting Office

GAO

Testimony

Before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Committee on Environment and Public Works, U.S. Senate

For Release on Delivery
Expected at 9:30 a.m. EST
Tuesday
Nov. 4, 1997

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAMS

Status of Federal Highway Programs in the Absence of Reauthorization

Statement of Phyllis F. Scheinberg,
Associate Director, Transportation Issues,
Resources, Community, and Economic
Development Division

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

We appreciate the opportunity to provide information on the status of federal surface transportation programs in the absence of funding from a new federal highway reauthorization act. As you know, in 1991, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) authorized over $122 billion in federal funds for highway programs for fiscal years 1992 through 1997.[1] This authorization expired on September 30, 1997, and no new federal highway funds have been authorized for fiscal year 1998. The states can, however, use their unobligated balances that remain from the ISTEA authorization period. For all 50 states, these federal-aid highway balances totaled $12.1 billion at the beginning of fiscal year 1998.[2]

Specifically, you asked that we compare unobligated federal highway fund balances at the beginning of fiscal year 1998 with the highway funds that the states obligated during the first part of fiscal year 1997. We performed this analysis using actual obligation data for federal-aid highway projects during the first 4 through 7 months of fiscal year 1997. For illustrative purposes, however, this testimony will focus on the 6-month period. (Details for the 4- through 7-month periods are presented in apps. I and II.) At your request, our testimony will also address strategies that could temporarily help the states continue to fund highway programs in the absence of a federal highway authorization act.

Our work is based on the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) obligation data for all 50 states. In addition, we contacted nine states to obtain their views on how they would operate without new federal highway funds in the short term. When we analyzed FHWA's obligation data for the 50 states, the analysis was limited to total obligation levels for federal highway projects. We did not address other important areas, such as the potential effects on the operations of agencies within the U. S. Department of Transportation or the effects on particular programs, such as transportation safety programs. In addition, we did not look at the impact on transit programs.

[1]The full ISTEA authorization for all surface transportation programs, including mass transit, totaled $155 billion for fiscal years 1992 through 1997.

[2]Funds that were not obligated at the end of fiscal year 1997 remained unobligated. These funds are the subject of this testimony. The unobligated balances represent funds apportioned or allocated but not yet committed by the states. The unobligated balances used in this statement pertain only to the states and do not apply to the District of Columbia or the territories.

In summary, we compared the level of unobligated highway fund balances available at the beginning of fiscal year 1998 with the actual obligations that the states made during the first part of fiscal year 1997. The total unobligated balance of $12.1 billion exceeds the total actual obligations of $8.1 billion that all states combined made during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1997. However, a comparison of the unobligated balances of individual states with their actual fiscal year 1997 obligations reveals that some state highway programs may experience financial difficulties by the middle of fiscal year 1998 if their obligation rates for this year are comparable to those for fiscal year 1997. The analysis indicates that while most states have unobligated balances that are greater than their actual federal highway obligations in the first 6 months of fiscal year 1997, 14 states have an unobligated balance that is lower than their actual obligations during that same period. The nine states that we contacted identified various strategies that they would use to try to continue their highway operations, such as relying more extensively on state funds. However, some of these states also noted that they would soon be postponing highway projects if new federal funds are not available within the next few months.

It is important to note when making these types of comparisons that the rates at which states obligated funds in fiscal year 1997 may not correspond to their plans for obligating federal highway funds in fiscal year 1998. Furthermore, some states may be limited in their ability to use available unobligated balances because of restrictions on the specific types of highway programs that the funds can be used for. Nonetheless, the comparisons do indicate that while many states may be able to continue financing highway projects for some time, some states may have difficulty dealing even in the short term with the absence of new federal highway funds.

