DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

FTA Fiscal Year 1996 Apportionments and Allocations

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Transportation (DOT) and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (Pub. L. 104–50), signed into law by President Clinton on November 15, 1995, provides fiscal year 1996 appropriations for the Federal Transit Administration transit assistance programs. Based upon this Act, this Notice contains a comprehensive list of apportionments/allocations of the various transit programs.

This Notice includes the apportionment of fiscal year 1996 funds for the Urbanized Area Formula Program, the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program, the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program, the Capital Program for Fixed Guideway Modernization, the Metropolitan Planning Program and the State Planning and Research Program, based on the 1996 DOT Appropriations Act and Federal transit laws. This Notice also contains the allocations of funds for the New Starts and Bus categories under the Capital Program. Statutory limitations on the use of operating assistance are also included in this Notice. For the first time, this Notice also includes the funding level authorized by the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) for each program.

In addition, the FTA policy regarding pre-award authority to incur project costs, as well as other pertinent information, is included in this Notice.

Public Law 103–272, signed by President Clinton on July 5, 1994, codifies Federal transit laws under title 49, chapter 53, of the United States Code. This Notice uses the codified citations.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The appropriate FTA Regional Administrator for grant specific information and issues; Janet Lynn Sahaj, Director, Office of Resource Management and State Programs, (202) 366–2053, for general information about the Urbanized Area Formula Program (49 U.S.C. 5307), the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program (49 U.S.C. 5311), the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program (49 U.S.C. 5310), or the Capital Program (49 U.S.C. 5309); or Sam Zimmerman, Director, Office of Planning Operations, (202) 366–2360, for general information concerning the Metropolitan Planning Program (49 U.S.C. 5303) and State Planning and Research Program (49 U.S.C. 5313(b)).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. Codification of Federal Transit Laws
II. Background
III. Overview of Appropriations for Grant Programs
A. General
B. ISTEA Authorized Program Levels
C. Project Management Oversight
IV. Departmental Initiatives
A. Livable Communities Initiative
B. Intelligent Transportation Systems
C. Expanded Capital Eligibility
D. FTA Home Page on Internet
V. Urbanized Area Formula Program (49 U.S.C. 5307)
A. Total Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments
B. Data Used for Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments, and Fiscal Year 1995 Apportionment Adjustment
C. Adjustments for Energy and Operating Efficiencies
D. Repayment of Temporary Matching Fund Waivers
E. Urbanized Area Formula Fiscal Year 1996 Apportionments to Governors
F. Urbanized Area Formula Operating Assistance Limitations
G. Statewide Operating Assistance Limitations
H. Designated Transportation Management Areas
I. Urbanized Area Formula Funds Used for Highway Purposes
VI. Nonurbanized Area Formula Program (49 U.S.C. 5311) and Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP) (49 U.S.C. 5311(b)(2)
A. Nonurbanized Area Formula Program
B. RTAP Program
VII. Elderly and Persons With Disabilities Program (49 U.S.C. 5310)
VIII. Surface Transportation Program ''Flexible'' Funds Used for Transit Purposes (Title 23, U.S.C.)
A. Transfer Process
B. Matching Share for Flexible Funds
C. Other Funds Transferred to FTA
IX. Capital Program (49 U.S.C. 5309)
A. Fixed Guideway Modernization
B. New Starts
C. Bus
a. Fiscal Year 1996 Allocations
b. Fiscal Year 1997 FTA Priorities for Allocation of Discretionary Bus Funds
D. Capital Program Circular
X. Unit Values of Data for Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program, Section 5311 Nonurbanized Area Formula Program, and Section 5309(m)(1)(A) Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula
XI. Metropolitan Planning Program (49 U.S.C. 5303) and State Planning and Research Program (49 U.S.C. 5313(b))
A. Metropolitan Planning Urbanized Area Program
B. State Planning and Research Program
C. Data Used for Metropolitan Planning and State Planning and Research Apportionments
D. Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs)
XII. Period of Availability of Funds
XIII. Notice of Pre-Award Authority To Incur Project Costs
A. Background
B. Current Coverage
C. Conditions
D. Environmental and Other Requirements
XIV. Electronic Grant Making and Management Initiatives: Fiscal Year 1996 and Beyond
A. Background
B. On-Line Grantee Program
C. Electronic Grant Making and Management (EGMM)
D. Electronic Signature of Certifications and Assurances
E. Future EGMM Expansion
XV. Quarterly Approval of Grants
XVI. Grant Application Procedures
Tables
1. FTA FY 1996 Appropriations and ISTEA Authorizations for Grant Programs
2. FTA FY 1996 Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments and ISTEA Authorized Levels
3. FTA FY 1996 Section 5311 Nonurbanized Area Formula Apportionments, Section 5311(b) Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP) Allocations, and ISTEA Authorized Levels
4. FTA FY 1996 Section 5310 Elderly and Persons With Disabilities Apportionments and ISTEA Authorized Levels
5. FTA FY 1996 Section 5309(m)(1)(A) Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula Apportionments and ISTEA Authorized Levels
6. FTA FY 1996 Section 5309(m)(1)(B) New Start Allocations and ISTEA Authorized Levels
7. FTA FY 1996 Section 5309(m)(1)(C) Bus Allocations and ISTEA Authorized Levels
8. FTA FY 1996 Section 5303 Metropolitan Planning and Section 5313(b) State Planning and Research Apportionments, and ISTEA Authorized Levels
9. Unit Values of Data—FTA FY 1996 Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula, Section 5311 Nonurbanized Area Formula, and Section 5309(m)(1)(A) Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula Apportionments

I. Codification of Federal Transit Laws

On July 5, 1994, President Clinton signed Public Law 103–272, which codifies Federal transit laws at title 49, chapter 53 of the United States Code. The enactment of Public Law 103–272 repeals the FT Act of 1992, as amended (the Act), without substantive changes to programs. The original meaning of the Act's provisions are unchanged by this codification, even though the new Public Law 103–272 language, in some instances, differs from that of the Act. The codification now includes laws enacted through July 5, 1994.

Additional provisions enacted after that date, and revisions to title 49, chapter 53, will be reflected in subsequent legislation now being drafted in Congress. This Notice accordingly uses the new form of citation. Listed below are the most commonly used citations:

Subject	49 U.S.C. section	Former Federal Transit Act citation
Capital Program	5309	Section 3
Metropolitan Planning Program	5303	Section 8
Urbanized Area Formula Program	5307	Section 9
Transit Employee Protective Certification	5333(b)	Section 13(c)
National Transit Database*	5335	Section 15
Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program	5310	Section 16
Nonurbanized Area Formula Program	5311	Section 18
Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP)	5311(b)(2)	Section 18(h)
State Planning and Research Program	5313(b)	Section 26(a)(2)

II. Background

Urbanized Area Formula Program funds are apportioned by statutory formula to urbanized areas and to the Governors to provide capital, operating and planning assistance in urbanized areas. Nonurbanized Area Formula Program funds are apportioned by statutory formula to the Governors for capital and operating assistance in nonurbanized areas. The Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program funds are apportioned by statutory formula to the Governors to provide capital assistance to organizations providing transportation service for the elderly and persons with disabilities. Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula funds are apportioned by statutory formula to specified urbanized areas for capital improvements in rail and other fixed guideways. Funds appropriated for the Metropolitan Planning Program are apportioned by a statutory formula to the Governors for allocation by them to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in urbanized areas or portions thereof. Appropriated funds for the State Planning and Research Program also are apportioned to States by a statutory formula. New Start funds identified for specific projects in the 1996 DOT Appropriations Act and all Bus fund allocations in its accompanying Conference Report are also included in this Notice.

III. Overview of Appropriations for Grant Programs

A. General

In fiscal year 1996, the appropriation for the Urbanized Area Formula Program and the Nonurbanized Area Formula Programs is $2,001,315,905. Of this amount, 94.50 percent ($1,891,243,530) is made available to the Urbanized Area Formula Program, and 5.50 percent ($110,072,375) is made available to the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program. The other program appropriations contained in this Notice are as follows: $4,500,000 for the Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP); $51,609,095 for the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program; $39,500,000 for the Metropolitan Planning Program; $8,250,000 for the State Planning and Research Program; and $1,665,000,000 for the Capital Program. Of the Capital Program amount, $666,000,000 is for Fixed Guideway Modernization, $666,000,000 is for New Starts, and $333,000,000 is for Bus.

Table 1 displays the amounts appropriated for these programs, including adjustments and final apportionment/allocation amounts. The text following this table provides a narrative explanation for the funding levels and other factors affecting these apportionments/allocations.

B. ISTEA Authorized Program Levels

For the first time, FTA is publishing the formula apportionment and allocation tables that compare the maximum program level proposed in the ISTEA authorization law for fiscal year 1996 and the actual program funds appropriated by Congress for fiscal year 1996. The first set of columns shows the actual appropriation as apportioned for this fiscal year, and the second set of columns shows the authorization level. The funding level available to an urbanized area or State for obligation is the appropriated amount as apportioned to the area. The authorized level does not represent funds that are actually available during the fiscal year. Rather, it reflects the maximum dollar amount authorized in ISTEA for which funds can be appropriated by Congress for a particular fiscal year.

