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Task Statement

Objective:
To aid Congress, state and federal transportation administrators in planning a stimulus program that may include transportation spending.

Tasks:
- Describe experience with stimulus spending in general
- Determine value of transportation investments as stimulus
- Determine how to structure and manage a transportation spending stimulus program for greatest benefit

(Stimulus program: Package of extraordinary federal expenditures or tax concessions, funded by borrowing, to speed recovery from recession)

Committee did not assess effect of transportation expenditures on employment or growth in the long run.
Public Works Stimulus Spending before ARRA

• Public Works Acceleration Act, 1962: $0.9B for local projects, under the Department of Commerce

• Accelerated Public Works Bill, 1971: $2B in bill; vetoed

• Local Public Works Program, 1976: $6B for public works, under Economic Development Administration

• Emergency Jobs Appropriation Act, 1983: $7.8 billion for public works, including $0.9B under the Department of Transportation

• Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1993: $0.1B for public works (out of $6B proposed by Administration)
Evaluations of past spending programs [RAND (1978), GAO (1986)] found 3 objections:

- Spending was not timely
- State and local governments substituted federal funds for own
- Accelerating spending increased risk of poor project selection
USDOT-Administered Funds in ARRA

- Highways: $27.5 billion
- Passenger rail: $9.3 billion
- Transit: $8.4 billion
- Other (aviation, marine, TIGER): $2.9 billion

Total $48.1 billion
Administrative Rules for USDOT Funds in ARRA

- Apportionment of most funds by existing procedures
- Matching funds waiver
- Obligation & spending deadlines
- Maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement
- Distressed areas priority
- Data collection & reporting requirements
Conclusions

Three areas of focus:

1. Effectiveness of stimulus spending
2. Value of transportation spending in a fiscal stimulus program
3. Design of a transportation stimulus program
Conclusions (continued)

Effectiveness of stimulus spending

• Stimulus spending, during recession or period of high unemployment, and when monetary policy is maintaining low interest rates, increases GDP and employment, at least in the short run

• Estimates of the magnitude of the effect vary over a wide range (E.g., CBO’s ARRA impact estimates cite range of 0.4 – 2.5 for spending multipliers)
Conclusions (continued)

Value of transportation spending in a stimulus program

• Once it is decided to undertake a stimulus program, transportation is appropriate as a component of a diversified program, especially if downturn is likely to be prolonged

• Justifications:
  - Provides benefit (transport services) regardless of size of stimulus impact
  - Diversifies the stimulus package
  - Expanding infrastructure raises expectations for growth, magnifying stimulus
  - Accelerating planned spending adds little to long-term debt
  - Construction prices lower in recession
FHWA Highway Construction Cost index
Conclusions (continued)

Value of transportation spending in a stimulus program (continued)

- For ARRA grants and 2009 conditions, objections raised with regard to past infrastructure stimulus programs were not as relevant.

  - **Timeliness**: Recovery protracted; future recoveries may be also. But, spending slow in new programs (TIGER, passenger rail)

  - **Fiscal substitution**: Constrained by MOE rule & state trust funds. But, net effect of ARRA on state/local transportation spending uncertain.

  - **Risk of poor project selection**: Most projects already in plans. But, deadlines favored simplest projects (e.g., pavement, buses).
Timeliness:
2/3 of ARRA public investment funds were spent within 2 years of enactment

Cumulative ARRA outlays and tax reductions (% of total through 2012Q3)

Months from start of recession

ARRA stimulus other than public investment
ARRA public investment
stimulus
Timeliness:
Recovery time after recessions has been lengthening

Percent change in employment from start of recession

Months from start of recession

1990 recession
2001 recession
2007 recession
Timeliness: Investment stimulus spending at the ARRA rate is timely if recovery is lengthy
Conclusions (continued)

Design of a transportation stimulus program

• *Transportation share* of overall program: Limited by federal, state, local agencies’ administrative capacities, industry capacity, available worthwhile projects

• *Allocation* within the transportation program: Following established formulas and procedures in ARRA helped speed enactment and spending

• *Administrative rules*: ARRA rules on jobs reporting, distressed areas priority, MOE were of uncertain value
Recommendations

Four areas of focus:

1. Expand transportation agency and construction industry capacity to absorb stimulus spending

2. Rationalize design of future transportation stimulus spending programs

3. Measure effect of federal aid program changes on recipient actions and program benefits

4. Define a method for balancing the recovery and reinvestment goals of transportation stimulus spending
Recommendations (continued)

1. Expand transportation agency and construction industry capacity to absorb stimulus spending

   • Two objectives: (1) Stabilize transportation spending over the business cycle; (2) Manage any future temporary federal assistance efficiently

   • Actions to consider:
     - Provide stability in established federal funding programs
     - Increase project backlog
     - Carry balances in trust funds
     - Establish federal competitive assistance program charged with accelerating grants in recessions

   • Would benefit the economy and the transportation system
Recommendations (continued)

2. Rationalize design of future transportation stimulus spending programs
   - Advance rulemaking: Congress should authorize USDOT to publish rules now that would be applicable in any future stimulus program
   - Revise Maintenance of Effort (MOE) rules, data reporting, deadline rules in ARRA after evaluation of their effects and effectiveness
3. Measure the effect of federal-aid program changes on recipient actions and program benefits

USDOT should conduct research on how changes in the level of federal aid and in rules of aid programs affect recipients’ spending decisions.

4. Define a method for balancing the recovery and reinvestment goals of transportation stimulus spending

USDOT should define a method for evaluating the combined transportation and stimulus benefits of projects in a unified framework.