A number of strategies could help the states respond to the absence of new federal highway funds in the short term. For example, the Congress could provide the states with the flexibility to use their unobligated balances across the range of federal highway programs, rather than keeping the balances tied to specific highway funding categories and demonstration projects. Then, after reauthorization, the Congress could “reimburse” the appropriate funding categories. The individual states could also consider a number of strategies, such as temporarily substituting state funds for federal highway funds. The states could also begin highway projects by using advance construction, which enables a state to access capital from a variety of sources, including its own funds and private capital, and later receive reimbursement through federal highway obligations. However, such strategies may delay other planned projects within individual states. Furthermore, these strategies may not be feasible for some states or for an extended period of time.

Background

ISTEA authorized over $122 billion for highway programs for fiscal years 1992 through 1997. The authorization was funded primarily through federal highway user taxes such as those on motor fuels (gasoline, gasohol, and diesel), tires, and trucks. Funds from these sources are collected from users and credited to the Highway Trust Fund for highway and mass transit projects or related activities. The fund is divided into a highway account and a mass transit account.

Except for a few minor deductions, such as those for federal administrative expenses, federal highway funds are provided to the states through FHWA, which is part of the U. S. Department of Transportation. The money is generally distributed to the states through various formula calculations.[3] The current formula, established by ISTEA, determines the distribution of funds for 13 funding categories, such as the Interstate Maintenance, the National Highway System, and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) programs.[4]

During the ISTEA authorization period, FHWA annually apportioned to the states authority to obligate funds. And, if the Congress took no further action, the states could proceed to obligate all the authority apportioned to them by FHWA. However, the Congress also imposed an annual obligation limitation as part of the appropriation process on most elements of the federal highway program. These limits did not take back spending authority that was already apportioned to the states; rather, the obligation limits acted to control the obligation rate.

The congressionally imposed obligation limits acted to control total obligations but left the states with some discretion to decide how they would use their obligation authority across the range of federal-aid programs. For example, in a particular year, a state could obligate all its Interstate Maintenance and National Highway System funds. But the state would then have to compensate by obligating a smaller part of its federal

[3]ISTEA also authorized over $6.2 billion over 6 years for 539 statutorily designated demonstration projects.

[4]Throughout this statement, unless otherwise noted, these funding categories will be referred to as programs.

highway funds from other categories. In addition, a few categories of highway funding are exempt from obligation limitations—the two largest are minimum allocation and demonstration projects.[5]

Once FHWA approves a project that a state proposes, the federal share of the project's cost is considered "obligated" against the state's apportionment. The state then proceeds—doing detailed design engineering, advertising for bids, and selecting a contractor for the construction work. The state incurs costs, pays the bills, and then seeks reimbursement of the federal share from FHWA. Federal outlays—that is, actual expenditures—do not occur until the state is reimbursed. Furthermore, the funds are outlayed over a number of years.

Comparing Unobligated Highway Balances With Previous Obligations

At the beginning of fiscal year 1998, the total unobligated federal highway fund balance for all states was $12.1 billion. This unobligated balance came from two sources. First, $9.6 billion in unobligated balances exists because the Congress annually imposed an obligation limit during the ISTEA period to control spending for most federal highway funding categories. Second, another $2.5 billion in unobligated authority remains for a few highway funding categories that were exempt from the obligation limitation. The two largest exempted programs were minimum allocation ($0.65 billion) and demonstration projects ($1.85 billion).

From a national perspective, the total unobligated highway balance of $12.1 billion at the beginning of fiscal year 1998 (including program funds exempt from obligation limits) is nearly 1.5 times the $8.1 billion that all states obligated during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1997. This does not mean, however, that each state's unobligated balance is greater than its obligations during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1997. FHWA's data show that the unobligated balances for each of 14 states fall short by 1 percent to 30 percent or by $1 million to almost $82 million of its actual obligations during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1997. Several states were in the 20 to 30 percent range. For example, Indiana's total unobligated balance is over $80 million less than its total highway obligations during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1997. This represents about a 28-percent difference. Similarly, North Carolina's total unobligated balance is about $94 million less than the amount it obligated during this same period in fiscal year

[5]Minimum allocation guarantees a state an amount such that its percentage of total apportionments and prior-year allocations from certain highway funding categories is not less than 90 percent of the state's estimated percentage of contributions to the Highway Trust Fund's Highway Account. Furthermore, Emergency Relief Program funding was also exempt from the obligation limits, but ISTEA's annual authorization for this program was limited to $100 million.