C. Project Management Oversight

49 U.S.C. 5327 allows the Secretary of Transportation to use not more than one-half of one percent of the funds made available under the Capital Program, the Urbanized Area Formula Program, the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program, the National Capital Transportation Act, as amended, and an additional one-quarter of one percent of Capital Program funds, to contract with any person to oversee the construction of any major project under these statutory programs and to conduct safety, procurement, management and financial reviews and audits. Therefore, one-half of one percent of the funds appropriated for the Urbanized Area Formula Program, the Nonurbanized Area Formula Programs and the National Capital Transportation Act, as amended, for fiscal year 1996, and three-quarters of one percent of Capital Program funds have been reserved for these purposes before apportionment of the funds.

IV. Departmental Initiatives

A. Livable Communities Initiative

The FTA developed the Livable Communities Initiative to encourage a stronger link between transit and communities. FTA is promoting the development of community-sensitive transit facilities and services in order to increase transit ridership, improve personal mobility and enhance the quality of life in communities. Active community involvement in the planning and design process is essential in developing more community-sensitive transit, and planning methods need to be more responsive to community concerns.

Community-sensitive transit is customer-friendly, community-oriented and designed to function effectively within the community. Customer-friendly transit provides readily available information, safety and security measures. Real time customer information, monitoring devices, help zones and improved lighting are illustrative characteristics. Community-oriented transit makes its transfer points both origins and destinations of trips through the provision of on-site services such as child care, public safety, health care and retail conveniences. Well

designed transit, from the perspective of more livable communities, improves pedestrian access, increases the person-carrying capacity of local transportation networks, and reflects the aesthetic and historic character of communities. More community-sensitive transit may result in increased transit ridership, reduced single occupant vehicle trips and improved air quality. In fiscal year 1995, FTA awarded a number of capital grants to implement projects which reflected the characteristics of community-sensitive transit.

The Livable Communities Initiative recognizes the important role that local land use and transportation policy can play in improving the effectiveness of transit. These are important tools in promoting transit facilities and services which help to make communities more livable. Mixed use development around transportation nodes combined with parking management, priority access for transit vehicles and transit pass programs can significantly reduce auto trips and increase transit ridership. FTA is asking transit agencies to work with local governments, employers and the business community in implementing transit supportive land use and transportation strategies through the metropolitan planning process.

FTA urges grantees to incorporate the concepts of the Livable Communities Initiative into the planning and capital projects financed with Federal assistance identified in this Notice and funds transferred as permitted by the flexible funding provisions of ISTEA. In addition, FTA urges grantees to consider incorporating quality design and art into transit projects funded with FTA assistance. FTA Circular C9400.1A, Design and Art and Transit Projects, June 9, 1995 provides more detail on this matter.

B. Intelligent Transportation Systems

The Department of Transportation is actively promoting the development of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) which apply advanced computer, communication, information and navigation technologies to surface transportation systems. ITS technologies improve customer service and make accurate information available to the traveling public, thus enabling travelers to make more informed transportation decisions, thereby improving the operational efficiency of transit services.

Customer services are improved through real-time information on bus and train arrival, reducing the stress of waiting for vehicles to arrive; in-vehicle signs and enunciator systems which inform passengers of upcoming stops and other relevant information; hold notification to vehicles at change-mode points; emergency response systems which decrease delays in responding to problems; and easier access through the use of electronic fare cards which eliminate specialized passes, cash fares or tokens. For example, the Milwaukee County Transit Authority reports on-time schedule adherence improved from 90 percent to 94 percent, thus increasing customer service reliability.

Operational efficiency of transit operations can also be improved using these technologies. Automatic Vehicle Location technology has helped the Kansas City Area Transit Authority decrease capital costs by approximately $1.8 million and operating costs by $400,000 annually. The planned introduction of Smart Cards in the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority rail stations as estimated will save approximately $2.4 million in annual cash handling costs.

It is important that transit agencies consider the application of these more advanced technologies as current planning and capital programs are developed. Authorities planning to purchase equipment such as radios, in-vehicle signs, etc. should consider the inclusion of state-of-the-art technologies in their programs.

Applications of these technologies are fully enhanced if the transit systems are compatible with similar technologies introduced in traffic management systems being acquired by city traffic departments. Traveler information systems for all customers are enhanced by providing both transit and highway information. Such systems include data which is readily and freely shared between the transit and highway ITS systems.

By integrating these systems, a ‘‘Core Infrastructure’’ of technology will be created providing maximum benefits to all travelers, and specifically to those who use transit within metropolitan areas. Elements of these systems are currently being purchased.

As requests for funding assistance are received by the FTA and other USDOT modal administrations, they will be reviewed with an intent toward ensuring that all surface transportation modes using or planning ITS systems share data to realize the fullest advantages of these systems. Metropolitan Planning Organizations, state Departments of Transportation, and transit authorities are encouraged to cooperate in the planning of ITS systems to ensure that they are able to share data and are expandable to accept new applications with minimal additional cost. It is important that decision makers keep their options open in specifying and procuring ITS systems so future enhancements may be readily added onto systems without costly conversion or modification.

To achieve the full benefits of ITS in metropolitan areas, it is important that the component elements be able to ‘‘talk’’ with each other and thereby share data.

In specifying and procuring ITS systems FTA urges grantees to incorporate the ability to share data between highway and transit elements and to keep future expansion options open.

For further information, please contact the appropriate FTA Regional Administrator.

C. Expanded Capital Eligibility

Bus Overhaul: Effective March 31, 1996, bus overhauls will be eligible for capital assistance. At FTA’s request, the 1996 DOT Appropriations Act amended 49 U.S.C 5302(a)(1)(B) and (C) to remove the requirement that bus rehabilitation or bus remanufacturing must extend the economic life of the bus. This change is intended to encourage the maintenance and improvement of bus rolling stock assets. Such overhaul work can be contracted out or performed directly by transit personnel, and will apply to all revenue service buses. FTA intends to issue guidance regarding the implementation of bus overhauls as a capital expenditure.

Associated Capital Maintenance Items: FTA has revised the procedure for determining whether spare parts to be acquired under the Urbanized Area Formula Program and the Capital Program are eligible for capital funding. Under 49 U.S.C. 5307(b)(4), certain spare parts are considered an eligible capital expense if these items cost at least one-half of one percent of the current fair market value of the rolling stock on which the items are to be used. Previously, FTA required that the current fair market value of rolling stock for which the equipment is to be used was the cost of new rolling stock. Consistent with the statute, FTA has revised the method of determining the current fair market value of rolling stock that serves as the basis for the spare parts eligibility calculation. It is now based on the current average vehicle value of a recipient’s fleet of vehicles. Spare parts to be purchased for a bus fleet are eligible for capital funding if they cost at least one-half of one percent of the straight line depreciated value of the average fleet vehicle or the depreciated value of a comparable bus of the same age and type.

D. FTA Home Page on the Internet

FTA in its efforts to provide better customer service and broaden the availability of FTA information has established an FTA Home Page on the Internet. This apportionment Notice as well as recently issued FTA circulars (Section 5309 Capital Program: Grant Application Instructions—C9300.1, September 29, 1995; Grant Management Guidelines, C5010.1B, September 7, 1995; and Third Party Contracting Requirements, C4220.1C, October 1, 1995) will be contained therein.

The FTA Home Page may be reached through the DOT Home Page at the following address: http://www.dot.gov. Once in the DOT Home Page, click on the ''Browse the DOT Administrations'' button and then scroll down to FTA and click. The FTA Home Page may also be accessed by using the worldwide web (www). The FTA direct www address is: http://www.dot.gov/dotinfo/fta/index.html.

V. Urbanized Area Formula Program (49 U.S.C. 5307)

A. Total Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments

In addition to the appropriated fiscal year 1996 Urbanized Area Formula funds of $1,891,243,530, the apportionment also includes $1,030,920 in deobligated funds authorized by 49 U.S.C. 5308 which have become available for reapportionment for the Urbanized Area Formula Program as provided by 49 U.S.C. 5336(i).

Table 2 displays the amount apportioned for the Urbanized Area Formula Program. After the one-half percent for oversight is reserved ($9,456,218), the amount appropriated for this program is $1,881,787,312. The funds to be reapportioned, described in the previous paragraph, were then added. Thus, the total amount apportioned for this program is $1,882,818,232.

B. Data Used for Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments, and Fiscal Year 1995 Apportionment Adjustment

Data from the 1994 National Transit Database (49 U.S.C. 5335) Report Year submitted in late 1994 and early 1995 have been used to calculate the fiscal year 1996 Urbanized Area Formula apportionments for urbanized areas 200,000 in population and over. The population and population density figures used in calculating the Urbanized Area Formula are from the 1990 Census.

An adjustment has been made to the apportionment for one urbanized area because of a correction to data from the 1993 National Transit Database that were used to compute the fiscal year 1995 Urbanized Area Formula apportionments published in the Federal Register of October 12, 1994 (59 FR 51758). The difference between the corrected apportionment and the previously published apportionment resulted in a decrease, and the necessary adjustment has been made to the area's apportionment for fiscal year 1996.

