



# Recreational Trails Program: Report on State Trail Projects



**COALITION  
FOR  
RECREATIONAL  
TRAILS**

1225 New York Avenue, NW  
Suite 450  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
202-682-9530  
FAX 202-682-9529

For the Federal Highway Administration by the  
Coalition for Recreational Trails

**Recreational Trails Program**  
**Report on State Trail Projects**

**May 14, 2004**

**For the Federal Highway Administration by the  
Coalition for Recreational Trails  
(Order No. DTFH61-02-C-00024, Requisition No. 67-01-1051)**

**This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation in the interest in information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for its contents or use thereof. The contents of this report reflect the views of the contractor, who is responsible for the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Department of Transportation. This report does not constitute a standard, specification or regulation.**

**Recreational Trails Program  
Report on State Trail Projects  
May 14, 2004**

**Table of Contents**

	Page
Executive Summary	3
Background	3
Database Findings	5
Trail Projects and Funding: 1993-2002	5
Trail Project Work Descriptions	7
Maintenance Project Funding	7
Construction Project Funding	9
Projects by Trail Use Category	10
Nonmotorized Trail Project Funding	11
Motorized Trail Project Funding	12
Education Project Funding	13

# RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM DATABASE PROJECT

## Executive Summary

In 1999, the Coalition for Recreational Trails (CRT), working in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), developed a database of State trail projects that had received funding from the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) since the program's inception. The RTP was first part of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), and then part of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21), in 1998. In July 2000, again in cooperation with the FHWA, CRT initiated an update of the database. In October 2001, FHWA and CRT entered into a three-year agreement, with the American Recreation Coalition acting as CRT's agent, to continue the database project on a more systematic basis. As part of this most recent effort, reports were prepared for the FHWA in March 2002 and October 2002. This May 2004 report updates those previous reports, adding 1,079 projects reported for 2002 by 48 States, plus the District of Columbia, bringing the total to 6,650 projects. Additionally, in the Summer and Fall of 2003, CRT requested that the States update their past submissions to the database, to ensure that the database accurately reflects the actual use of RTP funding. Twenty-one States and the District of Columbia responded with updated information for prior years' projects. For this reason, the numbers of projects and amounts of funding from previous years cited in this report differ from those numbers given in previous reports. The total RTP funding now reported has reached \$201,745,119 and has been matched by \$188,806,495 in other funding. The information contained in this latest report has also been compiled into a searchable database that is accessible on the Internet at [www.funoutdoors.info/rtphome.html](http://www.funoutdoors.info/rtphome.html).

According to this latest report, the leading use of RTP funds – 42% – is trail construction or development, which continues the trend observed in earlier reports. The gap between RTP spending on trail construction or development and spending on trail maintenance has increased, as 73% more in RTP funds – a difference of \$46.6 million – has been directed toward those types of projects, up slightly from a 71% gap in 2001. Hiking and walking trails continue to be the focus of more projects than other trails, with hiking's share now at 61% (down from 62% in 2001) and walking at 53% (no change from 2001). Sixty-six percent of projects can be clearly identified as benefiting motorized and/or nonmotorized trail uses. The ratio of nonmotorized to motorized projects is virtually unchanged at 2.7:1.

Each State is allowed to use up to 5% of its RTP funds for educational programs that promote trail-related safety and environmental protection. However, the States continue to focus on other priorities, reporting that 3% (205) of their projects were educational. For projects reported through 2001, the percentage was similarly low when 154 projects were reported from a total of 5,571.

## Background

A Federal assistance program for recreational trail construction, renovation and maintenance was created under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA). Under the program, known initially as the National Recreational Trails Funding Program, funds were allocated to all States and the District of Columbia during only

three of the legislation's initial six years (a total of \$37.5 million) as well as during the transitional period of October 1997 to June 1998.

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21) amended the program – now known as the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) – most notably by significantly increasing funds apportioned to the States (reaching \$50 million annually for the last four of the legislation's six years) and providing contract authority for the program.

The legislation establishes requirements for project eligibility but provides substantial flexibility to the States on project selection. Presently, there is no unified reporting process from the States to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), which administers the program, on use of the funds. It should be noted, however, that most States have substantial, though not uniform, information available to the public on use of RTP funds.

