I N T R O D U C T I O N

Because intersections are increasingly problematic for highway safety, Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety (Advocates) and State Farm are devoting more of their resources to public education and policy change in support of enhanced intersection safety. A fact sheet outlining key statistics about intersection safety follows this introduction.

Intersection Safety Countermeasures

There are numerous countermeasures for problems at intersections, some low-cost, and others more, and sometimes prohibitively, expensive.

Federal funding supplies opportunities, depending on the program, for almost any conceivable intersection safety enhancement actions by states, local governments, and other parties, including public-private cooperative efforts or partnerships. These initiatives, ranging from research, development, and technology transfer actions, through large-scale projects, are funded directly by the major authorization federal-aid programs in Title 1 of surface transportation authorization law. In addition, sophisticated technologies to supplement traditional engineering approaches to intersection safety improvement can be funded for development and deployment by several programs, including specific research and development provisions enacted by Congress. All these sources are described in subsequent sections of this document.

The degree of intervention required to make substantial gains in intersection safety usually is based on an engineering evaluation or field study. However, professional assessments of safety needs should not ignore the input of concerned, knowledgeable local citizens or coalitions and organizations which may be sensitive to the specific safety problems of both vehicles and pedestrians, especially at local intersections. Also, engineering surveys of intersection safety problems always must acknowledge the simultaneous need to maintain or even to increase vehicle mobility while also ensuring safe pedestrian negotiation of road and street crossings.

In other instances, unsignalized intersections may have become overburdened with traffic, leading to increased stop sign violations, crashes, and long queues of traffic waiting to execute left turns across oncoming traffic, for example. In these instances, installation of **phased signalization** may be warranted which can increase the

efficient through-put of existing and even increased volumes of traffic while reducing intersection conflicts leading to head-on, crossing, and rear-end crashes.

In instances where signalization is already present at an intersection, **timing of signal intervals** may be improper which generates unnecessarily long wait times for one direction of traffic. Long intersection wait times, in turn, lead to increased driver frustration resulting in a higher percentage of red signal phase violations. Also, traffic backed up in an intersection through lane not only promotes increased red signal violations but also provides dangerous opportunities for quick lane changes leading to sideswipe crashes or rear-end collisions with vehicles waiting to turn across oncoming traffic. In these cases, simple changes to signal phasing times can often relieve unnecessary congestion while simultaneously reducing signal violations and crashes leading to deaths, injuries, and property damage.

Many signalized intersections benefit from **dedicated turning lanes** so that queued traffic does not have to wait to turn in an intersection through lane. Dedicated turning bays also help to reduce the chances of dangerous rear-end crashes. However, introducing a dedicated turning lane into existing roads without widening often results in narrower lanes which, in turn, may increase lane violations leading to sideswipe crashes. Narrower lanes are also harder for large commercial vehicles to use safely. On the other hand, widening a lane may infringe on pedestrian sidewalks, or bike lanes, or may increase the speed of moving vehicles. These are trade-offs which must be considered.

In these and other instances, traffic demands and simultaneous safety needs require more complex and costly intersection improvement projects which may involve widening the roadway and providing more lanes, including dedicated turning lanes. However, these projects also often make pedestrian safety a more complicated enterprise because safe crossing signal phases, timing, and distances become more intricate and pedestrians are asked to make more sophisticated decisions about when to cross a wide road.

There are other cases when even more extensive intersection safety work may need to be done, such as instances where alignment difficulties restrict driver sight distances to dangerously inadequate amounts. In these cases, traditional engineering strategies combine more advanced warning signs with consideration of actually **removing sight distance restrictions**, an often very costly enterprise, or reducing vehicle conflicts by the use of **roundabouts**, for example. These intersections also may soon benefit from more innovative techniques which supplement and build upon traditional engineering safety countermeasures by employing **newer Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technologies** which help to overcome the inherent limitations of both drivers and vehicles, and of road design limitations. Many of these intriguing ITS

technologies can be researched and tested through federal funding, including funds available directly to local governments.

In any case, the important observation here is that intersection safety enhancement is a task requiring judicious selection of appropriate countermeasures. In certain instances, the appropriate response is a selective application of a specific countermeasure, such as **automated enforcement of red light running**, including cameras monitoring intersections for red signal phase violations, where other strategies to reduce violations have failed and reliance on traditional enforcement resources is not feasible. In other cases, simple initiatives involving **better signing such as larger, brighter stop, yield, and speed limit information** provide better driver notification which can substantially reduce intersection collisions.

The point is that most intersection problems need careful evaluation for determining the proper countermeasures. In most cases, data gathered on the nature and extent of the safety problem is needed, such as crash records maintained by a public authority, complaints of record, and files showing the historical road work such as reconstruction and maintenance performed in the past. Engineering study of the intersection location should be performed by knowledgeable professionals to simultaneously determine both operational and safety deficiencies, supplemented by any local citizen or other organizational initiatives which have been undertaken to identify hazardous intersections. In many instances, safety problems are a direct result simply of poor intersection service for both vehicles and pedestrians. Some problems can be corrected with improved enforcement, but others need more sophisticated traffic control measures, including improved or newly installed signalization. This is why both the effective and the cost-beneficial approach to intersection safety work needs to be determined by a careful engineering field study. In most cases, demonstration of a careful, professional assessment of need for intersection safety strategies is an obviously necessary part of an application to justify the expenditure of federal funds, especially when federal assistance requests are made by local governments.

Once you've figured out what makes sense to improve upon at an intersection, you will likely want to find funding for it. As with any roadway deficiency, changes can be complicated and resources scarce. Your study of any intersection and its problems will lead you to the conclusion that one solution will be preferable to another, probably because of the ease with which the countermeasure can be applied, or the price tag. It is usually not the case that the "best" or more sophisticated fixes that will significantly improve the safety of the intersection are always available to the community because sufficient funding is simply not available.

However, many lower cost approaches can be very helpful and result in saving lives, reducing injuries, and improving intersection operating efficiency. When you seek funding for such approaches, you are much more likely to be successful if you are asking for less money rather than more.

FACT SHEET

INTERSECTION SAFETY

According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), more than 41,600 people were killed in motor vehicle crashes, and 3,236,000 people were injured in 1999. The U.S. Department of Transportation, estimates that approximately 40 percent of motor vehicle crashes occur at intersections or are "intersection-related." This figure includes crashes resulting from any crossing conflicts, including ramp merging areas, driveways, red light running, and divided median crossovers. Given the very small percentage of surface mileage that intersections represent in the 3.94 million miles of roads and streets in the United States, it is clear that the inherent design and operational function of intersections present very high opportunities for vehicle conflicts leading to crashes.

Intersection conflicts and crashes pose dangers to both vehicle occupants and pedestrians. In
crashes at intersections vehicle occupants are vulnerable to severe injury and death because the
majority of the collisions involve side impacts into one of the vehicles. Side impacts have higher rates of deaths and serious injuries because there is comparatively little vehicle protective structure to safeguard occupants in the struck vehicle.

Addressing intersection-related crashes in a comprehensive and focused way is a highly complex task because intersections range in type all the way from complicated expressway interchanges which attempt to control vehicle entry and departure movements through the use of various geometric design and traffic engineering strategies, down to simple, rural right-angle intersections often controlled by only stop or yield signs, or in many cases, by no traffic control devices of any kind.

