

Obligation Rates for the Highway Safety Improvement Program

An obligation is a definite commitment that creates a legal liability of the government for the payment, or a legal duty on the part of the United States that could mature into a legal liability by virtue of actions on the part of the State or local public agency (LPA). A Federal agency incurs an obligation when it records an obligation under a grant agreement to pay the State (or LPA) for the Federal share of a project's eligible cost. This commitment is generally made as both the Federal and State governments agree to specific project expenditures based upon a defined scope of work. Under the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), obligations are recorded against HSIP funds that were distributed via a formula provided in the law; these funds are commonly referred to as an apportionment. From the Federal perspective, the obligation to apportionment ratio is a way to represent the degree to which a State is using HSIP funds, as shown in Table 1 below. Using apportionment figures for the calculations addresses two issues: 1) funding available is subject to transfer activities and 2) apportionments more accurately represent the extent to which States are using HSIP as a funding source.

HSIP funding obligation rates are not necessarily a reflection of a State's commitment to safety. There are many other ways to fund safety improvements. This summary does not show why obligations rates are high or low, or how safe highways may be in each State, as the information below does not include safety improvements that are planned, but not yet obligated, does not include transfer of funds to another agency, and does not reflect safety spending through other core programs such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program or the National Highway Performance Program, or funded by non-Federal funds.

HSIP Cumulative Obligations vs. Cumulative Apportionments Through Fiscal Year 2020

Table 1 illustrates the ratio of the HSIP cumulative obligations to the cumulative apportionments for each State through the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2020. FY 2014 through FY 2019 includes combined funds from the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act and FY 2020 includes funds only from the FAST Act. The obligation rates include the Railway-Highway Crossings Program (RHCP) and the High Risk Rural Roads (HRRR) Special Rule funding under MAP-21 and the FAST Act. MAP-21 (and the subsequent extension of MAP-21) was in effect from October 2013 through September 2015. The FAST Act went into effect on October 1, 2015.

Table 1: HSIP Cumulative Obligation Rates by State

State	Fiscal Year						
	MAP 21 & FAST Act						FAST Act
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Alabama	32.6%	41.5%	51.3%	54.8%	60.4%	63.1%	67.4%
Alaska	93.7%	98.0%	98.5%	98.8%	91.9%	82.9%	91.7%

Arizona	54.5%	56.4%	65.3%	77.5%	74.1%	66.4%	46.3%
Arkansas	28.7%	27.9%	51.1%	59.9%	74.5%	80.2%	117.7%
California	79.6%	86.3%	108.3%	123.6%	135.2%	139.2%	200.6%
Colorado	51.7%	65.3%	63.2%	75.4%	73.1%	71.3%	52.3%
Connecticut	30.9%	51.4%	61.0%	67.0%	77.7%	77.6%	92.8%
Delaware	86.7%	92.9%	91.7%	97.6%	99.5%	88.4%	81.9%
District of Columbia	6.0%	54.0%	94.1%	98.9%	99.0%	99.9%	95.9%
Florida	63.3%	79.9%	79.3%	86.7%	87.5%	74.9%	71.3%
Georgia	69.4%	65.5%	78.8%	85.3%	90.7%	88.5%	100.7%
Hawaii	1.9%	1.3%	17.5%	55.4%	59.9%	56.9%	42.0%
Idaho	5.9%	29.8%	44.7%	56.4%	71.0%	69.2%	79.7%
Illinois	50.6%	60.7%	74.6%	71.3%	78.4%	79.9%	70.0%
Indiana	6.7%	17.1%	28.4%	31.5%	37.9%	37.8%	48.7%
Iowa	52.9%	67.5%	69.2%	70.1%	75.8%	75.0%	61.2%
Kansas	30.7%	56.3%	52.9%	65.8%	71.5%	76.0%	73.3%
Kentucky	15.8%	43.1%	48.5%	59.1%	69.4%	64.7%	84.3%
Louisiana	94.1%	73.0%	90.9%	85.5%	89.8%	96.0%	87.5%
Maine	68.2%	91.1%	90.6%	91.7%	89.2%	91.6%	81.9%
Maryland	22.5%	33.1%	42.5%	40.8%	41.6%	36.3%	22.5%
Massachusetts	91.2%	97.0%	95.5%	100.1%	98.6%	95.8%	91.3%
Michigan	86.3%	85.8%	81.8%	87.6%	88.2%	90.0%	83.6%
Minnesota	40.5%	45.8%	52.7%	60.8%	65.4%	66.1%	61.7%
Mississippi	98.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.3%	98.5%	93.0%	96.6%
Missouri	45.7%	59.2%	65.6%	86.8%	98.5%	98.0%	94.0%
Montana	48.4%	59.6%	78.8%	81.0%	82.6%	74.2%	65.5%
Nebraska	61.6%	79.8%	77.9%	81.0%	79.8%	83.4%	67.0%
Nevada	98.1%	98.8%	97.7%	93.6%	88.6%	81.8%	66.8%
New Hampshire	93.6%	89.9%	93.0%	89.0%	87.3%	86.8%	78.7%
New Jersey	24.5%	44.8%	52.9%	51.7%	54.6%	54.6%	43.9%
New Mexico	27.4%	44.9%	49.7%	59.3%	70.7%	71.6%	77.8%
New York	41.3%	58.9%	56.7%	80.1%	82.2%	71.7%	69.8%
North Carolina	54.8%	73.2%	80.3%	84.5%	87.0%	84.1%	91.5%
North Dakota	70.1%	72.5%	75.1%	84.9%	93.6%	95.1%	107.9%
Ohio	97.1%	99.3%	99.3%	87.7%	89.4%	87.5%	90.1%
Oklahoma	82.4%	88.5%	91.1%	94.4%	96.1%	89.5%	89.7%