The Coalition for Recreational Trails (CRT), representing all major national trail interests, has taken an active role in the RTP since its inception and shares FHWA's interest in ensuring that the program is efficient, operates in full compliance with the law, and is understood by all interests. CRT regards it as essential that RTP projects can be identified and evaluated by the Administration, the Congress, and program advocates. The increase in funding for RTP approved as part of TEA-21 demonstrated Congressional support for trails programs, but this support will be sustained only if sufficient accomplishments can be demonstrated. Moreover, FHWA has a need to monitor projects for compliance with statutory direction.

For these reasons, in 1999, CRT worked cooperatively with FHWA and the States to collect initial information on projects funded under RTP since the program's beginning. The data requested included project date, location and description, contact name, amount of RTP funding and other funding, types of trail uses, the Congressional district involved, and project highlights. All the States and the District of Columbia reported information, in varying levels of detail. CRT compiled this information into a database, which it made available to FHWA, trail administrators, and major national trail organizations. A report highlighting key information from the database was prepared and submitted to FHWA. As part of that report, CRT recommended that the data-collection effort be continued.

In July 2000, again in cooperation with FHWA, CRT contacted the States to obtain information on RTP trail projects undertaken since the initial request for data in 1999. By December, 47 States had responded with data on new 1999 and 2000 projects and 16 States provided updated information regarding earlier projects. Arizona, Florida, Ohio and the District of Columbia did not submit information because they had not allocated funding in those years. In October 2001, a new three-year effort to update the database was initiated by CRT under a contract between the FHWA and the American Recreation Coalition. Reports published in March and October 2002 included 4,780 and 5,572 projects, respectively. As part of the contract, beginning with the October 2002 report, data have also been compiled into a searchable database that is accessible on the Internet at <http://www.funoutdoors.info/rtp/home.html>. In addition to reviewing the basic findings summarized in the following tables, those accessing the database on the Internet can search for projects by specific criteria, including State, type of project, type of trail activity and level of project funding.

In the Spring of 2003, CRT again contacted the States to obtain information on RTP projects undertaken in 2002. Additionally, CRT requested that the States submit corrections for past projects that had been altered (e.g., funding amounts changed, project cancelled) since the project information was originally submitted to CRT. In November 2003, CRT made available a Web-based system allowing States to view and edit their projects' records in the database. Twenty-one States and the District of Columbia made use of this system to update their RTP project records. Because of these updated records, numbers of projects and RTP funding amounts for previous years (1993-2001) do not match those numbers presented in previous versions of this report.

## Database Findings

By December 31, 2003, 48 States and the District of Columbia had submitted data regarding their use of Recreational Trails Program (RTP) funds in 2002. Only South Carolina and South Dakota have not submitted data for 2002. Additionally, 21 States and the District of Columbia updated previously submitted data for projects in 1993-2001. Total trail project funding reported now includes 2002 projects and totals \$201,745,119, an increase of \$38,214,018 over the total reported for the first nine years of the program. The number of projects reported increased from 5,571 to 6,650. In addition, the States reported that an amount equivalent to almost 94% of the RTP funding level – \$188,806,495 – had been provided by other sources, including Federal agencies (e.g., the USDA Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management), States, towns, counties, and trail clubs (e.g., mountain biking groups, equestrian councils, and snowmobiler associations).

### RTP Database Projects and Funding 1993 - 2002

State	2002 Projects	Total Projects	Total RTP Funding	Total Other Funding
AK	26	137	\$2,138,343	\$2,575,088
AL	16	121	\$4,824,982	\$1,495,525
AR	27	133	\$4,250,373	\$2,212,919
AZ	2	7	\$429,982	\$1,287,284
CA	11	151	\$11,136,545	\$6,715,870
CO	68	116	\$4,645,678	\$11,739,324
CT	33	135	\$2,418,080	\$1,488,752
DC	2	10	\$1,924,402	\$579,575
DE	5	33	\$1,320,100	\$2,477,865
FL	22	82	\$4,668,625	\$4,005,986
GA	10	70	\$5,243,342	\$3,673,626
HI	95	474	\$2,301,525	\$828,812
IA	7	37	\$3,914,684	\$2,459,820
ID	23	195	\$3,453,373	\$9,407,673
IL	17	92	\$6,052,422	\$3,686,546
IN	5	33	\$3,342,975	\$1,849,030
KS	21	150	\$4,144,807	\$3,528,456
KY	34	147	\$3,372,150	\$4,233,436
LA	20	96	\$3,323,759	\$1,354,502
MA	14	87	\$1,179,985	\$1,396,247
MD*	31	204	\$4,457,400	\$4,512,400