INTERSECTION SAFETY FACTS

- In 1998, half of all injury crashes were intersection related. (NHTSA 1998)
- In 1998 more than 10,500 fatal crashes occurred in or near some type of intersection. This amounts to more than one of every four fatal crashes on our roads. (NHTSA 1999)
- More than 50 percent of rear end crashes, the majority of which occur when a trailing vehicle strikes a lead vehicle that is either stopping or has come to a stop, occur at or near intersections. (NHTSA 1999)
- In 1998 unsignalized intersections had 2.5 times the number of fatal collisions – nearly 7,000 – than signalized intersections. (NHTSA, 1998)
- At signalized intersections, an estimated 260,000 crashes are caused by red light runners each year. More than 800 of these crashes are fatal. According to a survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Transportation and the American Trauma Society, 63 percent of Americans see someone running a red light at least a few times a week and, at most, once a day.
- More than two-thirds (70 percent) of the American public believe more attention should be paid to making dangerous intersections safer for drivers. An even higher number – 80 percent – think they need to be made safer for pedestrians. (Louis Harris Poll, 1999)
- Far fewer crashes occur at intersections with roundabouts than at intersections with signals or stop signs. A study conducted in Maine of 24 intersections before and after the construction of roundabouts showed a 39 percent overall decrease in crashes and a 76 percent decrease in injury producing crashes. Collisions involving fatal or incapacitating injuries fell by almost 90 percent. (IIHS, 2000)
- Elderly pedestrians are particularly at risk for injury or death at intersections. Thirty-six percent of pedestrian deaths among people age 65 and older in 1999 occurred at intersections. Many intersections permit pedestrian crossing, yet have signals timed to provide for the maximum movement of vehicle, not pedestrian traffic. (NHTSA 2000)
- Atlanta, Miami and Tampa are the three most dangerous cities for pedestrians. In these cities 59 percent of pedestrian fatalities occurred while the pedestrian was trying to cross in the middle of the street because no crosswalk was available. Lack of crosswalks is a major factor in making these cities such a dangerous place for walkers. (American Demographics, November 2000)
- On average, a pedestrian is killed every 112 minutes in the U.S.. (NHTSA, 1998)

January 2001

BACKGROUND ON INTERSECTION SAFETY ENHANCEMENT FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

Federal Laws Providing Intersection Funding

Numerous, varied opportunities for securing federal funds to improve the safety and efficiency of all types of intersections are available to state and local authorities in the periodic surface transportation funding or "authorization" bills passed by Congress.

The most recent multi-year federal legislation authorized the funding of federally assisted highways and bridges beginning with Fiscal Year (FY) 1998. This bill, named the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century or "TEA-21," provides authorized funding of scores of provisions, projects and programs through FY 2003 (ends September 30, 2003). Many of these provisions apply to intersection safety research, development, and direct project funding. Because federal highway projects are funded by gas tax revenues that go into a separate Highway Trust Fund and are multi-year projects, the mechanism for financing projects is unique.

Annual State Program of Projects and Federal Funding

States annually submit a list of planned projects to justify their use of federal highway funds. A unique feature of federal aid provided by Congressionally enacted surface transportation authorization laws is state budget authority.

Obligating federal funds by a state is a legal exercise of its budget authority provided by federal law. According to the Federal Highway Administration, there are two kinds of budget authority:

- contract authority, by which federal program funds can be obligated in the states before Congress actually releases the funds in a separate annual appropriations bill; and,
- appropriated budget authority which requires Congress to actually appropriate funds before federal money can be spent or distributed to states.

Most federal highway assistance used by the states consists of funds spoken for through the use of contract authority, a legal concept legislated by Congress in 1921.

This means that the states can "obligate" or cordon off the amount of federal assistance each of them needs for the coming year even in advance of Congress actually appropriating or making the money available. "Contract authority" is similar to having a line of credit available to make purchases. In the case of highway construction, which are often multi-year projects, the states are allowed to plan, design, and construct the project with the assurance that federal funds are there to cover the costs.

The amount of federal funds available for obligation depends on the actual level of funds provided for each state. This so-called "apportionment" is based on a formula which weights surface mileage, population, and other considerations to determine how much each state will receive as an annual distribution. How the money is spent within a state is also controlled for the various major federal-aid programs. For example, the Surface Transportation Program described in "Major Federal Funding Sources" must make the majority of its funds proportionally available within each state by levels of population in specific areas.

The states can obligate funds from either the federal Highway Trust Fund or from general Treasury revenues, depending on what funding source Congress has decided to use for a specific program. However, the use of contract authority is available only for the dedicated tax revenues in the Federal Highway Trust Fund.

The U.S. Department of Transportation is required to distribute funds that have been Congressionally authorized so that they are available for obligation on the date of their apportionment or allocation to the states, or no later than the start of each new fiscal year (October 1). "Obligating" federal funds means that the federal government is obligated to pay the bills for the various projects funded in whole or in part with authorized federal money.

This shows that the federal-aid highway program is not a "cash-up-front" operation, but rather the federal government makes payments to the states for costs as they are periodically incurred on different projects. Therefore, the federal-aid highway program operates through reimbursement as states gradually spend a balance of federal money provided to them by Congress as authorized sums.

It is important to note that projects do not need to be completed before reimbursement begins. Specific stages of larger projects taking longer periods of time can be periodically reimbursed, especially when these projects take several years from inception to completion. Reimbursement is a multi-step procedure flowing from a project contractor who sends billings to the state or other public authority, which in turn sends vouchers to the Federal Highway Administration. The Federal Highway

Administration then certifies the claim for payment to the U.S. Treasury which finally electronically transfers funds to the bank account of the public authority.

Regional and Local Government Roles In Securing Federal Funds:

Although only the states themselves can generally apply for and obligate federal funds for large-scale construction and reconstruction programs, **legislation since 1991 has considerably strengthened the role of regional and local public authorities** in creating the overall package of federal funding requests submitted by the states to the U.S. Department of Transportation.. The most important aspect of this stronger local government role are Metropolitan Planning Organizations, or MPOs. The states must now, by law, coordinate their funding needs with those proposed by MPOs. This important change in federal law means that the highway and bridge needs, especially of large metropolitan areas, some of which are multi-state regions, must be acknowledged and accommodated by the state planning and funding processes.

In addition, some specific Congressionally authorized programs, such as certain research, development, and technology transfer funds available through the Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) provisions in the federal-aid authorization bills, **can be applied for directly by local governments without being moved through a state planning and approval process.** For example, the Federal Highway Administration is currently (2001) seeking applications from cities, counties, and MPOs to demonstrate the effectiveness of pedestrian engineering and advanced technologies safety countermeasures. This program is strongly oriented towards intersection safety enhancement. It provides 80 percent federal funding for approved projects. Local public authorities need to inquire with their regional Federal Highway Administration resource center or with the federal-aid financial officers in the Federal Highway Administration headquarters offices in Washington, D.C., to determine when special legislated programs may permit direct application for federal funds by local governments.

MAJOR FEDERAL-AID FUNDING PROVISIONS

A number of major funding sources for federal assistance has emerged in the large, multi-year surface transportation funding laws passed by Congress, and they currently are the main avenues for applying for and receiving federal aid for intersection safety work. A short list of these provisions is provided below.

- **Interstate Maintenance Program, TEA-21 Section 1107:** Extends and increases funding for Interstate highway maintenance projects, including discretionary projects approved by the U.S. Department of Transportation and the priority consideration of certain projects on high volume urban routes or high truck-volume routes in rural areas. The federal share of projects is 90 percent.

- **Surface Transportation Program, TEA-21 Section 1108:** A block grant program, first enacted in the 1991 ISTEA, which comprises the mileage formerly funded as the federal-aid non-Interstate highway systems. The program was amended in TEA-21 to extend funding even to roads which formerly were never a part of any federal-aid highway system. The provision authorizes any operational or highway safety improvement projects to be federally funded. This program also permits Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) capital improvements which, among other things, would permit funding of automated intersection enforcement technologies. The federal share of project costs is 80 percent, but some states qualify for up to 95 percent federal funding if they have large portions of the state in federal lands.

In addition, a unique feature of the program is the safety set-aside of 10 percent of annually appropriated funds to address roadway hazards and rail-highway grade crossing safety needs. Hazard elimination and rail-highway grade crossing projects traditionally encompass many intersection safety improvement efforts. Moreover, the NHS Act inserted an advance payment option for states conducting transportation enhancement activities to secure federal funding in hand for projects in advance of the actual apportionment of funds.