1997—a difference of about 26 percent. (App. I provides a state-by-state comparison of the fiscal year 1998 unobligated balance of $9.6 billion (from highway programs subject to the obligation limit) to actual state obligations during the first 4 through 7 months of fiscal year 1997. App. II provides a similar comparison based on the combined total unobligated balance of $12.1 billion.)

It is important to note that these comparisons imply that the state's obligation rates for fiscal year 1997 correspond to those for fiscal year 1998, which may or may not be the case for individual states. Furthermore, the total unobligated balance of $12.1 billion includes balances from programs that were not subject to the obligation limitation. As of October 1, 1997, seven states had little or no unobligated balances in these program categories.

Strategies That Could Help the States in the Short-Term

A number of strategies could help the states get through a short period without a new highway funding authorization. At the federal level, the Congress could provide the states with the flexibility to use their unobligated balances across the range of federal highway programs, rather than keeping the balances generally tied to specific highway programs and demonstration projects. At the state level, some states may be able to obtain state, local, or private resources to begin projects and later seek federal reimbursement for these costs through advance construction authority.

Flexibility Needed If Unobligated Balances Are to Be Fully Used in the Short Term

The unobligated balance of $9.6 billion (from programs subject to the obligation limit) represents the sum of the unobligated balances remaining from specific programs, such as the Interstate Maintenance, National Highway System, Surface Transportation, and CMAQ programs. These balances may now generally be obligated in accordance with the individual program categories.

Throughout the ISTEA period, the obligation limits acted to control "total" obligations, thus leaving the states discretion to decide how they would use their obligation authority across the range of specific federal-aid highway programs. For example, in a particular year, a state could have opted to obligate all of its available National Highway System funds, but it would have had to make up for its full use of these funds by obligating less in another funding category, such as the CMAQ program.

Differences in the priorities that the states assigned to different highway programs are now reflected in significant variances in the unobligated balances that remain from ISTEA authorizations for these programs. For example, the National Highway System had a total unobligated balance of over $426 million at the beginning of fiscal year 1998, which represents only about 13 percent of the total fiscal year 1997 apportionment for this program. In comparison, the Surface Transportation program started fiscal year 1998 with an unobligated balance of $4.2 billion, or nearly half of the fiscal year 1997 apportionment for this program. Furthermore, the CMAQ program had an unobligated balance of $1 billion, or 108 percent of the fiscal year 1997 apportionment for this program. Because of the variances in the unobligated balances remaining across federal highway programs, these balances may not be consistent with state funding priorities or projects that the states planned for this year.

To identify any problems that the states might have in using their unobligated balances and to identify strategies that the states may use to help them respond to the absence of new federal highway funds in the short term, we contacted nine states—Arkansas, Connecticut, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, and South Dakota. These differed in the extent to which they expected that their unobligated federal highway balances would help them respond to any short-term absence of new federal highway funds. Several of the states did note that the usefulness of these unobligated balances will be somewhat limited because they are tied to specific programs. For instance, a Missouri transportation finance and budget manager estimated that in early fiscal year 1998, the state will be able to use only $50 million of its total of $169 million in unobligated funds because the balance of the money is for categories such as CMAQ or transportation enhancements in which the state does not have projects ready to go. Similarly, the Transportation Director of Program Management for New York commented that it is very difficult to say exactly when the state will use its unobligated balance because some of this money is limited to programs that (1) are not a state priority or (2) do not have projects that are ready to go.

If the Congress were to enact legislation that would give the states the flexibility to use unobligated balances interchangeably among federal highway programs, then some states would be better positioned to more fully use their unobligated federal highway funds. In addition, while minimum allocation funding can be used for numerous federal highway programs, demonstration project funds must be used only for the specific projects for which the funds were authorized under current law. These demonstration project funds, which generally were not subject to the obligation limits, ended fiscal year 1997 with a total unobligated balance of about $1.9 billion. If the Congress were to provide the states with the flexibility to use program as well as demonstration project funds to meet other highway program needs, a later reauthorization could provide for reimbursement to the borrowed fund account.