C. Adjustments for Energy and Operating Efficiencies

49 U.S.C. 5336(b)(2)(E) provides that, if a recipient of Urbanized Area Formula Program funds demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that energy or operating efficiencies would be achieved by actions that reduce revenue vehicle miles but provide the same frequency of revenue service to the same number of riders, the recipient's apportionment under 49 U.S.C. 5336(b)(2)(A)(i) shall not be reduced as a result of such actions. One recipient has submitted data acceptable to FTA in accordance with this provision. Accordingly, the revenue vehicle miles used in the Urbanized Area Formula database to calculate the fiscal year 1996 Urbanized Area Formula apportionment reflect the amount the recipient would have received without the reductions in mileage.

D. Repayment of Temporary Matching Fund Waivers

In accordance with the Temporary Matching Fund Waiver provision authorized by 49 U.S.C. 5307(i)(3) grantees were able to request a Federal share of 100 percent up to the area's total apportionment. Four grants or amendments were awarded which employed the temporary waiver of local matching funds for Urbanized Area Formula grants approved in fiscal years 1992 and 1993. The local share amounts for these grants were to be repaid by March 30, 1994. If not repaid, the amount owed would be deducted from the area's fiscal years 1995 and 1996 Urbanized Area Formula apportionments.

All affected grantees opted to have their future apportionments reduced rather than repay funds. The local share payment amount for each project was determined by dividing the project's total disbursement amount through September 30, 1994, by the project's total Federal capital obligations. The calculated percentage was then applied to the amount of the project's original local share that was waived. Of the calculated amount determined for repayment, 50 percent was deducted from the fiscal year 1995 Urbanized Area Formula apportionment. The remaining 50 percent is deducted from fiscal year 1996. The dollar amounts published in this Notice reflect these fiscal year 1996 adjustments, and the affected areas have been so advised.

E. Urbanized Area Formula Fiscal Year 1996 Apportionments to Governors

The total Urbanized Area Formula apportionment to the Governor for use in areas under 200,000 in population for each State is shown on Table 2. Table 2 also contains the total apportionment amount attributable to each of the urbanized areas within the State. The Governor may determine the allocation of funds among the urbanized areas under 200,000 in population with one exception. As further discussed below in Section H, funds attributed to an urbanized area under 200,000 in population, located within the planning boundaries of a transportation management area, must be obligated in that area.

F. Urbanized Area Formula Operating Assistance Limitations

The fiscal year 1996 limitations on the amount of Urbanized Area Formula funds that may be used for operating assistance are shown on Table 2 with the fiscal year 1996 apportionment.

The operating assistance limitations for all urbanized areas have been adjusted by 49 U.S.C. 5336(d)(2) to reflect the increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all urban consumers during the most recent calendar years. *The CPI Detailed Report,* December 1994, published by the Department of Labor (DOL), establishes that the calendar year 1994 CPI increase for all urban consumers is 2.7 percent. This increase was applied against the base operating assistance limitation calculated in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5336(d)(2).

This adjustment results in an overall national fiscal year 1996 authorized operating assistance limitation level of $1,112,922,445. However, the 1996 DOT Appropriations Act limits the nationwide availability for operating assistance to a maximum of $400,000,000. Further, it maintains the level of transit operating assistance to urbanized areas of less than 200,000 in population at seventy-five percent of the amount of operating assistance such areas received in fiscal year 1995. Accordingly, the operating assistance limitation published in this Notice takes into account both the 1996 DOT Appropriations Act and Federal transit laws. Therefore, the higher operating assistance limitation as authorized under Federal transit laws

($1,112,922,445) was reduced to the $400,000,000 required by the 1996 DOT Appropriations Act by taking a pro rata reduction across all categories of grantees. Further, the operating assistance limitation to urbanized areas less than 200,000 in population was adjusted to $92,949,803 or seventy-five percent of the amount of their fiscal year 1995 level of $123,933,070. The remaining $307,050,197 of the $400,000,000 was prorated to urbanized areas above 200,000 in population, as authorized by the 1996 DOT Appropriations Act.

Consistent with the 1996 Conference Report, the Secretary hereby directs each area of 1,000,000 or more in population to give priority consideration to the impact of reductions in operating assistance on smaller transit authorities operating within the area, and to consider the needs and resources of such transit authorities when the limitation is distributed among all transit authorities operating in the area.

G. Statewide Operating Assistance Limitations

49 U.S.C. 5307(f) specifies that in any case in which a statewide agency or instrumentality is responsible under State laws for the financing, construction and operation, directly, by lease, contract or otherwise, of public transportation services, and when such statewide agency or instrumentality is the designated recipient of FTA funds, and when the statewide agency or instrumentality provides service among two or more urbanized areas, the statewide agency or instrumentality shall be allowed to apply for operating assistance up to the combined total permissible amount of all urbanized areas in which it provides service, regardless of whether the amount for any particular urbanized area is exceeded. However, the amount of operating assistance provided for another State or local transportation agency within the affected urbanized areas may not be reduced.

H. Designated Transportation Management Areas

All urbanized areas over 200,000 in population have been designated as transportation management areas (TMAs), in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5305. These designations were formally made in a Federal Register Notice dated May 18, 1992 (57 FR 21160), signed by the Federal Highway Administrator and the Federal Transit Administrator. Additional areas may be designated as TMAs upon the request of the Governor and the MPO designated for such area or the affected local officials. As of October 1, 1995, two additional TMAs have been formally designated: Petersburg, Virginia, comprised solely of the Petersburg, Virginia, urbanized area; and Santa Barbara, Santa Maria, and Lompoc, California, which were combined and designated as one TMA.

Guidance for setting the boundaries of TMAs is contained in the joint transportation planning regulations codified at 23 CFR part 450 and 49 CFR part 613. In some cases, the TMA boundaries which have been established by the MPO for the designated TMA also include one or more urbanized areas with less than 200,000 in population. Where this situation exists, the discretion of the Governor to allocate urbanized area formula program ''Governor's Apportionment'' funds for urbanized areas with less than 200,000 in population is restricted.

As required by 49 U.S.C. 5307(a)(2), a recipient(s) must be designated to dispense the Urbanized Area Formula funds attributable to TMAs. Those urbanized areas that do not already have a designated recipient must name one and notify the appropriate FTA regional office of the designation. This would include those urbanized areas with less than 200,000 in population that may receive TMA designation independently, or those with less than 200,000 in population which are currently included within the boundaries of a larger designated TMA. In both cases, the Governor would only have discretion to allocate Governor's Apportionment funds attributable to areas which are outside of designated TMA boundaries. In order for the FTA and Governors to know which urbanized areas under 200,000 in population are included within the boundaries of an existing TMA, and so that they can be identified in future Federal Register notices, each MPO whose TMA planning boundaries include these smaller urbanized areas is asked to identify such areas to the FTA. This notification should be made in writing to the Associate Administrator for Program Management, Federal Transit Administration, 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590, no later than July 1 of each fiscal year. To date, FTA has been notified of the following urbanized areas with less than 200,000 in population that are included within the planning boundaries of designated TMAs:

Designated TMA	Small urbanized area included in TMA boundaries
Baltimore, Maryland	Annapolis, Maryland.
Dallas-Fort Worth, Texas	Denton, Texas; Lewisville, Texas.
Houston, Texas	Galveston, Texas; Texas City, Texas.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Pottstown, Pennsylvania.
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	Monessen, Pennsylvania; Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV-PA (PA portion).
Seattle, Washington	Bremerton, Washington.
Washington, DC-MD-VA	Frederick, Maryland (MD portion).

I. Urbanized Area Formula Funds Used for Highway Purposes

Urbanized Area Formula funds apportioned to a TMA, except for those amounts which can be used for the payment of operating expenses, are also available for highway projects if the following three conditions are met: (1) such use must be approved by the MPO after appropriate notice and opportunity for comment and appeal are provided to affected transit providers; (2) in the determination of the Secretary, such funds are not needed for investments required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990; and (3) funds may be available for highway projects under title 23, U.S.C., only if funds used for the State or local share of such highway projects are eligible to fund either highway or transit projects.

Urbanized Area Formula funds which are designated for highway projects will be transferred to and administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The MPO should notify FTA of its intent to program FTA funds for highway purposes.

VI. Nonurbanized Area Formula Program (49 U.S.C. 5311) and Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP) (49 U.S.C. 5311(b)(2))

A. Nonurbanized Area Formula Program

The fiscal year 1996 Nonurbanized Area Formula apportionments total $111,152,194. The Governor's apportionments are displayed on Table 3. A total of $110,072,375 is appropriated for the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program. After deducting the one-half percent for oversight ($550,362), the fiscal year 1996 apportionment also includes $1,630,181 in prior year deobligated funds which have become available for reapportionment under this program. These funds provide capital, operating and administrative assistance for areas less than 50,000 in population.

The population figures used in calculating these apportionments are from the 1990 Census. The apportionments for the States of Illinois and Oklahoma have been adjusted to compensate for incorrect population figures used in the fiscal year 1995 apportionments.

Each State must spend no less than 15 percent of its fiscal year 1996 Nonurbanized Area Formula apportionment for the development and support of intercity bus transportation, unless the Governor certifies to the Secretary that the intercity bus service needs of the State are being adequately met. Fiscal year 1996 Nonurbanized Area Formula grant applications must reflect this level of programming for intercity bus or include a certification from the Governor.