State	2002 Projects	Total Projects	Total RTP Funding	Total Other Funding
ME	23	154	\$2,809,850	\$1,769,045
MI	24	91	\$6,026,201	\$3,580,808
MN	22	118	\$4,030,538	\$9,618,946
MO	17	97	\$4,540,877	\$7,794,564
MS	4	67	\$3,517,479	\$669,764
MT	64	230	\$2,867,413	\$2,049,271
NC	25	189	\$5,875,659	\$8,758,666
ND	15	96	\$2,756,998	\$756,965
NE	6	51	\$3,081,993	\$3,091,923
NH	44	225	\$2,351,307	\$2,567,421
NJ	31	257	\$3,454,592	\$4,819,260
NM	12	57	\$3,117,258	\$1,506,075
NV	12	84	\$2,170,798	\$1,886,044
NY	6	133	\$5,778,124	\$5,782,229
OH	18	107	\$6,307,906	\$6,309,587
OK	16	108	\$3,670,324	\$2,451,647
OR	19	149	\$3,251,208	\$4,641,148
PA	15	175	\$7,004,503	\$5,339,454
RI	8	60	\$1,794,000	\$3,488,121
SC	0	103	\$2,053,325	\$1,101,840
SD*	0	113	\$3,852,717	\$1,875,586
TN	24	85	\$4,211,701	\$1,716,394
TX	28	257	\$10,733,117	\$5,995,076
UT	15	110	\$3,764,484	\$3,555,004
VA	16	139	\$5,476,958	\$3,348,174
VT	19	266	\$2,587,890	\$7,129,389
WA	33	174	\$4,924,395	\$7,240,339
WI	36	215	\$5,029,936	\$5,245,971
WV	21	90	\$2,691,805	\$1,044,266
WY	17	140	\$3,468,231	\$2,164,782
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1079</b>	<b>6650</b>	<b>\$201,745,119</b>	<b>\$188,806,495</b>

\* Data revisions pending

The trail projects reported were varied and included: building new trails and adding trail connections; building restrooms; providing water fountains; developing and implementing educational programs; maintaining trails, resurfacing trails treads; providing accessibility for mobility-impaired persons; and more. The following table represents a categorization of the different projects reported. The percentages shown reflect the percentage of all projects that reported trail project descriptions. The leading use of funds, by a substantial margin, in both the current and previous reports was trail construction or development. The percentages reported for each category did not change markedly.

## RTP Database Trail Project Work by Project Category 1993 - 2002

*For 5446 Projects that Reported Project Descriptions*

Description of Work Done	1993 - 2001 Cumulative		1993-2002 Cumulative	
Acquire Land	53	1%	73	1%
Administrative	11	<1%	21	<1%
Bridge Construction or Renovation	579	13%	655	12%
Brochures	64	1%	75	1%
Educational	154	3%	205	4%
Maps	56	1%	70	1%
Parking Lots	218	5%	254	5%
Restroom Facilities	165	4%	196	4%
Sign Purchase and Installation	554	12%	660	12%
Trail Construction or Development	1909	43%	2299	42%
Trail Equipment Purchased	431	10%	539	10%
Trail Grooming	169	4%	220	4%
Trail Improvements	740	16%	888	16%
Trail Maintenance	647	14%	787	14%
Trail Renovation and Relocation	960	21%	1141	21%
Trailhead Work	308	7%	363	7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4489</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5446</b>	<b>100%</b>

A broader definition of trail maintenance was used for the following table, which includes projects reported as renovations, improvements, and grooming, as well as maintenance. The 2,334 projects reported with those descriptions accounted for \$64 million in RTP funding and another \$60 million in matching funding.