States May Have to Rely More on State Funding for Highways

Federal highway funding represents one of the many financial sources used to support the nation's highways. The Department of Transportation's statistics indicate that the revenue available for highways totaled $92.5 billion in 1995, the latest year for which data are available. About $59.6 billion of this revenue came from highway user taxes—$18.3 billion from federal highway user taxes, $39.3 from state highway user taxes, and $2 billion from local highway user taxes. The balance came from a variety of sources, such as $5.1 billion from property taxes and assessments and $7.6 billion from bond receipts.

To compensate for the lack of new federal highway funds being available for part of fiscal year 1998, some states may be able to fund a proportionately larger share of their planned highway projects in early fiscal year 1998 with state funds. Later in fiscal year 1998, these states could use the federal funds made available to them. This assumes that at some unspecified time in fiscal year 1998, new federal highway funds will be available; however, this uncertainty poses problems for some states. A few of the nine states we contacted noted that they would be postponing highway projects if new federal funds are not available within the next few months.

The states also differ in their ability to provide greater funding in fiscal year 1998. For instance, the Commissioner of North Dakota's Department of Transportation stated that the disastrous flood this year left North Dakota without any additional state funds to pay for highway projects. In contrast, Indiana's Deputy Commissioner for Finance stated that the state does not face a financial crisis in early fiscal year 1998. He noted that Indiana's Department of Transportation has, if necessary, the ability to use $600 million in bonding authority to begin projects in fiscal year 1998. However, if the states draw on their own resources, they may have to delay other planned projects. Also, this short-term solution could have a defined payback period. For instance, a Missouri transportation official noted that the state expects to award highway contracts through

December 1997, using $100 million of state funds. He noted that this state money will be borrowed from other state programs and must be returned to the other accounts by June 30, 1998, the end of the state's fiscal year.

One financial tool that may help some states is advance construction. Under advance construction, a state can begin a highway project by obtaining capital from a variety of sources, including its own funds and private capital, and later receive reimbursement through federal highway obligations. Indiana's Deputy Commissioner for Finance stated that without new federal funds, Indiana will begin its highway program using advance construction with state funding. New York also indicated that it would turn to advance construction to help with its highway financing. The New York Transportation Director of Program Management remarked that he expects to keep the state's planned highway projects on schedule in early fiscal year 1998 through the use of advance construction. He stated that New York will use state money to keep the projects on schedule and then backfill with federal funds once a new authorization is passed.

In July 1997, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) conducted a survey to determine the possible effects of a delay in the reauthorization of the federal surface transportation program on state transportation programs. Many states reported to AASHTO that they would use advance construction to continue operations and project schedules. However, AASHTO noted that advance construction will not help some states that have already heavily relied on this technique.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony. I would be pleased to respond to any questions that you or other Members of the Subcommittee may have.

Unobiligated Federal Highway Balances (Subject to the Obligation Limitation) Compared With Fiscal Year 1997 Obligations