B. RTAP Program

The fiscal year 1996 RTAP allocations to the States totaling $4,571,903 are also displayed on Table 3. This amount includes $4,500,000 in fiscal year 1996 appropriated funds, and $71,903 in prior year deobligated funds which have become available for reallocation for this program. The funds are allocated to the States to undertake research, training, technical assistance, and other support services to meet the needs of transit operators in nonurbanized areas. These funds are to be used in conjunction with the States' administration of the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program.

VII. Section 5310 Elderly and Persons With Disabilities Program

A total of $51,703,234 is apportioned to the States for fiscal year 1996 for the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program. In addition to the fiscal year 1996 appropriation of $51,609,095, the fiscal year 1996 apportionment also includes $94,139 in prior year unobligated funds which have become available for reapportionment for the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program. The apportionment for Connecticut is adjusted to restore fiscal year 1995 funds which were not obligated due to an administrative error. Table 4 shows each State's apportionment.

The formula for apportioning these funds uses 1990 Census population data for persons aged sixty-five and over and for persons with disabilities.

The funds provide capital assistance for transportation for elderly persons and persons with disabilities. Eligible capital expenses may include, at the option of the recipient, the acquisition of transportation services by a contract, lease, or other arrangement.

While the assistance is intended primarily for private non-profit organizations, public bodies that coordinate services for the elderly and persons with disabilities, or any public body that certifies to the State that non-profit organizations in the area are not readily available to carry out the service, may receive these funds.

These funds may be transferred by the Governor to supplement the Urbanized Area Formula or Nonurbanized Area Formula capital funds during the last 90 days of the fiscal year. 3

VIII. Surface Transportation Program ''Flexible'' Funds Used for Transit Purposes (Title 23, U.S.C.)

A. Transfer Process

''Flexible'' DOT funds, such as Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, or others, which are designated for use in transit projects, are transferred from the FHWA to FTA after which FTA approves the project and awards a grant. Flexible funds designated for transit projects must result from the local and state planning and programming process, and must be included in an approved State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) before the funds can be transferred. In order to initiate the transfer process, the grantee must submit a completed application to the FTA Regional Office, and must notify the state highway/transportation agency that it has submitted an application which requires a transfer of funds. Once the state highway/transportation agency determines that the state has sufficient obligation authority, the State agency notifies FHWA that the funds are to be used for transit purposes and requests that the funds be obligated by FHWA as a transfer project to FTA. The flexible funds transferred to FTA will be placed in an urbanized area or state account for one of the three existing formula programs—Urbanized Area, Elderly and Persons with Disabilities, or Nonurbanized Area.

The flexible funds are then treated as FTA formula funds, although they retain a special identifying code. They may be used for any purpose eligible under these FTA programs except for operating expenses. All FTA requirements are applicable to transferred funds. Flexible funds should be combined with regular FTA formula funds in a single annual grant application.

B. Matching Share for Flexible Funds

The provisions of Title 23, U.S.C. regarding the non-Federal share apply to Title 23 funds used for transit projects. Thus, flexible funds transferred to FTA retain the same matching share that the funds would have if used for highway purposes and administered by the FHWA.

There are three instances in which a higher than 80 percent Federal share would be maintained. First, in States with large areas of Indian and certain public domain lands, and National Forests, parks and monuments, the local share for highway projects is determined by a sliding scale rate, calculated based on the percentage of public lands within that state. This sliding scale, which permits a greater Federal share, but not to exceed 95 percent, is applicable to transit projects funded with flexible funds in these public land states. FHWA develops the sliding scale matching ratios for the increased Federal share.

Secondly, commuter carpooling and vanpooling projects and transit safety projects using flexible funds administered by FTA may retain the same 100 percent Federal share that would be allowed for ride-sharing or safety projects administered by the FHWA. The third instance includes the 100 percent Federal safety projects; however, these are subject to a nationwide ten percent program limitation.

C. Other Funds Transferred to FTA

Certain demonstration projects authorized in Title 23 are specified to be used for transit projects and are more appropriately administered by FTA. In such cases, FHWA has transferred the funds to FTA for administration. Since these funds are not STP flexible funds, they are transferred into the appropriate Capital Program category (Bus, New

Starts, or Fixed Guideway Modernization) for obligation and are administered as Capital projects.

IX. Capital Program (49 U.S.C. 5309)

A. Fixed Guideway Modernization

Fixed Guideway Modernization funds are allocated by formula. Statutory percentages were established to allocate the first $497,700,000 to 11 fixed guideway areas. The next $70,000,000 is allocated one-half to these 11 urbanized areas and one-half to other urbanized areas with fixed guideways which are at least seven years old on the basis of the Urbanized Area Formula Program fixed guideway tier formula factors. The remaining funds are allocated to all of these urbanized areas as one universe. For fiscal year 1996, $666,000,000 was appropriated for fixed guideway modernization. After deducting the three-quarter percent for oversight ($4,995,000), $661,005,000 is available for apportionment to the specified urbanized areas for Fixed Guideway Modernization funding.

Table 5 displays these apportionments. Fixed Guideway Modernization funds apportioned for this section must be used for capital projects to modernize or improve fixed guideway systems.

All urbanized areas with fixed guideway systems that are at least seven years old are eligible to receive Fixed Guideway Modernization funds. A request for the start-up service dates for fixed guideways has been incorporated into the National Transit Database reporting system to ensure that all eligible fixed guideway data is included in the calculation of these apportionments. A threshold level of more than one mile of fixed guideway is required to receive Fixed Guideway Modernization funds. Therefore, urbanized areas reporting one mile or less of fixed guideway mileage under the National Transit Database are not included.

B. New Starts

The fiscal year 1996 appropriation for New Starts is $666,000,000. In addition, Congress reprogrammed $21,361,250 in unobligated New Start funds originally provided in fiscal year 1993, for a total of $687,361,250. The entire amount was allocated to projects specified within the 1996 DOT Appropriations Act. The actual amount of unobligated fiscal year 1993 New Start funds available for reprogramming is only $18,361,250, thereby reducing the total amount available in fiscal year 1996 to $684,361,250. This amount is further reduced by $4,995,000 (three quarter percent of $666,000,000 for oversight), leaving $679,366,250 available for allocation to areas. The reductions were prorated against all projects. Table 6 displays the allocations by area and also shows prior year unobligated allocations for New Starts.

C. Bus

a. Fiscal Year 1996 Allocations

The fiscal year 1996 appropriation for Bus is $333,000,000 for the purchase of buses, bus-related equipment and paratransit vehicles, and for the construction of bus-related facilities. After deducting the three-quarter percent for oversight ($2,497,500), $330,502,500 remains available for projects. The Conference Report accompanying the 1996 DOT Appropriations Act earmarked all of the fiscal year 1996 Bus funds to specified states or localities for bus and bus-related projects. In three instances where funds were earmarked to States, the funds were further suballocated to local entities within these states. The Conference Report also includes the multi-year ISTEA earmarks. In addition, the conferees direct those transit systems in the State of New York receiving Bus discretionary allocations in areas over 200,000 population for the express purpose of providing fixed-route transit services, to purchase alternative fueled buses.

Because the three-quarter percent for oversight was subtracted from the amount appropriated, each bus project identified in the Conference Report receives three-quarter percent less than the funding level contained in the report. No funds remain available for discretionary allocation by the Federal Transit Administrator. Table 7 displays the allocations of the fiscal year 1996 Bus funds by area and also shows prior year unobligated earmarks for the Bus Program.

b. Fiscal Year 1997 FTA Priorities for Allocation of Discretionary Bus Funds

FTA is opposed to the congressional earmarking of the discretionary bus program because it tends to favor certain areas year after year and limits the ability of the Administration to focus these resources to address critical national bus needs, including a backlog of grant applications to the FTA for discretionary bus funding totalling over $488 million. The FTA has established two priority areas for the use of capital bus funds, and as future funds are available for allocation, the FTA Administrator will follow these priorities: (1) Bus replacement for transit systems with significantly overaged transit fleets; and (2) projects that would assist areas in meeting the fixed route bus and paratransit requirements under the ADA.

Overaged Bus Transit fleets. The Federal useful life standard for full sized transit buses is 12 years, meaning that the FTA will not participate in the replacement of a standard transit bus that has not met its 12 year useful life. The national average age for bus fleets is 8.3 years, which is well above the six year national average required to maintain the national transit bus fleet at 12 years. Some individual transit systems are operating bus fleets significantly above the national average. It is an Administration priority to use discretionary resources to assist such areas where formula capital resources available are also being used for bus replacement purposes but are insufficient to meet all of the bus replacement needs.

ADA Requirements for Bus Systems. It is also an Administration priority to assist public transit systems to come into full compliance with the ADA. This means using bus capital funds to purchase accessible fixed-route buses as well as paratransit vehicles. This emphasis is particularly important in light of the January 26, 1997, deadline for full compliance with the ADA paratransit service requirements.