- **National Highway System, ISTEA Section 1006:** The establishment of the NHS to include all of the U.S. Interstate highways plus about another 120,000 miles of priority roads took place in 1991. Modification of the provisions governing the new federal system primarily occurred in the separate NHS legislation in 1995. The federal share for projects is 100 percent.

There are many important features of the NHS authorization provisions directly affecting intersection safety work:

-
  - Eligible projects may include any operational or highway safety improvement projects. This includes intersection work on both access-controlled and non-access controlled highways.

- Eligibility criteria also specifically authorize federal expenditures on capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and traffic control facilities and programs, including the labor, administration, utilities and rent, and other costs for continuous operation of traffic control such as integrated traffic control systems and traffic control centers.
- Amendments to the law controlling the use of federal money for maintenance work allows funds to be sourced from various federal funding categories to extend the useful service lives of intersection traffic engineering features rather than forcing states and local authorities to rely exclusively on their own revenues for road upkeep.

- **Highway Bridge Program, TEA-21 Section 1109:**Both traditionally federally assisted and non-assisted bridges now qualify for aid under this program which includes the use of funds for both on-bridge and approach roadway intersection improvement projects. The program also includes multi-year authorized sums for a discretionary bridge set-aside fund to be applied to specific bridge needs as determined by the judgment of the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation. Both parts of the program provide 80 percent federal share funding. The discretionary bridge program relies on allocated funds, that is, there must be prior appropriations by Congress for the awards made by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

- **Congestion Mitigation and Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ), NHS Section 319, TEA-21 Section 1110, ISTEA Section 1008:** As originally passed in 1991, no intersection improvement projects were permissible because of legislative prohibitions against increasing capacity for single-vehicle occupants save for off-peak use of High Occupancy Vehicle lanes.

However, amendments in 1995 in the NHS bill specifically authorize traffic monitoring, management, and control facilities and programs if the Secretary, in consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency Administrator, decides favorably that the projects are likely to advance national air quality standards. Among other things, this would arguably permit automated intersection enforcement technologies, as well as other intersection safety and operational improvements which simultaneously advance safety while relieving congestion.

Furthermore, the 1998 amendments also allowed states which do not have air quality attainment areas also to use funds for any program eligible for funding under the Surface Transportation Program. These include intersection projects of various kinds on any arterial or collector highway.

The 1998 amendments to the program also encourage public-private partnerships with any level of government, or even with non-governmental organizations, to cooperatively implement any project, including intersection projects, funded through CMAQ. The federal share of project costs is 80 percent.

OTHER FEDERAL-AID INTERSECTION SAFETY FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

In addition to the major federal funding sources, there are **numerous other provisions in federal law** that can be used for intersection safety improvement work. The most recent legislation enacted in 1998, "TEA-21", created several new opportunities for funding intersection safety improvements. These provisions, although they sometimes are not separate sources of new funding, often have **unique features that provide increased flexibility** for public authorities to use or transfer funds between different programs in surface transportation bills.

In many cases, these additional provisions provide **opportunities for justifying research and development work on intersection safety topics**, or they permit, for example, **partnering with private-sector organizations to boost the level of funds** needed for intersection safety improvements. In yet other instances, these provisions authorize the use of existing federal funds for unique applications, including even the materials and labor costs for intersection safety enhancement work. Some of these programs, as indicated earlier, allow **direct application for federal funding by local governments** without state sponsorship or approval.

Public authorities, particularly county and municipal governments, are well advised to explore these many additional funding opportunities in coordination with their state departments of transportation to determine if they qualify for receiving or transferring these funds for specific intersection safety needs of all kinds. In other cases, local governments may apply directly to the Federal Highway Administration for the approval of requested federal assistance. The following list of these intriguing funding possibilities contained in TEA-21 is provided below.

Most highway funds are distributed to states based on a legislatively mandated distribution formula and are called "apportionments." Distribution of funds when there are no formulas in law are called "allocations" and may be made any time during the fiscal year. The most important aspect of these additional funding opportunities is that they are virtually all project funds relying on "allocated" rather than "apportioned" funds. This means that when a federal legislative provision is couched in terms that indicates a range of different applicants may ask for federal funds – such as universities, public-private partnerships, non-profit organizations, local governments, and MPOs – it is a sign that the application and approval process is a transaction directly between the local government or other group seeking federal funding and the Federal Highway Administration, and not an apportionment to the state. Funds can be approved, such as grants by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation, without moving through a separate state approval procedure.

Finally, it is important to emphasize here that over the past decade there has been a wide-ranging relaxation of federal oversight and of state and local government reporting requirements. Federal funds are available in many provisions for intersection safety work without the burdens of direct federal inspection of projects or of documentation by public authorities of the use of federal funds for Federal Highway Administration approval. As a result, paperwork burdens at the state and local government levels have largely been eliminated.

Here are the other Federal-Aid intersection safety funding opportunities:

- **Federal-Aid Systems, Section 1105:** This provision increases funding flexibility for the states by treating the National Highway System and Interstate Maintenance Program as if they are consolidated highway maintenance and improvement efforts. Additional criteria for project eligibility are established permitting almost all kinds of highway work on both the NHS and on all non-NHS federally assisted highways. Projects may include construction, highway safety improvements, planning, research technology transfer, and capital and operating costs specifically for traffic monitoring/management/control facilities and programs. Even new intersections on qualifying facilities can be funded through Section 1105.

- **National Corridor Planning and Development Program, Section 1118:** Originally enacted in the 1991 ISTEA, this program is expanded to provide very broad project eligibility criteria to include any significant regional or multi-state highway corridor other than an already identified priority corridor. This program uses allocated, not apportioned funds. States may not obligate funds in advance of appropriations. Congress

must actually enact appropriations legislation to ensure the funds are available for use by the states.

- **Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program, Section 1119:** This important program directs the U.S. Department of Transportation to establish and implement a coordinated border infrastructure program under which states and MPOs are allocated federal funds for projects near both U.S. national borders. The provision provides very broad eligibility criteria for projects funded through it.

- **Definitions, Section 1201:** This very important provision considerably widens the definition of the term ‘construction' to include, among other things, specific improvements to facilitate and control traffic flow, such as grade separation of intersections, widening of lanes, channelization of traffic, and new traffic control systems. Therefore, virtually any intersection project qualifies as "construction" under this flexible definition of the term.
  - In addition, the meaning of ‘operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control' is changed now to include all labor costs, administrative costs, utilities and rent expenses, and any other costs associated with the continuous operation of traffic control, such as integrated traffic control systems and traffic control centers.
  - Similarly, ‘operational improvement' is also newly defined specifically to include capital improvements for installation of traffic monitoring and control equipment, computerized signal systems, and integrated traffic control systems.
- **Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program, Section 1221:** In general, this provision funds a demonstration program at $120,000,000 through FY 2003 for use by states, MPOs, and local governments for transportation system efficiency improvements, reduction of future infrastructure funding needs, and increased efficient access to jobs and services. The provision emphasizes public-private partnerships, including demonstrated

  commitment of non-federal resources to supplement federal funds. Projects selected should promote private sector investment in infrastructure. This program is authorized as allocated funds which require prior appropriations. Local governments may apply directly for federal funding under this program.

- **State Grants, Section 4003:** Although this provision is the mainstay funding authorization for the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program, it amends existing law permitting designation of up to five percent of state federal assistance allocations which could be used to improve intersection commercial vehicle compliance and safety. The provision emphasizes that high priority safety projects are now fundable which demonstrate new safety technologies.