Dollars in thousands

State	Unobligated balance subject to obligation limit as of 10/01/97	Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 4-month obligation total		Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 5-month obligation total		Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 6-month obligation total		Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 7-month obligation total	
		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Alabama	$142,290	$70,523	98	$54,933	63	$18,011	14	**-$13,762**	**-9**
Alaska	94,192	59,601	172	12,980	16	**-5,331**	**-5**	**-19,351**	**-17**
Arizona	144,747	61,638	74	48,153	50	35,920	33	27,297	23
Arkansas	87,129	**-11,524**	**-12**	**-28,961**	**-25**	**-32,323**	**-27**	**-40,468**	**-32**
California	816,665	535,661	191	494,274	153	406,101	99	215,761	36
Colorado	117,689	73,357	165	14,684	14	**-1,177**	**-1**	**-28,065**	**-19**
Connecticut	166,353	11,568	7	**-12,887**	**-7**	**-32,651**	**-16**	**-117,730**	**-41**
Delaware	54,052	48,091	807	46,936	660	40,646	303	20,332	60
Florida	225,197	136,682	154	75,480	50	**-14,489**	**-6**	**-258,506**	**-53**
Georgia	293,339	184,098	169	158,972	118	118,093	67	83,185	40
Hawaii	139,085	[a]	[a]	[a]	[a]	[a]	[a]	[a]	[a]
Idaho	50,407	22,596	81	5,743	13	5,457	12	39	0
Illinois	255,153	146,891	136	82,100	47	**-14,927**	**-6**	**-236,031**	**-48**
Indiana	182,028	47,488	35	**-50,888**	**-22**	**-102,013**	**-36**	**-124,776**	**-41**
Iowa	115,924	13,004	13	415	0	**-25,943**	**-18**	**-27,335**	**-19**
Kansas	128,419	57,528	81	51,050	66	45,803	55	35,262	38
Kentucky	134,226	92,030	218	60,001	81	11,759	10	**-12,999**	**-9**
Louisiana	270,665	211,548	358	196,015	263	192,316	245	176,085	186
Maine	48,887	16,706	52	57	0	**-10,845**	**-18**	**-10,548**	**-18**
Maryland	158,942	116,473	274	41,191	35	20,355	15	**-29,096**	**-15**
Massachusetts	793,225	614,708	344	374,672	90	298,761	60	256,679	48
Michigan	217,146	93,236	75	52,661	32	11,239	5	**-15,783**	**-7**
Minnesota	178,687	141,349	379	38,120	27	28,273	19	16,178	10
Mississippi	102,719	46,798	84	38,873	61	7,882	8	**-6,233**	**-6**
Missouri	168,587	26,114	18	**-67,796**	**-29**	**-100,490**	**-37**	**-111,528**	**-40**
Montana	88,072	73,364	499	41,622	90	33,642	62	13,022	17
Nebraska	77,809	47,919	160	39,276	102	**-5,837**	**-7**	**-7,870**	**-9**
Nevada	55,011	46,620	556	11,803	27	**–1,210**	**-2**	**-3,184**	**-5**
New Hampshire	59,340	43,848	283	34,426	138	11,932	25	3,535	6
New Jersey	274,799	85,692	45	41,416	18	28,863	12	**-28,507**	**-9**
New Mexico	69,402	44,746	181	42,160	155	38,298	123	24,543	55
New York	477,584	123,935	35	**-57,004**	**-11**	**-121,836**	**-20**	**-154,403**	**-24**

(continued)

Dollars in thousands

State	Unobligated balance subject to obligation limit as of 10/01/97	Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 4-month obligation total		Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 5-month obligation total		Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 6-month obligation total		Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 7-month obligation total	
		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
North Carolina	214,972	**-15,865**	**-7**	**-90,838**	**-30**	**-143,299**	**-40**	**-178,181**	**-45**
North Dakota	50,447	5,887	13	**-2,979**	**-6**	**-24,791**	**-33**	**-32,363**	**-39**
Ohio	356,246	231,419	185	200,963	129	158,654	80	79,029	29
Oklahoma	159,309	74,298	87	57,668	57	47,037	42	15,515	11
Oregon	92,166	42,543	86	24,747	37	15,926	21	**-397**	**-0**
Pennsylvania	456,826	325,819	249	298,829	189	213,084	87	84,355	23
Rhode Island	65,379	51,918	386	36,309	125	30,320	86	20,101	44
South Carolina	179,141	101,532	131	27,858	18	16,615	10	8,401	5
South Dakota	69,729	12,996	23	**-8,395**	**-11**	**-22,791**	**-25**	**-33,301**	**-32**
Tennessee	196,644	67,328	52	20,013	11	**-22,553**	**-10**	**-81,974**	**-29**
Texas	619,695	193,004	45	136,984	28	58,399	10	**-25,147**	**-4**
Utah	89,670	66,048	280	35,048	64	27,477	44	18,313	26
Vermont	71,618	58,166	432	50,025	232	36,629	105	26,728	60
Virginia	212,321	99,361	88	68,801	48	28,694	16	2,329	1
Washington	204,873	167,859	454	87,103	74	68,522	50	**-493**	**-0**
West Virginia	120,166	84,653	238	37,892	46	12,857	12	**-13,368**	**-10**
Wisconsin	163,333	**-10,469**	**-6**	**-63,820**	**-28**	**-74,008**	**-31**	**-82,887**	**-34**
Wyoming	53,579	7,042	15	**-6,478**	**-11**	**-15,180**	**-22**	**-23,071**	**-30**
Total	$9,563,884	$4,987,272	109	$2,893,616	43	$1,295,871	16	**-$590,668**	**-6**