Other Considerations. In the allocation of funding according to the priorities discussed above, consideration will be given to applications which are complete and have met all Federal requirements and to areas that have programmed all of their formula resources. Consideration will also be given to an equitable distribution of funds among areas of different sizes, as well as to a geographic distribution of funding.

Fiscal Year 1997 Capital Bus Funding Requests. FTA invites transit authorities to submit applications for fiscal year 1997 capital bus funding during fiscal year 1996, with the realization that funds appropriated by Congress in FY 1997 may again be fully earmarked. The information acquired by FTA in this application process will be fully shared with appropriations committees during the fiscal year 1997 appropriations process to assist them in their decision-making.

D. Capital Program Circular

FTA has issued a new circular (Section 5309 Capital Program Grant Application Instructions, C9300.1, September 29, 1995) to provide program information and guidance in the preparation of grant applications for the Capital Program.

X. Unit Values of Data for the Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula and Section 5311 Nonurbanized Area Formula Programs, and Section 5309(m)(1)(A) Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula

For technical assistance purposes, the dollar unit values of data derived from the computations of the Urbanized Area Formula and Nonurbanized Area Formula Programs, and the Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula apportionments are included in this Notice on Table 9. To determine how a particular apportionment amount was developed, areas may multiply their population, population density, and data from the National Transit Database by these unit values.

XI. Metropolitan Planning Program (49 U.S.C. 5303) and State Planning and Research Program (49 U.S.C. 5313(b))

A. Metropolitan Planning Urbanized Area Program

The fiscal year 1996 Metropolitan Planning apportionments to States for MPOs to be used in urbanized areas total $39,500,000. A basic allocation of 80 percent of this amount ($31,600,000) is distributed to the States based on the State's urbanized area population for subsequent State distribution to each urbanized area, or parts thereof, within each State. A supplemental allocation of the remaining 20 percent ($7,900,000) is also provided to the States based on an FTA administrative formula to address planning needs in the larger, more complex urbanized areas. Table 8 contains the final State apportionments for the combined basic and supplemental allocations. Each State, in cooperation with the MPOs, must develop an allocation formula for the combined apportionment which distributes these funds to MPOs representing urbanized areas, or parts thereof, within the State. This formula, which must be approved by the FTA, must ensure to the maximum extent practicable that no MPO is allocated less than the amount it received by administrative formula under the Metropolitan Planning Program in fiscal year 1991 (minimum MPO allocation). Each State formula must include a provision for the minimum MPO allocation. Where the State and MPOs desire to use a new formula not previously approved by FTA, it must be submitted to the appropriate FTA Regional Office for prior approval.

B. State Planning and Research Program

The fiscal year 1996 apportionments for the State Planning and Research Program total $8,250,000. Final State apportionments for this program are also contained on Table 8. This is the fifth year of a consolidated program which is apportioned to the States for the purpose of such activities as planning, technical studies and assistance, demonstrations, management training and cooperative research. In addition, a State may authorize a portion of these funds to be used to supplement planning funds allocated by the State to its urbanized areas as the State deems appropriate.

C. Data Used for Metropolitan Planning and State Planning and Research Apportionments

Population data from the 1990 Census is used in calculating these apportionments. The Metropolitan Planning funding provided to urbanized areas in each State by administrative formula in fiscal year 1991 was used as a ''hold harmless'' base in calculating funding to each State.

D. Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs)

The PEAs are aids to the States and MPOs in the development of planning work programs. They are advisory and are intended to serve FTA, FHWA, and the rest of the Department as a means of helping to meet national transportation needs and implementing national transportation policy. The last PEAs were issued by the FTA and the FHWA on July 11, 1994, for Federal fiscal years 1994 and 1995. These remain in effect until changed, which is expected some time during the first quarter of fiscal year 1996.

The PEAs currently under development will address common problems that have been identified during ongoing reviews of metropolitan (and State) planning processes and will also highlight program objectives identified in FTA and FHWA strategic plans. These include, but are not limited to, financial planning/innovative financing, public participation/environmental justice, transportation data/modeling, Intelligent Transportation Systems, multimodalism, and the need for community sensitive transportation that considers social, environmental, economic, land-use and other quality of life factors early in the transportation planning and development process.

XII. Period of Availability of Funds

The funds apportioned under the Urbanized Area Formula Program, Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula, Metropolitan Planning and State Planning and Research Programs in this Notice will remain available to be obligated by FTA to recipients for three (3) fiscal years following fiscal year 1996. Any of these apportioned funds unobligated at the close of business on September 30, 1999, will revert to FTA for reapportionment under these respective programs. Funds apportioned to nonurbanized areas under the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program, including RTAP funds, will remain available for two (2) fiscal years following fiscal year 1996. Any such funds remaining unobligated at the close of business on September 30, 1998, will revert to FTA for reapportionment among the States under the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program. Funds allocated to States under the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program in this Notice must be obligated by September 30, 1996. Any such funds remaining unobligated as of this date will revert to FTA for reapportionment among the States under the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program. The 1996 DOT Appropriations Act includes a provision requiring that fiscal year 1996 New Starts and Bus funds not obligated for their original purpose as of September 30, 1998, shall be made available for other discretionary projects within the respective categories of the Capital Program. Similar provisions in the 1994 and 1995 DOT Appropriations Acts required that fiscal year 1994 Bus and New Start funds that are not obligated by September 30, 1996, shall also be made available for other discretionary Bus or New Start projects, respectively, and fiscal year 1995 Bus and New Start funds unobligated by September 30, 1997, shall be made available for other discretionary Bus or New Start projects, respectively.

XIII. Notice of Pre-Award Authority to Incur Project Costs

A. Background

FTA is engaged in an ongoing effort to streamline and simplify the administration of its programs. To this end, the agency has expanded the authority extended to grantees to incur costs for operating assistance projects prior to grant award to cover planning and capital costs as well. In fiscal year 1994 FTA extended this authority to non-operating projects funded with current year apportioned formula funds. This automatic pre-award spending authority permitted a grantee to incur costs on an eligible transit capital or planning project without prejudice to possible future Federal participation in the cost of the project or projects. Because this provision worked so well to reduce the paperwork burden on both the grantee and FTA regional offices in

fiscal year 1995, FTA further broadened this authority.

B. Current Coverage

In fiscal year 1996, authority to incur costs for Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula, Metropolitan Planning, Urbanized Area Formula, Elderly and Persons with Disabilities, Nonurbanized Area Formula, and State Planning and Research in advance of possible future Federal participation applies to fiscal year 1996 FTA funds apportioned in this Notice for the programs listed above, as well as funds to be apportioned in fiscal year 1997. Carryover amounts for these programs are also included in this authority. This pre-award authority is also extended to projects intended to be funded with STP or CMAQ funds transferred to FTA in fiscal years 1996 and 1997, provided that the projects are included in a Federally approved STIP. The flexible funds do not have to be transferred to FTA before the authority can be used. This pre-award authority also applies to Bus funds identified in this Notice. The pre-award authority does not apply to Capital New Start funds.

C. Conditions

Similar to the FTA Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) authority, the conditions under which this authority may be utilized are specified below:

(1). This pre-award authority is not a legal or moral commitment that the project(s) will be approved for FTA assistance or that the FTA will obligate Federal funds. Furthermore, it is not a legal or moral commitment that all items undertaken by the applicant will be eligible for inclusion in the project(s).

(2). All FTA statutory, procedural, and contractual requirements must be met.

(3). No action will be taken by the grantee which prejudices the legal and administrative findings which the Federal Transit Administrator must make in order to approve a project.

(4). Local funds expended by the grantee pursuant to and after the date of this authority will be eligible for credit toward local match or reimbursement if the FTA later makes a grant for the project(s) or project amendment(s).

(5). The Federal amount of any future FTA assistance to the grantee for the project will be determined on the basis of the overall scope of activities and the prevailing statutory provisions with respect to the Federal-local match ratio at the time the funds are obligated.

(6). For funds to which this authority applies, the authority expires with the lapsing of fiscal year 1997 funds.

D. Environmental and Other Requirements

FTA emphasizes that all of the Federal grant requirements must be met for the project to remain eligible for Federal funding. Some of these requirements must be met before pre-award costs are incurred, notably the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Compliance with NEPA and other environmental laws or executive orders (e.g., protection of parklands, wetlands, historic properties) must be completed *before* state or local funds are advanced for a project expected to be subsequently funded with FTA funds. Depending on which class the project is included under in FTA's environmental regulations (23 CFR part 771) the grantee may not advance the project beyond planning and preliminary engineering before FTA has approved either a categorical exclusion (refer to 23 CFR part 771.117(d)), a finding of no significant impact, or a final environmental impact statement. The conformity requirements of the Clean Air Act (40 CFR part 51) also must be fully met before the project may be advanced with non-Federal funds.

Similarly, the requirement that a project be included in a transportation improvement program, Federal procurement procedures, as well as the whole range of Federal requirements, must be followed for projects in which Federal funding will be sought in the future. Failure to follow any such requirements could make the project ineligible for Federal funding. In short, this increased administrative flexibility requires a grantee to make certain that no Federal requirements are circumvented thereby. If a grantee has questions or concerns regarding the environmental requirements, or any other Federal requirements that must be met before incurring costs, it should contact the appropriate regional office.