Oregon	44.0%	57.3%	78.7%	80.5%	73.4%	69.0%	64.6%
Pennsylvania	62.4%	64.9%	78.7%	77.8%	79.3%	78.1%	69.3%
Rhode Island	53.2%	53.6%	50.7%	57.4%	67.4%	73.4%	68.7%
South Carolina	85.9%	97.0%	87.6%	86.5%	89.4%	79.3%	73.8%
South Dakota	7.4%	16.3%	59.7%	99.8%	128.0%	121.5%	177.9%
Tennessee	59.8%	72.0%	83.3%	88.4%	89.0%	87.5%	87.1%
Texas	63.2%	89.8%	91.2%	91.0%	89.8%	80.5%	77.5%
Utah	61.6%	93.4%	88.9%	94.6%	89.6%	90.3%	95.8%
Vermont	38.7%	53.6%	72.1%	81.2%	82.6%	78.0%	84.3%
Virginia	91.3%	77.4%	85.7%	86.8%	86.1%	78.4%	67.0%
Washington	60.9%	62.2%	79.1%	79.4%	78.9%	82.1%	72.6%
West Virginia	23.4%	34.9%	44.1%	54.4%	85.9%	89.9%	93.7%
Wisconsin	2.8%	4.8%	19.4%	32.8%	36.7%	36.5%	33.5%
Wyoming	84.2%	79.9%	76.4%	85.7%	91.7%	97.7%	83.4%
Total	58.1%	68.6%	76.6%	82.4%	86.2%	83.6%	86.7%

Funding Transferred to Other Core Apportioned Programs Through Fiscal Year 2020

A "transfer" involves the shifting of the budget (contract) authority in one fund account to another. The HSIP is subject to the transfer provision under section 126 of Title 23, United States Code (U.S.C.). Under this provision, States are permitted to transfer up to 50 percent of their HSIP funds apportioned for the fiscal year to any other eligible core apportioned program. As of September 30, 2020, 20 States transferred FAST Act funds out of the HSIP into to other core apportioned programs and 10 States transferred funds from other core apportioned programs into the HSIP. Table 2 below shows the transfer amounts and rates through FY 2019. Table 2 does not include transfer of funds to another agency.