## RTP Database Maintenance Project Funding 1993 - 2002

*Including Maintenance, Improvement, Renovation and Grooming Projects*

State	2002 Projects	Total Projects	Total RTP Funding	Total Other Funding
AK	10	74	\$1,192,139	\$1,653,716
AL	6	29	\$975,189	\$346,597
AR	5	22	\$763,918	\$459,616
AZ	2	2	\$20,600	\$5,805
CA	3	58	\$3,970,875	\$2,026,419
CO	33	47	\$1,652,783	\$4,747,883
CT	11	52	\$672,479	\$250,424
DC	1	4	\$1,071,150	\$319,550
DE	3	18	\$616,900	\$899,515
FL	2	20	\$780,678	\$627,678
GA	2	20	\$1,202,677	\$383,384
HI	0	2	\$704,049	\$429,442
IA	2	15	\$1,048,188	\$313,242
ID	15	111	\$1,929,842	\$1,964,311
IL	11	48	\$2,701,972	\$1,933,663
IN	0	5	\$611,870	\$113,470
KS	5	32	\$562,457	\$409,361

State	2002 Projects	Total Projects	Total RTP Funding	Total Other Funding
KY	8	52	\$1,090,489	\$1,947,712
LA	1	4	\$158,012	\$37,022
MA	7	33	\$514,424	\$586,769
MD	9	64	\$1,286,957	\$1,256,957
ME	12	67	\$1,406,420	\$732,349
MI	15	53	\$3,078,054	\$2,022,077
MN	5	55	\$1,481,783	\$3,868,842
MO	2	25	\$1,082,806	\$1,100,523
MS	3	9	\$655,500	\$128,000
MT	34	138	\$1,435,181	\$1,081,746
NC	4	43	\$1,203,351	\$783,644
ND	2	26	\$683,036	\$186,416
NE	0	10	\$153,117	\$77,078
NH	13	106	\$973,869	\$1,005,612
NJ	14	101	\$1,309,332	\$1,579,526
NM	0	12	\$473,233	\$195,752
NV	2	18	\$311,522	\$300,541
NY	4	4	\$300,506	\$159,806
OH	7	35	\$1,165,149	\$752,713
OK	3	29	\$1,004,556	\$538,271
OR	9	57	\$1,250,054	\$1,365,829
PA	9	97	\$3,553,521	\$2,963,286
RI	4	22	\$341,052	\$470,073
SC	0	20	\$677,162	\$211,899
SD	0	31	\$925,358	\$421,105
TN	7	24	\$1,010,150	\$378,380
TX	11	94	\$3,372,616	\$2,016,254
UT	3	25	\$878,218	\$870,968
VA	6	52	\$1,809,799	\$942,946
VT	9	149	\$1,537,823	\$5,604,548
WA	20	95	\$2,917,936	\$5,051,153
WI	26	121	\$2,566,712	\$2,630,183
WV	8	25	\$701,761	\$288,025
WY	12	79	\$2,421,175	\$1,752,359
<b>Total</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>2334</b>	<b>\$64,208,400</b>	<b>\$60,192,440</b>

While the quantity of projects incorporating trail construction versus trail maintenance is 17% higher (2,741 vs. 2,334), the total amount of funding for trail construction is 76% higher than the amount used for trail maintenance funding. As would be expected, the average per-project cost for construction projects is markedly higher than for maintenance projects: \$79,832 vs. \$53,299. Since 2001, the per-project average costs for both construction and maintenance projects have increased slightly, from \$77,442 and \$52,109, respectively.