Before an applicant may incur costs either for activities expected to be funded by New Start funds, or for activities requiring funding beyond fiscal year 1997, it must first obtain a written LONP from the FTA. To obtain an LONP, a grantee must submit a written request accompanied by adequate information and justification to the appropriate FTA regional office.

XIV. Electronic Grant Making and Management Initiatives: Fiscal Year 1996 and Beyond

A. Background

As a result of the National Performance Review and the FTA strategic planning process, the FTA is implementing a series of automation improvements in the grant making and management process which are designed to improve customer service and efficiency of program delivery. Known as the Electronic Grant Making and Management (EGMM) initiative, steps are underway to provide a streamlined electronic interface between grantees and FTA which will allow complete electronic application submission, review, approval, and management of all grants. The ultimate goal is to have in place a fully electronic, paperless process for awarding and managing Federal transit assistance programs involving grants and cooperative agreements.

B. On-Line Grantee Program

The On-Line Grantee Program is now available to all grantee agencies to enable them to access the FTA Grants Management Information System (GMIS) data base via a toll free telephone connection. This program was initially designed to permit grantees to inquire about the status of grants only, but has now been expanded to all registered grantees for filing their required quarterly financial status and narrative progress reports and to make annual certifications and assurances through GMIS. Over 470 of FTA's approximately 700 grantees are currently ''on line''.

C. Electronic Grant Making and Management (EGMM)

This initiative streamlines the entire FTA grant making and management process through a paperless electronic grant application, review, approval, acceptance and management process. The Department of Labor has agreed to participate in the program and receive requests for Transit Employee Protective Certification of projects, as well as issue the Transit Employee Protective Certifications electronically for the EGMM pilot program participants.

During fiscal year 1995, 22 grantee agencies participated in the FTA EGMM pilot program. The pilot grantees successfully tested and utilized the EGMM system to electronically develop, submit, and manage their grants during the full life cycle of the grant via grantee computer station connections to the FTA GMIS computer using a modem and toll free telephone connection. FTA is continuing to implement the EGMM system during fiscal year 1996 through the inclusion of additional grantee agencies. Any transit agency interested in participating in any aspect of the EGMM program should contact the appropriate FTA Regional Office.

D. Electronic Signature of Certifications and Assurances

The FTA is required by 49 U.S.C. 5307 as well as other laws and regulations to obtain specific certifications and assurances for its programs. In fiscal year 1995, FTA compiled the certifications and assurances applicable to the FTA programs into one document published in the Federal Register. Grantees are now able to sign one document annually certifying to all the certifications and assurances applicable to FTA grants. During fiscal year 1996, all EGMM grantee participants and on-line grantee participants will be able to provide this certification electronically, completely eliminating paper certification.

E. Future EGMM Expansion

FTA has several activities under consideration to expand the functional content of EGMM, including the following: an enhanced distributive PC-based system, a mechanism to facilitate electronic submission, review, approval and management of statewide transportation improvement programs; electronic development, review, approval and management of unified planning work programs; and a more comprehensive electronic library system.

Through these initiatives, FTA hopes to more effectively and efficiently serve our customers. We appreciate and look forward to the continued support of our grantee agencies as we look for additional ways to improve delivery of the mass transit program.

XV. Quarterly Approval of Grants

The FTA has established a quarterly approval and release cycle for processing grants. All Urbanized Area Formula, Nonurbanized Area Formula, Elderly and Persons with Disabilities, Capital, Metropolitan Planning, and State Planning and Research grants are processed on a quarterly basis. This includes grants using STP or CMAQ funds.

If completed applications are submitted to the appropriate FTA Regional Office no later than the first business day of the quarter, FTA will award grants by the last business day of the quarter.

In order to expedite the grant approval process within the quarterly approval structure, grants which are complete and have received the required Transit Employee Protective Certification will be approved before the end of the quarter. There are only two factors which would delay FTA approval of the project beyond the end of a quarter. First is a failure by DOL to issue a Transit Employee Protective Certification where such certification is a prerequisite to a grant approval, and second is the failure of FHWA to actually transfer flexible funds.

For an application to be considered complete, all required activities such as inclusion of the project in a locally approved Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), a Federally approved State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), intergovernmental reviews, environmental reviews, all applicable civil rights, anti-drug, clean air requirements and submission of all requisite certifications and documentation must be completed. The application must be in approvable form with all required documentation and submissions on hand, except for the labor protection certification which is issued by DOL. Incomplete applications will not be processed, but if the missing components are supplied, applications will be considered in the next quarter.

It is the policy of FTA to expedite grant application reviews and speed program delivery by reducing the number of grant applications. To this end, FTA strongly encourages grant applicants to submit only one application per fiscal year for each formula program. The single application should contain the fiscal year's capital (including flexible funds), planning and operating elements.

Applications for the first quarter should be submitted to the FTA Regional Office within five business days of this Notice. The first-quarter grants will be released on or before December 30, 1995.

XVI. Grant Application Procedures

All applications for FTA funds should be submitted to the appropriate FTA Regional Office. Formula grant applications should be prepared in conformance with the following FTA Circulars: Urbanized Area Formula—C9030.1A, September 18, 1987; Nonurbanized Area Formula—C9040.1C, November 3, 1992; Elderly and Persons with Disabilities—C9070.1C, December 23, 1992; and Section 5309 Capital Program: Grant Application Instructions—C9300.1, September 29, 1995. Applications for STP ''flexible'' fund grants should be prepared in the same manner as the apportioned funds under the Urbanized Area Formula, Nonurbanized Area Formula, or Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Programs. Guidance on preparation of applications for Metropolitan Planning, and State Planning and Research funds may be obtained from each FTA Regional Office. Also available are newly revised editions of the Grant Management Guidelines, C5010.1B, September 7, 1995; and Third Party Contracting Requirements, C4220.1C, October 1, 1995. Copies of circulars are available from FTA Regional Offices, and revised circulars are also available on the FTA Home Page on the Internet.

Issued on November 17, 1995.

Gordon J. Linton,

Administrator.

BILLING CODE 4910–57–P

TABLE 1

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 APPROPRIATIONS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZATIONS FOR GRANT PROGRAMS

SOURCES OF FUNDS	FY 1996 APPROPRIATIONS	*AUTHORIZED LEVELS*
SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM AND SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM	$2,001,315,905	$2,796,375,000
SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM	$1,891,243,530	*$2,642,574,375*
94.5% of Total Available for Urbanized Area Formula and Nonurbanized Area Formula Programs		
Less Oversight (1/2%)	(9,456,218)	
Reapportioned Funds Added	1,030,920	
Total Apportioned	$1,882,818,232	
Operating Assistance Limitation	$400,000,000	*$1,112,922,445*
SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM	$110,072,375	*$153,800,625*
5.5% of Total Available for Urbanized Area Formula and Nonurbanized Area Formula Programs		
Less Oversight (1/2%)	(550,362)	
Reapportioned Funds Added	1,630,181	
Total Apportioned	$111,152,194	
SECTION 5311(b) RTAP PROGRAM	$4,500,000	*$7,687,500*
Reapportioned Funds Added	71,903	
Total Apportioned	$4,571,903	
SECTION 5310 ELDERLY AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES PROGRAM	$51,609,095	*$68,675,000*
Reapportioned Funds Added	94,139	
Total Apportioned	$51,703,234	
SECTION 5309 CAPITAL PROGRAM	$1,665,000,000	*$2,050,000,000*
SECTION 5309(m)(1)(A) FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION	$666,000,000	*$820,000,000*
Less Oversight (3/4%)	(4,995,000)	
Total Apportioned	$661,005,000	
SECTION 5309(m)(1)(B) NEW STARTS	$666,000,000	*$820,000,000*
Less Oversight (3/4%)	(4,995,000)	
Reprogrammed Funds	18,361,250	
Total Allocated	$679,366,250	
SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) BUS	$333,000,000	*$410,000,000*
Less Oversight (3/4%)	(2,497,500)	
Total Allocated	$330,502,500	
SECTION 5303 METROPOLITAN PLANNING PROGRAM	$39,500,000	*$69,187,500*
SECTION 5313(b) STATE PLANNING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM	$8,250,000	$14,625,000
TOTAL (Above Grant Programs)	$3,770,175,000	$5,006,550,000

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA SIZE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
OVER 1,000,000 IN POPULATION	$1,384,566,927	$239,872,374	*$1,943,169,586*	*717,669,717*
200,000-1,000,000 IN POPULATION	317,068,794	67,177,823	*445,112,204*	*200,988,088*
50,000-200,000 IN POPULATION	181,182,511	92,949,803	*254,292,585*	*194,264,640*
NATIONAL TOTAL	$1,882,818,232	$400,000,000	*$2,642,574,375*	*$1,112,922,445*