- **Surface Transportation Research, Section 5102:** This provision authorizes the U.S. Department of Transportation to carry out research, development, and technology transfer activities for all phases of transportation planning and development. A long list of qualifying activities is provided which include projects affecting traffic conditions. Projects testing or development specific technologies are allowed. The U.S. Department of Transportation may carry out these wide-ranging research and development activities in cooperation with any agency or other institution, government or non-government, including cost-shared funded projects with state and local governments, corporations, partnerships, and trade associations. The federal funding share can be 50 percent or more. Many of the examples provided as authorized research activities would explicitly allow intersection safety and operations research, development, and implementation of safety-enhancing equipment. This program uses allocated funds which require prior appropriations legislation by Congress. Local governments may apply directly to the Federal Highway Administration for funds.

- **Technology Deployment, Section 5103:** The U.S. Department of Transportation is directed to develop and administer a national technology deployment initiatives and partnership program to accelerate adoption of innovative surface transportation technologies. The goal of the program is to increase the benefits of safer, more reliable transportation systems. Certain intersection projects may qualify at least in part for funds under this program. The U.S. Department of Transportation may provide grants or enter into cooperative agreements and contracts with states, local governments, other federal agencies, universities, private sector organizations, and nonprofit organizations to pay the federal share of the cost of research, development, and technology transfer especially for innovative materials. Grants are secured by direct application to the U.S. Department of Transportation. Federal share is determined at the discretion of the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation. This program relies on actual

appropriated funds by Congress, not state contract authority to obligate in advance of apportionments. Local governments may apply directly to the Federal Highway Administration for funding.

- **ITS General Authorities and Requirements, Section 5204:** This provision authorizes the U.S. Department of Transportation to conduct an ongoing ITS research, development, and testing program, especially nationwide deployment of innovative technologies as integral components of surface transportation systems. It also encourages public-private partnerships and cooperation with state and local governments. Funding authorization is expanded to include transportation planning costs. The program operates through actual appropriated funds by Congress, not by contract authority. Local governments may apply directly to the Federal Highway Administration for funding.

- **ITS Research and Development, Section 5207:** This section directs the U.S. Department of Transportation to carry out a comprehensive ITS program of research, development, and operational tests with priority emphasis on several areas, including traffic management. The provision directs the integration of ITS innovations into traffic control technologies. The federal share of operational tests and demonstrations is 80 percent. The program operates by means of actual appropriated funds by Congress, not by contract authority. Local governments may apply directly to the Federal Highway Administration for grants.

- **Intelligent Transportation System Integration Program, Section 5208 :** This provision directs the U.S. Department of Transportation to carry out a comprehensive program for accelerating the integration and interoperability of ITS in both metropolitan and rural areas. Improved transportation efficiency, increased safety, and increased traffic flow are specifically mentioned as model funding projects. Once again, the section emphasizes priority funding for public-private cooperative efforts with increased private sector involvement and funding commitment. There are specific funding limitations for each metropolitan or rural area, or in each state. Federal share for approved projects is up to 50 percent. Local governments may apply for grants by directly contacting the Federal Highway Administration.

- **Safety Incentive Grants for Use of Seat Belts, Section 1403:** This provision could be a source of additional highway funding for intersection safety projects for states which have greater than the national average seat belt use rate. In cases where the U.S. Department

of Transportation determines that a given state exceeds the national average, a specific additional allocation will be made to that state on the basis of a calculated savings due to improved traffic safety. The provision allows these extra federal funds to be used for any eligible projects under the Interstate Maintenance Program, the Bridge Program, the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, the Surface Transportation Program, and the National Highway System.

- **Safety Incentives to Prevent Operation of Motor Vehicles By Intoxicated Persons, Section 1404:** Section 1404 provides additional grant apportionments to states which have enacted 0.08 blood alcohol limits for motor vehicle drivers. The funds may be used for any project authorized under Title 1 of the authorization bill, including intersection safety work. Also, the funds made available by this section have no time limit for obligation – states may qualify for any remaining funds whenever they enact a 0.08 law.

- **Open Container Laws, Section 1405:** This section was added to the original TEA-21 in a technical corrections bill enacted in July 1998 (The TEA-21 Restoration Act of 1998). It requires that states have an open container laws in place by October 1, 2000. States which do not enact an open container law must transfer 1.5 percent of their entire federal-aid highway construction funds (the National Highway System, Surface Transportation Program, and Interstate Maintenance funds are specifically liable for the reductions) to either alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures or for enforcement of anti-drunk driving laws. This transfer requirement rises to 3 percent of a state's annual federal assistance if an open container law is not in place by October 1, 2002. However, the provision also gives the states the discretion to use these transferred funds for their federal-aid hazard elimination programs which permit a wide range of safety-related expenditures, including intersection safety improvement projects.

- **Minimum Penalties for Repeat Offenders for Driving While Intoxicated or Driving Under the Influence, Section 1406:** A provision similar to the preceding law requiring federal-aid transfers for failure to enact open container laws, was also passed as part of the technical corrections bill for TEA-21. Section 1406 requires each state to enact a law that provides that an individual is liable for a range of severe penalties, including license suspension and vehicle impoundment, for example, as well as imprisonment, if that individual is convicted of a second or subsequent offense of driving while intoxicated or under the

influence. By October 1, 2000, any state not having enacted or enforced a repeat intoxicated driver law shall have 1.5 percent of its apportioned funds used either to improve alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures or transferred to the hazard elimination program where the funds may be used on intersection safety project, among other things. After October 2, 2002, the transfer of funds rises to 3 percent.

ADDITIONAL POINTERS FOR OBTAINING FEDERAL FUNDS

- An important first step is to identify all the stakeholders among public agencies from whom you could secure funding, and with whom you need to work on the project. For federal funding, the key agencies will be the Federal Highway Administration federal-aid division offices, regional resource centers, as well as the national headquarters for FHWA, and your state's department of transportation. State-by-state lists of these offices and phone numbers are included in the appendices section of this guide, along with some other helpful contact information.

- When meeting with local, state and federal officials who hold the purse strings, consider carefully who you bring with you to the meeting, or who could write a strategic letter of support. Elected officials, community opinion leaders, safety officials, survivor advocates, law enforcement, other public safety representatives, and metropolitan planning organization (MPO) members representing the community are all influential parties who help leverage successful outcomes.

- If you bring members of the community with you to the meeting, decide upon speaking roles ahead of time so that each person speaks from his or her own perspective on the need for intersection fixes. Be passionate, but non-confrontational.

- Pull together and synthesize materials and talking points, make sure all parties to the discussion are working from the same set of facts and are making the same points. Come prepared with crash data, safety facts and other relevant information that supports your case.

- Be as knowledgeable as you can about local budget constraints and other priorities with which the agency you are visiting must deal.

- If starting from "square one" in your quest for funds, discuss possibilities of funding available from the major categories of funds first (see "Major Federal Funding Sources"). If that goes nowhere, broach the subject of other possible funding from non-traditional federal sources (see "Other Federal-Aid Intersection Safety Funding Opportunities").

- If funds are not available to actually fix the intersection problem right away, request funds for a study, with future remedial work scheduled down the road (contingent on the findings of the study).

- For yourself, document steps taken by you and your group to request funding. The media is always interested in a human interest story about how a community plans and lobbies for solutions to the problem. Promote the story of your efforts in the local press. Meet with the editorial board to ask for support. Coverage in the media could help you obtain funding.

Appendix A

Financing Federal-Aid Highways
A Glossary of Terms

Allocation. An administrative distribution of funds for programs that do not have statutory distribution formulas.

Apportionment. The distribution of funds as prescribed by a statutory formula.

Appropriated Budget Authority (ABA). A form of Budget Authority that requires both an authorization act and an appropriations act before any funds can be obligated.

Appropriations Act. Action of a legislative body that makes funds available for expenditure with specific limitations as to amount, purpose, and duration. In most cases, it permits money previously authorized to be obligated and payments made, but for the highway program operating under contract authority, the appropriations act specifies amounts of funds that Congress will make available for the fiscal year to liquidate obligations.