## RTP Database Construction Project Funding 1993 – 2002

*Including Trail Construction and Bridge Construction & Renovation*

State	2002 Projects	Total Projects	Total RTP Funding	Total Other Funding
AK	9	41	\$635,479	\$688,008
AL	12	89	\$3,814,477	\$1,165,100
AR	24	78	\$2,993,747	\$1,384,367
AZ	0	4	\$366,382	\$1,281,479
CA	1	70	\$5,566,398	\$4,400,910
CO	20	59	\$3,497,454	\$10,936,112
CT	15	63	\$1,360,612	\$1,142,527
DC	1	5	\$561,502	\$161,475
DE	2	16	\$776,450	\$877,350
FL	17	56	\$3,458,197	\$2,993,358
GA	9	40	\$3,270,898	\$2,438,974
HI	0	2	\$704,049	\$429,442
IA	3	16	\$2,132,218	\$2,215,386
ID	6	50	\$1,120,674	\$1,420,700
IL	9	38	\$3,643,356	\$2,765,296
IN	4	27	\$2,791,557	\$1,358,842
KS	7	70	\$2,373,415	\$2,419,357
KY	27	108	\$2,761,440	\$3,081,969
LA	19	63	\$2,498,801	\$759,322
MA	7	35	\$566,203	\$605,907
MD	11	76	\$1,945,113	\$2,030,113
ME	13	51	\$1,064,256	\$640,259
MI	8	37	\$3,254,261	\$1,544,850
MN	9	52	\$2,004,281	\$5,047,709
MO	7	58	\$2,934,045	\$6,108,285
MS	3	34	\$2,063,455	\$425,864
MT	17	59	\$1,057,576	\$757,210
NC	14	119	\$3,902,205	\$7,216,378
ND	9	48	\$1,428,289	\$422,739
NE	6	30	\$2,430,292	\$2,755,054
NH	13	97	\$951,019	\$820,588
NJ	10	72	\$1,139,888	\$2,411,463
NM	2	26	\$1,943,899	\$850,541
NV	7	46	\$1,533,169	\$1,066,656
NY	2	2	\$160,000	\$440,000
OH	11	67	\$4,732,973	\$5,145,256
OK	12	67	\$2,413,504	\$1,524,781
OR	10	51	\$1,525,628	\$3,242,484
PA	6	74	\$3,696,678	\$3,012,779
RI	1	25	\$865,406	\$2,577,662
SC	0	69	\$1,286,143	\$818,703
SD	0	21	\$650,389	\$566,683
TN	19	57	\$2,949,984	\$1,100,046
TX	17	149	\$6,562,982	\$3,763,941
UT	6	26	\$1,477,983	\$1,422,323
VA	10	88	\$3,789,834	\$2,401,094

State	2002 Projects	Total Projects	Total RTP Funding	Total Other Funding
VT	5	63	\$587,024	\$731,583
WA	7	57	\$1,824,915	\$1,905,759
WI	10	101	\$3,287,272	\$3,624,573
WV	13	63	\$1,965,700	\$782,098
WY	1	26	\$482,813	\$331,273
<b>Total</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>2741</b>	<b>\$110,804,285</b>	<b>\$108,014,628</b>

Trail users on trails that received RTP funding represented every category of trail-related recreation, although data on trail use were not reported for all projects. The table that follows displays those categories. Hiking and walking have been the dominant trail uses reported since the data-collection project was initiated.

### RTP Database Trail Use Categories 1993 – 2002

*For 4,373 Projects with Reported Trail Uses*

Trail Use Category	1993 - 2001 Cumulative		1993 - 2002 Cumulative	
All Terrain Vehicle	556	16%	661	15%
Bicycling	828	23%	998	23%
Cross Country Skiing	767	22%	924	21%
Equestrian	694	20%	804	18%
Four Wheeling	210	6%	233	5%
Hiking	2188	62%	2671	61%
In-Line Skating	307	9%	373	9%
Motorboating	14	0%	15	0%
Mountain Biking	1197	34%	1448	33%
Off-Highway Motorcycling	435	12%	517	12%
Paddling	124	4%	146	3%
Running	1168	33%	1444	33%
Skateboarding	123	3%	168	4%
Snowmobiling	627	18%	792	18%
Snowshoeing	272	8%	356	8%
Walking	1888	53%	2332	53%
Total	3540	100%	4373	100%

As shown by the following two tables, 3,618 of the reported projects can be clearly identified as benefiting nonmotorized trail uses and 1,332 as benefiting motorized trail uses. While there is some overlap where projects accommodate both motorized and nonmotorized trail uses, the trend favoring the expenditure of RTP funds for nonmotorized trail uses is very clear. The average per-project cost of projects benefiting nonmotorized trail use is also higher than for projects identified as motorized: \$68,884 vs. \$60,666. The per-project average costs have changed slightly since 2001 (from \$68,677 and \$58,930, respectively), and the spread between them has decreased, \$8,218 currently versus \$9,747.