Table 2: HSIP FAST Act Funding Transferred to/from Other Core Apportioned Programs

State	Total HSIP Apportionment (2016-2020)	Total HSIP Funds Transferred (2016-2020)	Transfer Rate
Alabama	\$219,833,015	(\$25,545,713)	-11.62%
Alaska	\$150,103,163	\$46,124,171	30.73%
Arkansas	\$150,536,983	\$48,269,277	32.06%
California	\$986,146,929	\$985,000,000	99.88%
Colorado	\$138,928,121	(\$35,192,970)	-25.33%
Connecticut	\$144,192,019	\$13,754,551	9.54%

Florida	\$586,558,651	(\$78,214,529)	-13.33%
Georgia	\$337,841,191	\$35,000,000	10.36%
Indiana	\$258,505,632	(\$83,746,195)	-32.40%
Kansas	\$90,910,985	(\$7,420,302)	-8.16%
Kentucky	\$192,013,504	(\$26,614,768)	-13.86%
Maryland	\$170,981,815	(\$85,329,940)	-49.91%
Massachusetts	\$161,408,579	(\$500,000)	-0.31%
Minnesota	\$175,877,448	(\$22,521,062)	-12.80%
Montana	\$118,060,029	\$6,698,423	5.67%
Nevada	\$100,682,265	(\$30,460,386)	-30.25%
New Jersey	\$272,611,218	(\$146,936,259)	-53.90%
New Mexico	\$104,085,900	(\$17,179,476)	-16.51%
New York	\$465,634,996	(\$160,052,065)	-34.37%
North Dakota	\$59,559,256	\$30,414,955	51.07%
Oregon	\$143,074,566	(\$44,520,109)	-31.12%
Rhode Island	\$64,098,627	(\$14,526,780)	-22.66%
South Dakota	\$72,908,401	\$81,526,902	111.82%
Texas	\$1,054,672,796	(\$137,806,460)	-13.07%
Utah	\$98,358,317	(\$46,615)	-0.05%
Vermont	\$58,130,739	(\$5,610,244)	-9.65%
Virginia	\$286,991,921	\$33,255,245	11.59%
Washington	\$180,251,377	\$2,718,684	1.51%
Wisconsin	\$213,473,466	(\$106,736,732)	-50.00%
Wyoming	\$77,017,985	(\$8,000,000)	-10.39%

RHCP Cumulative Obligations vs. Cumulative Apportionments Through Fiscal Year 2020

Rail-Highway Crossings Program (RHCP) Section 130 funds are set-aside from the HSIP apportionment. The RHCP set-aside funds are apportioned to States by formula. Table 3 illustrates the ratio of the RHCP (Section 130) set-aside obligations to the apportionments for each State through the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2020. FY 2014 through FY 2019 includes combined funds from MAP-21 and the FAST Act and FY 2020 includes funds only from the FAST Act.

As noted above, RHCP funding obligation rates are not a reflection of a State's commitment to safety. This summary does not show why obligations rates are high or low, or how safe rail-

highway crossings may be in each State, as the information in Table 3 does not include safety improvements that are planned, but not yet obligated, and does not reflect safety spending through other core programs.