Authorization Act. Basic substantive legislation that establishes or continues Federal programs or agencies and establishes an upper limit on the amount of funds for the

program(s). The current authorization act for surface transportation programs is the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21).

Budget Authority. Empowerment by Congress that allows Federal agencies to incur obligations that will result in the outlay of funds. This empowerment is generally in the form of appropriations. However, for most of the highway programs, it is in the form of contract authority.

Contract Authority (CA). A form of Budget Authority that permits obligations to be made in advance of appropriations. Most of the programs under the Federal-Aid Highway Program operate under Contract Authority.

Federal-aid Highway Program (FAHP). An umbrella term for most of the Federal programs providing highway funds to the States. This is not a term defined in law. As used in this document, FAHP is comprised of those programs authorized in Titles I and V of TEA-21 that are administered by FHWA.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The Federal agency within the U.S. Department of Transportation responsible for administering the Federal-aid Highway Program.

Highway Trust Fund (HTF). An account established by law to hold Federal highway-user taxes that are dedicated for highway and transit related purposes. The HTF has two accounts: the Highway Account, and the Mass Transit Account.

Obligational Authority (OA). The total amount of funds that may be obligated in a year. For the Federal-aid Highway Program this is comprised of the obligation limitation amount plus amounts for programs exempt from the limitation.

Obligation Limitation. A restriction, or "ceiling" on the amount of Federal assistance that may be promised (obligated) during a specified time period. This is a statutory budgetary control that does not affect the apportionment or allocation of funds. Rather, it controls the rate at which these funds may be used.

Obligation. The Federal government's legal commitment (promise) to pay or reimburse the States or other entities for the Federal share of a project's eligible costs.

Source: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), U.S. Department of Transportation

Appendix B

WORLD WIDE WEB and TELEPHONE CONTACTS

Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety (Advocates)
www.saferoads.org
Phone: 202-408-1711

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)
www.aashto.org
Phone: 202-624-5800

Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs)
www.ampo.org
Phone: 202-457-0710

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), U.S. Department of Transportation (Wash., D.C.)
Office of Budget and Finance
www.fhwa.dot.gov/innovativefinance
Phone: 202-366-0622

(Federal-aid Financial Management Division - Phone: 202-366-2853)

Office of Safety
www.safety.fhwa.dot.gov
Phone: 202-366-2288

Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP) Centers (Managed by
American Public Works Association)
www.ltapt2.org
Phone: 202-408-9541

ITS America (Intelligent Transportation Systems)
www.itsa.org
Phone: 202-484-4586

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Transportation
www.nhtsa.dot.gov
Phone: 202-366-9294

Appendix C

American Asscoiation of State Highway and Transport Officials

(as of April 2001)

States

Alabama Department of Transportation
G. Mack Roberts, Transportation Director
Alabama Department of Transportation
1409 Coliseum Blvd.
Montgomery, AL 36130
(334) 242-6311
(334) 262-8041 Fax
(334) 242-6319 Donald W. Vaughn, Administrative Engineer
(334) 242-6318 Ray D. Bass, Chief Engineer
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.al.us

Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities
Joseph L. Perkins, Commissioner
Department of Transportation & Public Facilities
3132 Channel Drive
Juneau, AK 99801-7898
(907) 465-3900
(907) 586-8365 Fax
(907) 465-6973 Boyd J. Brownfield, Deputy Commissioner
(907) 465-3906 M. Clyde Stolzfus, Special Assistant to the Commissioner
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.ak.us

Arizona Department of Transportation
Mary Peters, Director
Department of Transportation
206 S. 17th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85007
(602) 712-7011
(602) 712-8315 Fax
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.az.us

Arkansas Department of Transportation
Dan Flowers, Director of Highways & Transportation
State Highway & Transportation Department
State Highway Department Building
P.O. Box 2261; 10324 Interstate 30
Little Rock, AR 72203; Little Rock, AR 72209
(501) 569-2211
(501) 569-2400 Fax

(501) 569-2214 Robert L. Walters, Deputy Director & Chief Engineer
Web Site: http://www.ahtd.state.ar.us

California Department of Transportation
Jeff Morales, Director of Transportation
Department of Transportation
1120 N Street
P. O. Box 942673
Sacramento, CA 94273-0001
(916) 654-5267
(916) 654-6608 Fax
Web Site: http://www.dot.ca.gov

Colorado Department of Transportation
Tom Norton, Executive Director
Department of Transportation
4201 E. Arkansas Ave.
Denver, CO 80222
(303) 757-9201
(303) 757-9656 Fax
(303) 757-9772 Michael Fitzsimmons, Director, Office of Policy
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.co.us

Connecticut Department of Transportation
James F. Sullivan, Commissioner
Department of Transportation
P. O. Box 317546 / 2800 Berlin Turnpike
Newington, CT 06131-7546
(860) 594-3000
(860) 594-3008 Fax
(860) 594-3000 Harry P. Harris, Deputy Commissioner
(860) 594-2001 Richard A. Martinez, Bureau Chief
Web Site: http://www.state.ct.us/dot/

Delaware Department of Transportation
Nathan Hayward, III, Secretary
Department of Transportation
Highway Administration Center
P. O. Box 778 Bay Road, Route 113
Dover, DE 19903 Dover, DE 19903
(302) 760-2303
(302) 739-5736 Fax
(302) 739-4303 Kathi Karsnitz, Executive Assistant, Secretary's Office
Web Site: http://www.state.de.us/deldot/index.html

District of Columbia Department of Public Works
Leslie Hotaling, Acting Director of Public Works
Reeves Center
2000 14th Street, N.W., 6th Floor
Washington, DC 20009
(202) 939-8000
(202) 939-8191 Fax
(202) 939-8012 Art Lawson, Deputy Director of Operations
(202) 939-8060 Gary A. Burch, Administrator, Design, Engineering & Construction
Web Site: http://ddot.dc.gov/main.shtm

Florida Department of Transportation
Tom Barry, Secretary of Transportation
Department of Transportation
605 Suwannee Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450
(850) 414-5205
(850) 488-5526 Fax
(202) 624-5885 Douglas Callaway, Federal Program Coordinator
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.fl.us

Georgia Department of Transportation
Tom Coleman, Commissioner
Department of Transportation
2 Capitol Square
Atlanta, GA 30334
(404) 656-5206
(404) 656-3507 Fax
(404) 656-5212 G. Steve Parks, Deputy Commissioner
(404) 656-0610 Paul V. Mullins, Dir. of Planing & Programming
(404) 656-5277 Frank Danchetz, Chief Engineer
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.ga.us

Hawaii Department of Transportation
Brian Minaai, Director of Transportation
Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813-5097
(808) 587-2150
(808) 587-2167 Fax
(808) 587-2220 Hugh Ono, Chief, Highways Division
Web Site: http://hinc.hinc.hawaii.gov/hinc/dot/dot.html

Idaho Transportation Department
Dwight Bower, Director

Transportation Department
3311 W. State Street
P. O. Box 7129
Boise, ID 83707
(208) 334-8807
(208) 334-3858 Fax
(208) 334-8818 Keith Bumsted, Deputy Director
Web Site: http://www.state.id.us/itd

Illinois Department of Transportation
Kirk Brown, Secretary
Department of Transportation
2300 S. Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, IL 62764
(217) 782-5597
(217) 782-6828 Fax
(217) 782-5123 Dan Gentry, Chief of Policy & Federal Affairs
Web Site: http://dot.state.il.us

Indiana Department of Transportation
Cristine M. Klika, Commissioner
Department of Transportation
Indiana Government
Center North
100 N. Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2249
(317) 232-5526
(317) 232-0238 Fax
Web Site: http://www.ai.org/dot/