Note 1: Bold type indicates that previous obligations exceed the unobligated balance.

Note 2: The comparison represents data for the states only and does not include data for the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the North Marianas.

[a]Not available.

Source: GAO's analysis based on FHWA's data.

Unobligated Federal Highway Balances (Subject to the Obligation Limitation and Exempt) Compared With Fiscal Year 1997 Obligations

Dollars in thousands

State	Total unobligated balance as of 10/01/97	Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 4-month obligation total		Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 5-month obligation total		Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 6-month obligation total		Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 7-month obligation total	
		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Alabama	$198,888	$127,121	177	$111,531	128	$74,609	60	$42,836	27
Alaska	94,192	59,601	172	12,980	16	**-5,331**	**-5**	**-19,351**	**-17**
Arizona	184,093	100,984	122	87,499	91	75,266	69	66,643	57
Arkansas	153,005	54,352	55	36,915	32	33,553	28	25,408	20
California	1,091,527	810,523	288	769,136	239	680,963	166	490,623	82
Colorado	117,689	73,357	165	14,684	14	**-1,177**	**-1**	**-28,065**	**-19**
Connecticut	167,954	13,169	9	**-11,286**	**-6**	**-31,050**	**-16**	**-116,129**	**-41**
Delaware	54,052	48,091	807	46,936	660	40,646	303	20,332	60
Florida	298,813	210,298	238	149,096	100	59,127	25	**-184,890**	**-38**
Georgia	487,021	377,780	346	352,654	262	311,775	178	276,867	132
Hawaii	148,605	[a]	[a]	[a]	[a]	[a]	[a]	[a]	[a]
Idaho	82,813	55,002	198	38,149	85	37,863	84	32,445	64
Illinois	284,971	176,709	163	111,918	65	14,891	6	**-206,213**	**-42**
Indiana	203,799	69,259	51	**-29,117**	**-13**	**-80,242**	**-28**	**-103,005**	**-34**
Iowa	136,787	33,867	33	21,278	18	**-5,080**	**-4**	**-6,472**	**-5**
Kansas	147,075	76,184	107	69,706	90	64,459	78	53,918	58
Kentucky	157,586	115,390	273	83,361	112	35,119	29	10,361	7
Louisiana	339,687	280,570	475	265,037	355	261,338	334	245,107	259
Maine	57,472	25,291	79	8,642	18	**-2,260**	**-4**	**-1,963**	**-3**
Maryland	166,683	124,214	292	48,932	42	28,096	20	**-21,355**	**-11**
Massachusetts	799,910	621,393	348	381,357	91	305,446	62	263,364	49
Michigan	250,289	126,379	102	85,804	52	44,382	22	17,360	7
Minnesota	238,211	200,873	538	97,644	69	87,797	58	75,702	47
Mississippi	116,125	60,204	108	52,279	82	21,288	22	7,173	7
Missouri	187,257	44,784	31	**-49,126**	**-21**	**-81,820**	**-30**	**-92,858**	**-33**
Montana	88,072	73,364	499	41,622	90	33,642	62	13,022	17
Nebraska	84,959	55,069	184	46,426	120	1,313	2	**-720**	**-1**
Nevada	55,012	46,621	556	11,804	27	**-1,209**	**-2**	**-3,183**	**-5**
New Hampshire	63,770	48,278	312	38,856	156	16,362	35	7,965	14
New Jersey	331,142	142,035	75	97,759	42	85,206	35	27,836	9
New Mexico	71,431	46,775	190	44,189	162	40,327	130	26,572	59
New York	529,008	175,359	50	**-5,580**	**-1**	**-70,412**	**-12**	**-102,979**	**-16**