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
Amounts Apportioned and Authorized to Urbanized Areas Over 1,000,000 in Population:				
Atlanta, GA	$26,839,796	$2,817,569	*$37,659,460*	*$8,429,834*
Baltimore, MD	23,224,123	4,509,748	*32,586,040*	*13,492,632*
Boston, MA	50,684,051	8,467,028	*71,119,774*	*25,332,346*
Chicago, IL-Northwestern IN	127,782,235	23,457,893	*179,385,792*	*70,183,237*
Cincinnati, OH-KY	9,072,460	2,442,814	*12,728,284*	*7,308,611*
Cleveland, OH	16,046,638	4,469,540	*22,513,571*	*13,372,334*
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	24,363,705	4,008,037	*34,180,861*	*11,991,571*
Denver, CO	14,536,961	2,736,257	*20,394,878*	*8,186,555*
Detroit, MI	24,001,631	9,922,644	*33,673,043*	*29,687,373*
Ft Lauderdale-Hollywood-Pompano Bch, FL.	13,996,500	3,403,116	*19,638,115*	*10,181,720*
Houston, TX	28,784,046	4,211,604	*40,385,072*	*12,600,620*
Kansas City, MO-KS	6,512,147	2,069,850	*9,136,002*	*6,192,747*
Los Angeles, CA	124,287,559	26,465,555	*174,376,805*	*79,181,805*
Miami-Hialeah, FL	25,707,774	3,887,455	*36,068,679*	*11,630,806*
Milwaukee, WI	11,829,319	2,532,863	*16,595,934*	*7,578,026*
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN	16,652,932	3,377,190	*23,364,328*	*10,104,152*
New Orleans, LA	10,810,730	3,063,597	*15,167,698*	*9,165,919*
New York, NY-Northeastern NJ	407,163,089	61,292,372	*571,334,032*	*183,379,517*
Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA	7,898,757	1,946,012	*11,454,972*	*5,822,236*
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	73,238,333	14,754,704	*102,764,882*	*44,144,326*
Phoenix, AZ	14,050,740	2,182,056	*19,712,901*	*6,528,452*
Pittsburgh, PA	20,396,244	4,404,289	*28,616,176*	*13,177,022*
Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA	14,759,223	2,040,724	*20,707,309*	*6,105,605*
Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	11,159,496	1,166,383	*15,657,893*	*3,489,679*
Sacramento, CA	8,573,242	1,613,097	*12,028,302*	*4,826,195*
San Antonio, TX	13,055,968	2,122,548	*18,317,041*	*6,350,412*
San Diego, CA	23,453,384	3,386,799	*32,905,869*	*10,132,901*
San Francisco-Oakland, CA	74,755,286	9,017,750	*104,894,091*	*26,980,038*
San Jose, CA	19,034,030	3,063,813	*26,706,442*	*9,166,564*
San Juan, PR	18,655,885	3,482,258	*26,174,834*	*10,418,502*
Seattle, WA	32,689,692	2,861,557	*45,867,318*	*8,561,438*
St. Louis, MO-IL	15,896,099	4,446,206	*22,301,936*	*13,302,520*
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	10,841,506	2,420,798	*15,209,825*	*7,242,742*
Washington, DC-MD-VA	63,813,346	7,828,278	*89,541,427*	*23,421,282*
TOTAL	$1,384,566,927	$239,872,374	*$1,943,169,586*	*$717,669,717*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS	
			SECTION 5307	OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION
Amounts Apportioned and Authorized to Urbanized Areas 200,000 to 1,000,000 in Population :				
Akron, OH	$3,739,754	$1,068,223	$5,246,517	$3,195,998
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	4,869,154	1,036,060	6,831,213	3,099,768
Albuquerque, NM	3,696,147	715,983	5,185,359	2,142,135
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	2,934,020	1,083,235	4,116,172	3,240,910
Anchorage, AK	1,513,460	353,514	2,123,266	1,057,671
Ann Arbor, MI	2,389,025	454,205	3,351,583	1,358,927
Augusta, GA-SC	1,311,735	361,822	1,840,243	1,082,528
Austin, TX	7,400,768	681,375	10,382,794	2,038,593
Bakersfield, CA	2,387,166	444,280	3,349,018	1,329,233
Baton Rouge, LA	1,926,005	593,692	2,702,028	1,776,257
Birmingham, AL	3,328,335	1,090,569	4,669,430	3,262,854
Bridgeport-Milford, CT	4,044,066	946,815	5,674,112	2,832,758
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	8,289,472	2,779,198	11,629,745	8,315,030
Canton, OH	1,321,944	523,119	1,854,554	1,565,111
Charleston, SC	2,000,854	495,970	2,807,111	1,483,884
Charlotte, NC	4,026,919	597,902	5,649,625	1,788,851
Chattanooga, TN-GA	1,643,938	450,735	2,306,325	1,348,546
Colorado Springs, CO	2,401,466	447,449	3,369,077	1,338,714
Columbia, SC	1,900,596	506,333	2,666,382	1,514,889
Columbus, GA-AL	1,225,022	379,379	1,718,591	1,135,057
Columbus, OH	7,513,761	2,015,697	10,541,344	6,030,728
Corpus Christi, TX	2,374,232	398,138	3,330,884	1,191,182
Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, IA-IL	1,942,898	518,039	2,725,708	1,549,913
Dayton, OH	8,176,922	1,341,289	11,472,822	4,012,977
Daytona Beach, FL	1,452,502	359,735	2,037,747	1,076,285
Des Moines, IA	1,781,444	504,542	2,499,267	1,509,529
Durham, NC	1,814,220	370,789	2,545,215	1,109,355
El Paso, TX-NM	5,843,067	825,225	8,197,797	2,468,977
Fayetteville, NC	1,007,412	341,222	1,413,313	1,020,897
Flint, MI	2,832,232	701,838	3,973,425	2,099,817
Fort Myers-Cape Coral, FL	1,493,715	262,047	2,095,575	784,015
Fort Wayne, IN	1,285,722	500,447	1,803,737	1,497,278
Fresno, CA	3,467,394	673,470	4,864,463	2,014,943
Grand Rapids, MI	2,767,813	711,831	3,883,002	2,129,714
Greenville, SC	1,456,978	344,063	2,044,023	1,029,397
Harrisburg, PA	1,525,415	519,625	2,140,034	1,554,657
Hartford-Middletown, CT	6,146,451	1,054,496	8,623,501	3,154,927
Honolulu, HI	15,040,461	1,305,970	21,102,923	3,907,308
Indianapolis, IN	5,712,839	1,754,741	8,014,723	5,249,977
Jackson, MS	1,274,183	414,816	1,787,549	1,241,080
Jacksonville, FL	5,314,070	929,739	7,455,330	2,781,669
Knoxville, TN	1,493,973	413,520	2,095,901	1,237,204
Lansing-East Lansing, MI	2,192,584	533,804	3,075,997	1,597,078
Las Vegas, NV	7,508,897	633,660	10,534,707	1,895,834
Lawrence-Haverhill, MA-NH	2,320,366	392,260	3,255,656	1,173,595
Lexington-Fayette, KY	1,316,539	595,036	1,846,979	1,780,276
Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR	1,775,840	475,798	2,491,350	1,423,532

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
Amounts Apportioned and Authorized to Urbanized Areas 200,000 to 1,000,000 in Population (continued):				
Lorain-Elyria, OH	$861,005	$358,920	$1,207,899	$1,073,846
Louisville, KY-IN	7,321,902	1,792,128	10,272,196	5,361,835
Madison, WI	3,345,638	457,794	4,693,870	1,369,666
McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX	915,901	380,331	1,284,911	1,137,906
Melbourne-Palm Bay, FL	2,333,000	323,361	3,273,082	967,456
Memphis, TN-AR-MS	6,173,037	1,660,925	8,660,467	4,969,290
Mobile, AL	1,578,497	462,840	2,214,498	1,384,762
Modesto, CA	1,963,767	455,526	2,754,997	1,362,880
Montgomery, AL	1,031,791	470,960	1,447,506	1,409,056
Nashville, TN	3,592,225	770,071	5,039,626	2,303,961
New Haven-Meriden, CT	6,228,653	1,063,941	8,739,705	3,183,185
Ogden, UT	1,982,134	321,567	2,780,789	962,090
Oklahoma City, OK	3,422,333	1,065,815	4,801,241	3,188,792
Omaha, NE-IA	3,874,785	1,093,065	5,435,970	3,270,320
Orlando, FL	8,193,216	804,301	11,494,612	2,406,374
Oxnard-Ventura, CA	3,705,962	623,767	5,199,617	1,866,236
Pensacola, FL	1,277,158	348,591	1,791,743	1,042,942
Peoria, IL	1,507,444	485,694	2,114,804	1,453,139
Providence-Pawtucket, RI-MA	10,583,742	2,183,415	15,125,851	6,532,519
Provo-Orem, UT	1,714,979	374,328	2,405,971	1,119,946
Raleigh, NC	1,821,556	335,902	2,555,543	1,004,980
Reno, NV	2,555,303	387,233	3,584,907	1,158,555
Richmond, VA	4,059,523	889,706	5,695,206	2,661,896
Rochester, NY	4,915,213	1,426,222	6,895,637	4,267,087
Rockford, IL	1,307,952	446,955	1,834,945	1,337,236
Salt Lake City, UT	8,702,591	1,128,032	12,209,205	3,374,937
Sarasota-Bradenton, FL	2,512,287	582,302	3,524,501	1,742,178
Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA	2,091,063	800,237	2,933,565	2,394,214
Shreveport, LA	1,846,482	484,985	2,590,538	1,451,018
South Bend-Mishawaka, IN-MI	1,602,438	529,802	2,248,102	1,585,105
Spokane, WA	3,898,958	514,098	5,469,922	1,538,120
Springfield, MA-CT	4,009,137	934,026	5,624,496	2,794,494
Stockton, CA	2,045,651	616,738	2,869,852	1,845,208
Syracuse, NY	3,462,323	875,658	4,857,382	2,619,865
Tacoma, WA	6,834,378	715,757	9,588,373	2,141,460
Toledo, OH-MI	3,752,175	1,034,105	5,263,977	3,093,920
Trenton, NJ-PA	3,287,120	913,035	4,611,950	2,731,693
Tucson, AZ	5,725,089	764,985	8,031,994	2,288,745
Tulsa, OK	3,074,489	724,300	4,313,254	2,167,019
West Palm Bch-Boca Raton-Delray Bch, FL	8,709,875	762,335	12,221,104	2,280,817
Wichita, KS	2,127,154	626,604	2,984,214	1,874,726
Wilmington, DE-NJ-MD-PA	4,017,483	926,743	5,636,438	2,772,705
Worcester, MA-CT	2,239,136	534,935	3,141,292	1,600,463
Youngstown-Warren, OH	1,682,473	824,093	2,360,335	2,465,588
TOTAL	$317,068,794	$67,177,823	$445,112,204	$200,988,088