Iowa Department of Transportation
Mark Wandro, Director
Department of Transportation
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, IA 50010
(515) 239-1111
(515) 239-1639 Fax
(515) 239-1131 Dan Franklin, Assistant Director, Director's Staff Division
Web Site: http://www.state.ia.us/government/dot

Kansas Department of Transportation
E. Dean Carlson, Secretary of Transportation
Department of Transportation
Docking State Office
915 Harrison
Topeka, KS 66612

(785) 296-3461
(785) 296-1095 Fax
(785) 296-3285 Warren Sick, State Transp. Engineer
(785) 296-2252 Terry Heidner, Director of Planning & Development
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.ks.us

Kentucky Transportation Cabinet
James C. Codell, III, Transportation Secretary
State Office Building
501 High Street
Frankfort, KY 40622
(502) 564-4890
(502) 564-9540 Fax
Web Site: http://www.kytc.state.ky.us/

Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development
Kam K. Movassaghi, Ph.D., Secretary
Department of Transportation and Development
P. O. Box 94245 1201 Capitol Access Rd.
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9245 / Baton Rouge, LA 70804
(225) 379-1200
(225) 379-1851 Fax
(225) 379-1240 Roddy Dillon, Dir., & Chief Engineer
(225) 379-1233 Vacant, Deputy Secretary
Web Site: http://www.dotd.state.la.us/

Maine Department of Transportation
John Melrose, Commissioner
Department of Transportation
Transportation Building
State House Station 16
Augusta, ME 04333-0016
(207) 287-2551
(207) 287-2896 Fax
(207) 287-2551 Jane L. Lincoln, Deputy Commissioner, Public Affairs & Human Resources
(207) 287-2661 John E. Dority, Chief Engineer
Web Site: http://www.state.me.us/mdot

Maryland Department of Transportation
John D. Porcari, Secretary of Transportation
Department of Transportation
Office of the Secretary
P. O. Box 8755
10 Elm Road
BWI Airport, MD 21240-0755

(410) 865-1000
(410) 865-1334 Fax
(410) 865-1000 Vacant, Deputy Secretary
Web Site: http://www.mdot.state.md.us/

Massachusetts Highway Department
Matthew J. Amorello, Commissioner
Highway Department
10 Park Plaza
Boston MA 02116-3973
(617) 973-7868
(617) 973-8040 Fax
(617) 973-7040 Michael W. Swanson, Deputy Secretary
(617) 973-7830 Ross B. Dindio, Chief Engineer
Web Site: http://www.magnet.state.ma.us/mhd/home.htm

Massachusetts Executive Office of Transportation and Construction
Kevin J. Sullivan, Secretary
Executive Office of Transportation and Construction
10 Park Plaza, Suite 3510
Boston, MA 02116-3969
(617) 973-7000
(617) 523-6454 Fax

Michigan Department of Transportation
Greg Rosine, Director
Department of Transportation
State Transportation Building
425 West Ottawa; P.O. Box 30050
Lansing, MI 48933; Lansing, MI 48909
(517) 373-2114
(517) 373-0167 Fax
Web Site: http://www.mdot.state.mi.us

Minnesota Department of Transportation
Elwyn Tinklenberg, Commissioner
Department of Transportation
395 John Ireland Boulevard
Room 411, Transportation Building
St. Paul, MN 55155
(651) 297-2930
(651) 296-3587 Fax
(651) 296-7942 Edwin H. Cohoon, Deputy Commissioner
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.mn.us/

Mississippi Department of Transportation
Hugh Long, Executive Director
Department of Transportation
MDOT Administration Building 401 North West Street
P. O. Box 1850 10th Floor
Jackson, MS 39215-1850 Jackson MS 39205
(601) 359-7001
(601) 359-7050 Fax
Web Site: http://www.mdot.state.ms.us

Missouri Department of Transportation
Henry Hungerbeeler, Director
Highway and Transportation Building
P. O. Box 270
105 West Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(573) 751-4622
(573) 526-5419 Fax
(573) 751-3758 J.T. Yarnell, Chief Engineer
(573) 751-4622 Mike Golden, Chief Operation Officer
Web Site: http://www.modot.state.mo.us

Montana Department of Transportation
Dave Galt, Director
Department of Transportation
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-6201
(406) 444-7643 Fax
(406) 444-6206 Gary Gilmore, Chief Engineer
(406) 444-3143 Patricia Saindon, Admin., Rail & Transit Div.
Web Site: http://www.mdt.mt.gov

Nebraska Department of Roads
John L. Craig, Director and State Engineer
Department of Roads
1500 Nebraska Highway 2
P. O. Box 94759
Lincoln, NE 65809-4759
(402) 479-4615
(402) 479-4325 Fax
(402) 479-4671 Monty W. Fredrickson, Deputy Director Engineering
(402) 479-4615 Wayne Teten, Deputy Director, Operations
(402) 479-4671 Thomas A. Wais, Deputy Director, Planning and Administration
Web Site: http://www.dor.state.ne.us

Nevada Department of Transportation
Thomas E. Stephens, Director
Department of Transportation
1263 S. Stewart Street
Carson City, NV 89712
(702) 888-7440
(702) 888-7201 Fax
Web Site: http://www.nevadadot.com/

New Hampshire Department of Transportation
Carol Murray, Acting Commissioner
Department of Transportation
John O. Morton Bldg.
Hazen Drive
P. O. Box 483
Concord, NH 03301-0483
(603) 271-3734
(603) 271-3914 Fax
Web Site: www.state.nh.us/dot

New Jersey Department of Transportation
James Weinstein, Commissioner
Department of Transportation
1035 Parkway Avenue, CN-600
Trenton, NJ 08625
(609) 530-3535
(609) 530-3894 Fax
(609) 530-2002 Albert B. Ari, Deputy Commissioner
Web Site: http://www.state.nj.us/transportation

New Mexico State Highway and Transportation Department
Pete Rahn, Secretary
State Highway and Transportation Department
State Highway Department Building
1120 Cerrilos Road, P.O. Box 1149
Santa Fe, NM 87504
(505) 827-5110
(505) 827-5469 Fax
John Fenner, Executive Assistant (505) 827-5446
Web Site: http://www.nmshtd.state.nm.us

New York Department of Transportation
Joseph H. Boardman, Commissioner
Department of Transportation
Building 5, State Office Campus
Albany, NY 12232

(518) 457-4422
(518) 457-4190 Fax
(518) 457-2345 Steven Hewitt, Director, Governmental Relations
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.ny.us

North Carolina Department of Transportation
W. Lyndo Tippett, Secretary
Department of Transportation
P. O. Box 25201
1. S. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27611
(919) 733-2520
(919) 733-9150 Fax
David King, Deputy Secretary for Transportation
Len Sanderson, State Highway Administrator
(202) 624-5830 Geoff Trego, Federal Program Coordinator 444 N. Capitol St., N.W.
Suite 332
Washington, DC 20001
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.nc.us/DOT

North Dakota Department of Transportation
David Sprynczynatyk, Director
Department of Transportation
608 E. Boulevard Avenue
Bismarck, ND 58505-0700
(701) 328-2581
(701) 328-1420 Fax
(701) 328-2584 Grant Levi, Deputy Director for Engineering
Web Site: http://www.state.nd.us/dot

Ohio Department of Transportation
Gordon Proctor, Director of Transportation
Department of Transportation
1980 West Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43223
(614) 466 2335
(614) 466-0587 Fax
(614) 466-2448 Ronald L. Zook, Assistant Director of Transportation & Chief Engineer
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.oh.us

Oklahoma Department of Transportation
Neal McCaleb, Secretary - Director
Department of Transportation
200 N.E. 21st Street

Oklahoma City, OK 73105
(405) 521-2631
(405) 521-2093 Fax
(405) 521-2701 Paul Adams, Deputy Director
(405) 521-2688 Bruce Taylor, Chief Engineer
Web Site: http://www.okladot.state.ok.us/