## RTP Database Nonmotorized Trail Project Funding 1993-2002

State	2002 Projects	Total Projects	Total RTP Funding	Total Other Funding
AK	4	46	\$746,319	\$1,153,188
AL	15	54	\$2,562,114	\$414,674
AR	27	98	\$3,602,817	\$1,663,403
AZ	2	6	\$287,381	\$329,885
CA	1	92	\$6,542,719	\$4,943,077
CO	26	70	\$3,995,030	\$11,472,774
CT	32	120	\$2,265,236	\$1,414,093
DC	2	10	\$1,924,402	\$579,575
DE	5	14	\$559,750	\$212,500
FL	22	73	\$4,336,585	\$3,773,746
GA	10	60	\$4,733,242	\$3,473,910
HI	92	173	not reported	not reported
IA	4	29	\$2,944,155	\$2,220,600
ID	19	124	\$2,225,306	\$8,573,917
IL	6	58	\$4,147,139	\$1,561,877
IN	3	27	\$2,465,768	\$1,474,695
KS	15	122	\$3,404,732	\$3,294,144
KY	34	144	\$3,313,133	\$4,157,436
LA	20	65	\$2,556,558	\$772,562
MA	6	26	\$330,793	\$318,323
MD	3	90	\$2,009,926	\$2,144,926
ME	19	124	\$2,209,381	\$1,487,017
MI	19	72	\$5,083,020	\$2,149,550
MN	12	70	\$2,388,570	\$5,886,410
MO	12	65	\$3,264,843	\$6,528,767
MS	4	32	\$1,966,355	\$389,464
MT	15	54	\$549,386	\$449,415
NC	24	111	\$3,756,152	\$7,573,695
ND	13	80	\$1,863,130	\$525,058
NE	6	40	\$2,724,956	\$2,974,912
NH	39	172	\$1,619,738	\$2,026,924
NJ	0	211	\$2,278,656	\$3,089,386
NM	2	20	\$1,586,265	\$686,094
NV	12	48	\$1,617,343	\$1,123,951
OH	13	98	\$5,915,689	\$6,058,432
OK	15	48	\$1,958,432	\$1,340,260
OR	12	47	\$1,539,049	\$3,570,294
PA	7	137	\$5,625,818	\$4,433,217
RI	0	51	\$1,400,560	\$3,372,761
SC	0	16	\$738,879	\$392,660
SD	0	42	\$1,636,941	\$726,828
TN	19	79	\$3,900,057	\$1,583,250
TX	20	133	\$5,777,060	\$2,277,736
UT	7	20	\$1,131,282	\$1,075,622
VA	15	75	\$3,939,503	\$1,668,251
VT	15	45	\$805,394	\$3,355,616
WI	22	127	\$2,453,421	\$2,695,985

State	2002 Projects	Total Projects	Total RTP Funding	Total Other Funding
WV	7	37	\$1,596,453	\$557,760
WY	13	63	\$1,570,125	\$1,423,579
<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>3618</b>	<b>\$125,849,563</b>	<b>\$123,372,199</b>