Table 3: RHCP Cumulative Obligation Rates by State

State	Fiscal Year						
	MAP-21 & FAST Act						FAST Act
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Alabama	0.0%	4.7%	34.7%	53.1%	47.1%	34.6%	14.9%
Alaska	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	98.3%	100.0%	87.6%
Arizona	13.3%	43.3%	55.3%	59.4%	51.8%	45.8%	33.8%
Arkansas	37.1%	31.3%	36.6%	44.1%	48.9%	59.3%	59.9%
California	5.7%	9.7%	22.0%	53.5%	60.3%	59.7%	52.4%
Colorado	31.5%	21.6%	24.2%	37.8%	47.1%	70.8%	53.9%
Connecticut	14.4%	9.6%	31.9%	47.6%	54.1%	61.2%	91.4%
Delaware	7.6%	35.0%	42.5%	100.0%	100.0%	98.8%	89.1%
District of Columbia	0.0%	62.4%	60.5%	100.0%	92.1%	99.0%	94.8%
Florida	97.8%	92.2%	83.4%	95.5%	94.1%	89.8%	85.7%
Georgia	9.3%	10.8%	25.8%	53.3%	57.1%	60.9%	58.3%
Hawaii	15.7%	10.5%	32.4%	45.2%	47.6%	76.0%	97.0%
Idaho	0.0%	2.7%	21.5%	41.1%	46.6%	52.7%	35.9%
Illinois	0.0%	1.3%	47.1%	39.8%	47.0%	59.2%	43.4%
Indiana	10.9%	10.1%	36.6%	37.8%	61.3%	68.6%	67.4%
Iowa	29.5%	33.4%	35.4%	41.9%	49.4%	61.9%	57.2%
Kansas	69.5%	75.1%	57.5%	79.0%	93.5%	82.0%	73.8%
Kentucky	0.0%	8.1%	35.4%	36.0%	46.1%	82.2%	57.9%
Louisiana	77.8%	62.8%	64.7%	58.7%	58.3%	59.2%	42.2%
Maine	23.6%	27.2%	25.0%	32.9%	22.7%	39.4%	32.0%
Maryland	49.6%	45.6%	54.5%	61.6%	50.6%	51.3%	37.1%
Massachusetts	0.0%	94.4%	83.0%	94.9%	91.1%	93.1%	68.8%
Michigan	26.8%	21.0%	32.4%	45.3%	52.7%	65.3%	60.0%
Minnesota	11.2%	29.2%	34.5%	38.4%	48.3%	51.3%	35.5%
Mississippi	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	94.2%	87.6%	75.3%	97.0%
Missouri	62.1%	93.8%	92.3%	86.8%	85.8%	81.1%	71.6%
Montana	67.8%	77.7%	78.0%	91.4%	96.9%	89.3%	85.8%

Nebraska	0.0%	1.0%	34.5%	61.2%	59.8%	79.3%	55.9%
Nevada	99.1%	77.8%	61.2%	61.4%	54.7%	52.6%	29.0%
New Hampshire	59.3%	43.3%	46.3%	42.1%	47.5%	50.2%	31.9%
New Jersey	99.8%	96.7%	92.1%	98.2%	95.1%	95.9%	79.3%
New Mexico	33.6%	41.0%	64.7%	68.0%	62.9%	62.5%	37.4%
New York	40.5%	29.8%	47.1%	42.9%	46.3%	59.9%	53.0%
North Carolina	83.8%	85.6%	90.0%	91.7%	91.2%	78.7%	57.9%
North Dakota	3.9%	12.6%	59.2%	71.9%	78.5%	82.6%	77.0%
Ohio	99.5%	97.9%	99.2%	100.0%	96.2%	100.0%	97.0%
Oklahoma	3.1%	44.8%	47.5%	64.3%	72.6%	75.6%	62.1%
Oregon	37.5%	36.9%	45.8%	51.3%	53.7%	60.0%	53.5%
Pennsylvania	0.0%	1.3%	24.0%	37.0%	47.7%	60.5%	45.8%
Rhode Island	48.5%	36.9%	22.3%	35.6%	48.8%	61.1%	45.0%
South Carolina	66.0%	70.2%	53.3%	68.2%	79.4%	69.4%	51.9%
South Dakota	0.0%	15.8%	24.3%	36.6%	56.4%	60.2%	48.7%
Tennessee	0.0%	14.7%	66.5%	82.1%	68.4%	63.4%	53.7%
Texas	34.0%	57.7%	55.9%	53.3%	47.7%	45.2%	17.2%
Utah	46.4%	46.8%	40.4%	46.4%	56.1%	81.2%	91.3%
Vermont	0.0%	0.0%	92.5%	98.0%	85.3%	72.5%	86.4%
Virginia	30.2%	50.0%	50.3%	47.3%	51.6%	43.9%	25.7%
Washington	0.0%	16.4%	55.9%	47.1%	58.7%	74.2%	61.8%
West Virginia	47.3%	53.6%	58.4%	52.4%	48.6%	67.9%	59.5%
Wisconsin	11.0%	21.2%	21.0%	25.3%	32.4%	39.5%	28.4%
Wyoming	88.1%	60.9%	54.5%	57.3%	65.5%	73.1%	50.9%
Total	33.4%	40.4%	51.0%	59.3%	62.7%	66.1%	54.9%