Oregon Department of Transportation
Bruce Warner, Director
Department of Transportation
355 Capitol Street, N.E.
Salem, OR 97310
(503) 986-3200
(503) 986-3446 Fax
(503) 986-3200 Thomas D. Lulay, Deputy Director
Web Site: http://www.odot.state.or.us/

Pennsylvania Department of Transportation
Bradley L. Mallory, Secretary of Transportation
Department of Transportation
400 North Street, 8th Floor
P.O. Box 3543
Harrisburg, PA 17101-3543
(717) 787-5574
(717) 787-5491 Fax
(717) 787-3154 Larry M. King, Deputy Sec. for Planning
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.pa.us/

Puerto Rico Department of Transportation and Public Works
Jose Manuel Izquierdo Encarnacion, Secretary of Transportation and Public Works
Department of Transportation and Public Works
Office of the Secretary
P.O. Box 41269
Minillas Station
San Juan, PR 00940-2007
(787) 722-2929
(787) 728-8963 Fax
(787) 723-1420 Manuel Feliciano, Deputy Secretary
(787) 729-1531 Dr. Sergio L. Gonzalez, Executive Director
Highway and Transportation Authority
Web site: http://www.dtop.gov.pr

< **Rhode Island** Department of Transportation
William D. Ankner,Director
Department of Transportation

2 Capitol Hill
State Office Building
Providence, RI 02903
(401) 222-2481
(401) 222-6038 Fax
(401) 222-2481 James R. Capaldi, Chief Engineer
(401) 222-2694 Paul R. Annarummo, P.E., Managing Engineer
(401) 222-2694 Robert A. Shawver, P.E., Chief, Strat. Planning
Web Site: http://www.state.ri.us

South Carolina Department of Transportation
Elizabeth Mabry, Executive Director
Department of Transportation
Silas N. Pearman Building
955 Park Street
P. O. Box 191
Columbia, SC 29202
(803) 737-1300
(803) 737-2038 Fax
(803) 737-1314 D. H. Freeman, State Highway Engineer
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.sc.us

South Dakota Department of Transportation
Ron Wheeler, Secretary of Transportation
Department of Transportation
Transportation Building
700 East Broadway Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501-2586
(605) 773-3265
(605) 773-3921 Fax
Web Site: http://www.state.sd.us/state/executive/dot

Tennessee Department of Transportation
John Bruce Saltsman, Commissioner
Department of Transportation
700 James K. Polk Building
Fifth and Deaderick
Nashville, TN 37243-0349
(615) 741-2848
(615) 741-2508 Fax
(615) 741-0791 William L. Moore, Jr., Executive Director, Planing and Development
Web Site: http://www.state.tn.us/transport

Texas Department of Transportation
Charles "Wes" Heald, Executive Director

Department of Transportation
Dewitt C. Greer Highway Building
125 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701-2483
(512) 305-9501
(512) 463-0283 Fax
(512) 305-9502 Kirby W. Pickett, P.E., Deputy Executive Director
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.tx.us

Utah Department of Transportation
Tom Warne, Executive Director
Department of Transportation
UDOT/DPS Complex
4501 S. 2700 West
Salt Lake City, UT 84119
(801) 965-4113
(801) 965-4338 Fax
(801) 965-4082 John R. Njord, Deputy Director
Web Site: http://www.sr.ex.state.ut.us

Vermont Agency of Transportation
Brian Searles, Secretary of Transportation
Agency of Transportation
State Administration Building
133 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05633
(802) 828-2657
(802) 828-3522
(802) 828-2658 Jeffrey F. Squires, Deputy Secretary
Web Site: http://www.aot.state.vt.us

Virginia Department of Transportation
Shirley J. Ybarra, Secretary of Transportation
Department of Transportation
1401 E. Broad Street, Room 414
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 786-6675
(804) 786-6683 Fax
(804) 786-6675 Charles Waddell, Deputy Secretary
(804) 225-3542 (Vacant), Intergovernmental Relations Coordinator
Web Site: http://www.vdot.state.va.us/

Washington State Department of Transportation
Douglas B. MacDonald, Secretary of Transportation
Department of Transportation
310 Maple Park Ave., SE

P.O. Box 47813
Olympia, WA 98504-7813
(360) 705-7054
(360) 705-6888 Fax
(360) 705-7024 Rick Daniels, Dir., Intergovernmental Relations
Web Site: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov

West Virginia Department of Transportation
Fred Van Kirk, Secretary of Transportation
Department of Transportation
1900 Kanawha Boulevard, E.
Charleston, WV 25305-0440
(304) 558-0444
(304) 558-4076 Fax
Web Site: http://www.wvdot.com

Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Terry Mulcahy, Secretary
Department of Transportation
State Transportation Building
4802 Sheboygan Avenue
P. O. Box 7910
Madison, WI 53707-7910
(608) 266-1114
(608) 266-9912 Fax
Web Site: http://www.dot.state.wi.us

Wyoming Department of Transportation
Sleeter Dover, Director
Department of Transportation
5300 Bishop Boulevard
P. O. Box 1708
Cheyenne, WY 82003-1708
(307) 777-4484
(307) 777-4163 Fax
Web Site: http://www.wydotweb.state.wy.us

Appendix D

FHWA DIVISION OFFICE AND RESOURCE CENTER ADDRESSES

FEDERAL-AID DIVISION OFFICES

ALABAMA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-AL) Telephone: 334-223-7370
7:15-4:30 CST
500 Eastern Boulevard, Suite 200
Montgomery, Alabama 36117-2018

ALASKA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-AK) Telephone: 907-586-7180
7:30-5:00 AST
709 W. Ninth Street, Room 851
Juneau, Alaska 99802-1648
Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 21648
Juneau, Alaska 99802-1648

ARIZONA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-AZ) Telephone: 602-379-3646
7:30-4:15 MST
234 N. Central Avenue, Suite 330
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2220

ARKANSAS DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-AR) Telephone: 501-324-5625
7:30-4:00 CST
Federal Office Building
700 West Capitol Avenue, Room 3130
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201-3298

CALIFORNIA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-CA) Telephone: 916-498-5001
7:30-4:00 PST/PDST
980 9th Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, California 95814-2724

COLORADO DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-CO) Telephone: 303-969-6730
7:45-4:15 MST
555 Zang Street, Room 250
Lakewood, Colorado 80228-1097

CONNECTICUT DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-CT) Telephone: 860-659-6703
7:30-4:00 EST Ext.3009
628-2 Hebron Avenue, Suite 303
Glastonbury, Connecticut 06033-5007

DELAWARE DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-DE) Telephone: 302-734-5323
7:15-4:15 EST

300 South New Street, Room 2101
Dover, Delaware 19904-6726

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-DC)
Telephone: 202-523-0163
8:00-4:30 EST
Union Center Plaza, Suite 750
820 First Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

FLORIDA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-FL) Telephone: 850-942-9650
7:30-4:00 EST Ext. 3001
227 N. Bronough Street, Suite 2015
Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1330

GEORGIA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-GA) Telephone: 404-562-3630
7:00-4:00 EST
61 Forsyth Street, SW, Suite 17T100
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3104

HAWAII DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-HI) Telephone: 808-541-2700
7:30-4:00 HST Ext. 312
Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole Federal Building
300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room 3-306
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850-3306

IDAHO DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-ID) Telephone: 208-334-9180
7:30-4:00 MST
3050 Lakeharbor Lane
Suite 126
Boise, Idaho 83703-6243

ILLINOIS DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-IL) Telephone: 217-492-4640
7:30-4:15 CST
3250 Executive Park Drive
Springfield, Illinois 62703-4514

INDIANA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-IN) Telephone: 317-226-7475
7:30-4:00 EST
575 N. Pennsylvania Street, Room 254
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-1576