## RTP Database Motorized Trail Project Funding 1993-2002

State	2002 Projects	Total Projects	RTP Funding	Other Funding
AK	8	41	\$717,726	\$893,455
AL	1	3	\$392,000	\$18,000
AR	3	9	\$484,426	\$140,040
AZ	0	2	\$222,781	\$180,060
CA	11	55	\$3,425,628	\$1,689,510
CO	41	48	\$1,159,601	\$724,629
CT	2	15	\$117,047	\$50,925
FL	0	7	\$239,607	\$139,807
GA	0	14	\$696,960	\$259,488
HI	22	76	not reported	not reported
IA	5	18	\$1,818,111	\$283,977
ID	13	99	\$2,037,343	\$7,928,299
IL	3	15	\$2,117,607	\$639,203
IN	1	7	\$860,759	\$173,185
KS	3	10	\$435,575	\$119,432
KY	1	17	\$345,665	\$261,950
LA	1	14	\$564,226	\$139,670
MA	2	22	\$453,848	\$252,634
MD	1	20	\$475,110	\$445,110
ME	9	77	\$1,434,197	\$862,666
MI	9	35	\$2,790,038	\$2,174,177
MN	11	56	\$1,911,654	\$3,458,906
MO	5	24	\$995,484	\$880,547
MS	1	8	\$733,500	\$124,500
MT	20	61	\$811,909	\$619,909
NC	3	24	\$953,195	\$414,187
ND	3	18	\$932,718	\$233,707
NE	1	3	\$159,456	\$64,401
NH	31	146	\$1,702,196	\$1,790,922
NJ	0	15	\$599,583	\$843,547
NM	0	2	\$16,405	\$16,405
NV	4	14	\$424,539	\$412,709
OH	5	22	\$851,474	\$560,934
OK	1	8	\$247,516	\$112,917
OR	4	30	\$621,433	\$482,908
PA	4	72	\$2,267,720	\$1,690,097
RI	0	12	\$262,866	\$200,866
SC	0	6	\$284,179	\$83,045
SD	0	12	\$404,321	\$178,079
TN	2	5	\$229,033	\$131,532
TX	2	19	\$2,327,291	\$609,618

State	2002 Projects	Total Projects	RTP Funding	Other Funding
UT	6	25	\$793,652	\$793,652
VA	0	10	\$362,856	\$95,406
VT	1	6	\$517,545	\$2,760,166
WI	6	64	\$1,728,446	\$1,754,571
WV	0	5	\$349,788	\$112,297
WY	10	61	\$2,042,094	\$1,685,438
<b>Total</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>1332</b>	<b>\$43,319,108</b>	<b>\$37,487,483</b>

A State is allowed to use up to 5% of its RTP funds for educational programs that promote trail-related safety and environmental protection. Only 205 such programs have been reported by 33 States. Those programs used \$5,374,410 in RTP funds and an additional \$7,955,811 in other funding, bringing the per-project average cost to \$65,025.

### RTP Database Education Project Funding 1993-2002

State	2002 Projects	Total Projects	RTP Funding	Other Funding
AK	2	12	\$185,295	\$262,979
AL	0	2	\$60,275	\$15,068
CA	4	8	\$737,686	\$346,668
CO	0	2	\$153,600	\$600,400
CT	2	8	\$55,371	\$68,744
HI	0	1	\$449,770	\$112,442
ID	1	5	\$101,174	\$149,736
IL	0	4	\$94,323	\$76,324
IN	0	2	\$249,530	\$30,820
KS	0	6	\$119,975	\$333,882
KY	1	2	\$10,000	\$10,000
MA	1	4	\$39,438	\$79,540
MD	0	13	\$135,841	\$135,841
MO	1	2	\$75,000	\$75,000
MT	11	16	\$235,974	\$184,609
NC	2	8	\$179,972	\$104,275
NH	2	6	\$54,385	\$57,094
NJ	1	6	\$69,074	\$63,085
NV	2	6	\$120,497	\$344,076
OH	0	5	\$186,567	\$782,865
OR	1	5	\$102,960	\$38,924
PA	0	6	\$195,400	\$399,175
SC	0	2	\$52,000	\$13,000
SD	0	2	\$10,560	\$2,640
TN	1	3	\$100,120	\$33,780
TX	3	9	\$246,540	\$100,025
UT	5	13	\$260,026	\$260,026
VA	2	8	\$368,679	\$118,560
VT	3	9	\$370,790	\$2,761,886
WA	6	22	\$181,544	\$283,427
WI	0	2	\$21,833	\$26,049

<b>State</b>	<b>2002 Projects</b>	<b>Total Projects</b>	<b>RTP Funding</b>	<b>Other Funding</b>
WV	0	1	\$22,400	\$11,200
WY	0	5	\$127,811	\$73,671
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>\$5,374,410</b>	<b>\$7,955,811</b>