(continued)

Dollars in thousands

State	Total unobligated balance as of 10/01/97	Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 4-month obligation total		Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 5-month obligation total		Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 6-month obligation total		Difference between unobligated balance and FY 1997 7-month obligation total	
		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
North Carolina	264,629	33,792	15	**-41,181**	**-13**	**-93,642**	**-26**	**-128,524**	**-33**
North Dakota	58,999	14,439	32	5,573	10	**-16,239**	**-22**	**-23,811**	**-29**
Ohio	495,754	370,927	297	340,471	219	298,162	151	218,537	79
Oklahoma	173,644	88,633	104	72,003	71	61,372	55	29,850	21
Oregon	98,712	49,089	99	31,293	46	22,472	29	6,149	7
Pennsylvania	968,126	837,119	639	810,129	513	724,384	297	595,655	160
Rhode Island	85,502	72,041	535	56,432	194	50,443	144	40,224	89
South Carolina	201,518	123,909	160	50,235	33	38,992	24	30,778	18
South Dakota	74,690	17,957	32	**-3,434**	**-4**	**-17,830**	**-19**	**-28,340**	**-28**
Tennessee	225,294	95,978	74	48,663	28	6,097	3	**-53,324**	**-19**
Texas	770,416	343,725	81	287,705	60	209,120	37	125,574	19
Utah	92,600	68,978	292	37,978	70	30,407	49	21,243	30
Vermont	88,085	74,633	555	66,492	308	53,096	152	43,195	96
Virginia	333,797	220,837	196	190,277	133	150,170	82	123,805	59
Washington	204,887	167,873	454	87,117	74	68,536	50	**-479**	**-0**
West Virginia	307,110	271,597	765	224,836	273	199,801	186	173,576	130
Wisconsin	181,199	7,397	4	**-45,954**	**-20**	**-56,142**	**-24**	**-65,021**	**-26**
Wyoming	53,579	7,042	15	**-6,478**	**-11**	**-15,180**	**-22**	**-23,071**	**-30**
Total	$12,066,439	$7,489,827	164	$5,396,171	81	$3,942,319	49	$2,055,720	21

Note 1: Bold type indicates that previous obligations exceed the unobligated balance.

Note 2: The comparison represents data for the states only and does not include data for the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the North Marianas.

[a]Not available.

Source: GAO's analysis based on FHWA's data.

Ordering Information

The first copy of each GAO report and testimony is free. Additional copies are $2 each. Orders should be sent to the following address, accompanied by a check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents, when necessary. VISA and MasterCard credit cards are accepted, also. Orders for 100 or more copies to be mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent.

Orders by mail:

U.S. General Accounting Office
P.O. Box 37050
Washington, DC 20013

or visit:

Room 1100
700 4th St. NW (corner of 4th and G Sts. NW)
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC

Orders may also be placed by calling (202) 512-6000
or by using fax number (202) 512-6061, or TDD (202) 512-2537.

Each day, GAO issues a list of newly available reports and testimony. To receive facsimile copies of the daily list or any list from the past 30 days, please call (202) 512-6000 using a touchtone phone. A recorded menu will provide information on how to obtain these lists.

For information on how to access GAO reports on the INTERNET, send an e-mail message with "info" in the body to:

info@www.gao.gov

or visit GAO's World Wide Web Home Page at:

http://www.gao.gov

United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001

Bulk Rate
Postage & Fees Paid
GAO
Permit No. G100

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use $300

Address Correction Requested