IOWA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-IA) Telephone: 515-233-7300
7:45-4:15 CST
105 6th Street
Ames, Iowa 50010-6337

KANSAS DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-KS) Telephone: 785-267-7281
7:45-4:15 CST
3300 South Topeka Boulevard, Suite 1
Topeka, Kansas 66611-2237

KENTUCKY DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-KY) Telephone: 502-223-6720
8:00-4:45 EST
John C. Watts Federal Building
330 W. Broadway
Frankfort, KY 40601

LOUISIANA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-LA) Telephone: 225-757-7600
7:30-4:00 CST
5304 Flanders Drive, Suite A
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808-4348

MAINE DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-ME) Telephone: 207-622-8487
7:30-4:00 EST Ext. 19
Edmund S. Muskie Federal Building
40 Western Avenue, Room 614
Augusta, Maine 04330-6394

MARYLAND DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-MD) Telephone: 410-962-4440
7:30-4:00 EST
The Rotunda, Suite 220
711 West 40th Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21211-2108

MASSACHUSETTS DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-MA) Telephone: 617-494-3657
7:45-4:15 EST
55 Broadway - 10th Floor
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142-1093

MICHIGAN DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-MI) Telephone: 517-377-1844
7:30-4:15 EST
Federal Building, Room 207
315 West Allegan Street
Lansing, Michigan 48933-1528

MINNESOTA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-MN) Telephone: 651-291-6100
7:30-4:00 CST
Galtier Plaza, Box 75
175 E. Fifth Street, Suite 500
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2904

MISSISSIPPI DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-MS) Telephone: 601-965-4215
7:30-4:00 CST
666 North Street, Suite 105
Jackson, Mississippi 39202-3199

MISSOURI DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-MO) Telephone: 573-636-7104
7:30-4:00 CST
209 Adams Street
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101-3203

MONTANA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-MT) Telephone: 406-449-5303
6:30-4:30 MST Ext. 235
2880 Skyway Drive
Helena, Montana 59602-1230

NEBRASKA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-NE) Telephone: 402-437-5521
7:30-4:15 CST
Federal Building, Room 220
100 Centennial Mall North
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508-3851

NEVADA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-NV) Telephone: 775-687-1204
7:30am-4:00pm PST
705 North Plaza Street, Suite 220
Carson City, Nevada 89701-0602

NEW HAMPSHIRE DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-NH) Telephone: 603-228-0417
7:30-4:00 EST
279 Pleasant Street, Suite 204
Concord, New Hampshire 03301-7502

NEW JERSEY DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-NJ) Telephone: 609-637-4200
8:00-4:30 EST
840 Bear Tavern Road, Suite 310
West Trenton, New Jersey 08628-1019

NEW MEXICO DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-NM) Telephone: 505-820-2021
7:30-4:00 MST
604 W. San Mateo Road
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505-3920

NEW YORK DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-NY) Telephone: 518-431-4125
7:30-4:00 EST
Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building, Room 719
Clinton Avenue and North Pearl Street

Albany, New York 12207

NORTH CAROLINA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-NC) Telephone: 919-856-4346
7:45-4:15 EST
310 New Bern Avenue, Suite 410
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-1441

NORTH DAKOTA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-ND) Telephone: 701-250-4204
7:45-4:30 CST
1471 Interstate Loop
Bismarck, North Dakota 58503-0567

OHIO DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-OH) Telephone: 614-280-6896
7:30-4:15 EST
200 North High Street, Room 328
Columbus, Ohio 43215

OKLAHOMA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-OK) Telephone: 405-605-6012
7:30-4:00 CST
300 N. Meridian, Suite 105 S
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73107-6560

OREGON DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-OR) Telephone: 503-399-5749
7:30-4:15 PST
The Equitable Center
Suite 100
530 Center Street, NE.
Salem, Oregon 97301-3740

PENNSYLVANIA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-PA) Telephone: 717-221-3461
8:00-4:30 EST
228 Walnut Street, Room 558
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101-1720

PUERTO RICO DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-PR) Telephone: 787-766-5600
7:30-4:00 AST Ext. 223
Federico Degetau Federal Building
Carlos Chardon Street, Room 329
San Juan, PR 00918-1755

RHODE ISLAND DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-RI) Telephone: 401-528-4541
7:45-4:15 EST
380 Westminster Mall, Fifth Floor
Providence, Rhode Island 02903-3246

SOUTH CAROLINA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-SC) Telephone: 803-765-5411

7:30-4:00 EST
Strom Thurmond Federal Building
1835 Assembly Street, Suite 1270
Columbia, South Carolina 29201-2483

SOUTH DAKOTA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-SD) Telephone: 605-224-8033
8:00-4:30 CST
The Sibley Building
116 East Dakota Avenue
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-3110

TENNESSEE DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-TN) Telephone: 615-781-5770
8:00-4:30 CST
640 Grassmere Park Road
Suite 112
Nashville TN 37211-3568

TEXAS DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-TX) Telephone: 512-536-5900
7:30-4:15 CST
Federal Office Building
300 East Eighth Street, Room 826
Austin, Texas 78701-3233

UTAH DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-UT) Telephone: 801-963-0182
7:30-4:00 MST
2520 West 4700 South, Suite 9A
Salt Lake City, Utah 84118-1847

VERMONT DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-VT) Telephone: 802-828-4423
7:30-4:00 EST
Federal Building
87 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602-2954

VIRGINIA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-VA) Telephone: 804-775-3320
7:30-4:00 EST
400 North 8th Street
Room 750
Richmond, VA 23240

VIRGIN ISLANDS (HVI-01)

For information, contact the Puerto Rico Division at
787-766-5600

WASHINGTON DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-WA) Telephone: 360-753-9480

7:30-4:30 PST
Suite 501, Evergreen Plaza
711 South Capitol Way
Olympia, Washington 98501-1284

WEST VIRGINIA DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-WV) Telephone: 304-347-5928
8:00-4:30 EST
700 Washington Street East
Geary Plaza Suite 200
Charleston, West Virginia 25301-1604

WISCONSIN DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-WI) Telephone: 608-829-7500
7:30-4:15 CST
Highpoint Office Park
567 D'Onofrio Drive
Madison, Wisconsin 53719-2814

WYOMING DIVISION OFFICE (HDA-WY) Telephone: 307-772-2101
7:30-4:00 MST Ext. 40
1916 Evans Avenue
Cheyenne, WY 82001-3764

RESOURCE CENTERS

EASTERN RESOURCE CENTER
Location:
10 S. Howard Street, Suite 4000
Baltimore, Maryland 21201-2819
Hours of Duty:
7:30-4:30 EST
Telephone:
410-962-0093

MID-WESTERN RESOURCE CENTER
Location:
19900 Governors Drive, Suite 301
Olympia Fields, Illinois 60461-1021
Hours of Duty:
7:30-4:15 CST
Telephone:
708-283-3510

SOUTHERN RESOURCE CENTER
Location:

Suite 17T26
61 Forsyth Street, SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3104
Hours of Duty:
7:30-4:00 EST
Telephone:
404-562-3570

WESTERN RESOURCE CENTER
Location:
201 Mission Street
Suite 2100
San Francisco, California 94105
Hours of Duty:
7:45-4:15 PST
Telephone:
415-744-3102

FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY DIVISION OFFICES

EASTERN (HFL-15) Telephone: 703-404-6201
7:45-4:15 EST
Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division
Loudoun Tech Center
21400 Ridgetop Circle
Sterling, Virginia 20166-6511

CENTRAL (HFL-16) Telephone: 303-716-2000
7:45-4:15 MST
Central Federal Lands Highway Division
555 Zang Street
Lakewood, Colorado 80228-1010

WESTERN (HFL-17) Telephone: 360-696-7700
8:00-4:30 PST
Western Federal Lands Highway Division
610 East Fifth Street
Vancouver, Washington 98661-3801