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS	
			SECTION 5307	OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION
Amounts Apportioned and Authorized to State Governors for Urbanized Areas 50,000 to 200,000 in Population:				
ALABAMA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$3,403,269	$1,970,561	$4,776,314	$4,118,462
Anniston, AL	328,268	231,980	460,708	484,838
Auburn-Opelika, AL	263,370	129,622	369,626	270,908
Decatur, AL	300,586	152,422	421,857	318,561
Dothan, AL	252,468	133,304	354,326	278,604
Florence, AL	351,728	235,002	493,633	491,153
Gadsden, AL	310,868	233,057	436,287	487,089
Huntsville	986,837	504,984	1,384,975	1,055,414
Tuscaloosa, AL	609,144	350,190	854,902	731,895
ALASKA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$0	$0	$0	$0
ARIZONA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$540,377	$206,966	$758,391	$432,557
Yuma, AZ-CA (AZ)	540,377	206,966	758,391	432,557
ARKANSAS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,300,294	$798,674	$1,824,896	$1,669,225
Fayetteville-Springdale, AR	358,858	168,344	503,638	351,838
Fort Smith, AR-OK (AR)	488,504	275,251	685,591	575,274
Pine Bluff, AR	330,121	269,436	463,308	563,120
Texarkana, TX-AR (AR)	122,811	85,643	172,359	178,992
CALIFORNIA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$19,917,670	$6,801,253	$27,953,433	$14,214,586
Antioch-Pittsburg, CA	1,126,392	345,636	1,580,833	722,378
Chico, CA	491,805	185,098	690,224	386,855
Davis, CA	597,024	213,010	837,893	445,190
Fairfield, CA	725,103	255,671	1,017,646	534,351
Hemet-San Jacinto, CA	604,950	195,698	849,016	409,007
Hesperia-Apple Valley-Victorville, CA	771,736	265,938	1,083,092	555,810
Indio-Coachella, CA	365,797	126,070	513,377	263,485
Lancaster-Palmdale, CA	1,298,088	162,437	1,821,800	339,492
Lodi, CA	508,197	175,169	713,228	366,103

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
CALIFORNIA (Continued):				
Lompoc, CA	$312,109	$107,558	$438,029	$224,795
Merced, CA	554,873	188,067	778,736	393,059
Napa, CA	579,782	266,728	813,694	557,460
Palm Springs, CA	722,306	180,689	1,013,720	377,639
Redding, CA	417,649	149,645	586,149	312,757
Salinas, CA	1,099,062	423,192	1,542,477	884,469
San Luis Obispo, CA	520,478	179,409	730,464	374,964
Santa Barbara, CA	1,700,301	700,123	2,386,286	1,463,254
Santa Cruz, CA	879,200	376,707	1,233,912	787,316
Santa Maria, CA	799,910	227,014	1,122,633	474,457
Santa Rosa, CA	1,550,935	449,066	2,176,658	938,546
Seaside-Monterey, CA	1,042,196	521,884	1,462,669	1,090,736
Simi Valley, CA	986,513	306,429	1,384,520	640,434
Vacaville, CA	598,886	206,423	840,506	431,423
Visalia	684,059	225,542	960,042	471,382
Watsonville, CA	376,859	129,889	528,903	271,467
Yuba City, CA	601,319	236,597	843,921	494,486
Yuma, AZ-CA (CA)	2,141	1,564	3,005	3,269
COLORADO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$3,670,024	$1,839,230	$5,150,691	$3,843,983
Boulder, CO	816,637	412,508	1,146,108	862,140
Fort Collins, CO	680,178	294,588	954,595	615,688
Grand Junction, CO	387,265	189,506	543,507	396,068
Greeley, CO	544,019	283,630	763,503	592,785
Longmont, CO	495,760	170,885	695,774	357,148
Pueblo, CO	746,165	488,113	1,047,204	1,020,155
CONNECTICUT:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$12,192,072	$4,543,229	$17,110,538	$9,495,326
Bristol, CT	578,451	297,793	811,826	622,385
Danbury, CT-NY (CT)	2,052,677	492,302	2,880,724	1,028,909
New Britain, CT	1,083,147	626,111	1,520,141	1,308,568
New London-Norwich, CT	871,611	533,937	1,223,262	1,115,926
Norwalk, CT	2,173,486	676,464	3,050,274	1,413,806
Stamford, CT-NY (CT)	2,755,374	1,016,038	3,866,924	2,123,514
Waterbury, CT	2,677,326	900,584	3,757,387	1,882,217

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
DELAWARE:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$276,875	$95,414	*$388,580*	*$199,416*
Dover, DE	276,875	95,414	*388,580*	*199,416*
FLORIDA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$8,438,549	$3,152,975	*$11,843,073*	*$6,589,702*
Deltona, FL	280,578	96,684	*393,776*	*202,069*
Fort Pierce, F	672,119	205,216	*943,284*	*428,900*
Fort Walton Beach, FL	651,532	258,405	*914,392*	*540,065*
Gainesville, FL	834,982	351,847	*1,171,855*	*735,358*
Kissimmee, FL	388,909	134,039	*545,814*	*280,142*
Lakeland, FL	853,604	345,542	*1,197,990*	*722,181*
Naples, FL	561,788	146,868	*788,440*	*306,954*
Ocala, FL	377,378	147,105	*529,631*	*307,449*
Panama City, FL	566,341	234,999	*794,831*	*491,148*
Punta Gorda, FL	370,353	127,629	*519,772*	*266,745*
Spring Hill, FL	283,115	97,565	*397,338*	*203,911*
Stuart, FL	493,989	170,246	*693,288*	*355,813*
Tallahassee, FL	951,837	393,861	*1,335,854*	*823,167*
Titusville, FL.	272,470	93,895	*382,398*	*196,240*
Vero Beach, FL	345,073	118,916	*484,293*	*248,533*
Winter Haven, FL.	534,481	230,158	*750,117*	*481,028*
GEORGIA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$3,694,609	$2,169,758	*$5,185,196*	*$4,534,784*
Albany, GA.	457,623	316,131	*642,251*	*660,712*
Athens, GA.	438,756	197,454	*615,772*	*412,678*
Brunswick, GA	252,489	87,007	*354,355*	*181,844*
Macon, GA.	820,221	542,798	*1,151,138*	*1,134,446*
Rome, GA.	257,398	149,674	*361,245*	*312,819*
Savannah, GA	1,073,169	689,903	*1,506,138*	*1,441,893*
Warner Robins, GA	394,953	186,791	*554,297*	*390,393*
HAWAII:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$981,936	$475,852	*$1,378,096*	*$994,529*
Kailua, HI	981,936	475,852	*1,378,096*	*994,529*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
IDAHO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,943,421	$809,759	*$2,727,492*	*1,692,392*
Boise City, ID	1,189,207	469,898	*1,668,991*	*982,083*
Idaho Falls, ID	426,308	146,933	*598,301*	*307,090*
Pocatello, ID	327,906	192,928	*460,200*	*403,219*
ILLINOIS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$8,901,852	$5,371,412	*$12,493,289*	*11,226,225*
Alton, IL	481,081	372,784	*675,172*	*779,118*
Aurora, IL	1,347,372	723,464	*1,890,967*	*1,512,035*
Beloit, WI-IL (IL)	61,486	25,498	*86,292*	*53,290*
Bloomington-Normal, IL	775,027	382,645	*1,087,711*	*799,726*
Champaign-Urbana, IL	1,093,716	616,763	*1,534,974*	*1,289,032*
Crystal Lake, IL	439,137	151,340	*616,306*	*316,301*
Decatur, IL	615,654	446,782	*864,038*	*933,771*
Dubuque, IA-IL (IL)	14,341	8,765	*20,127*	*18,319*
Elgin, IL	971,930	636,793	*1,364,054*	*1,330,894*
Joliet, IL	1,123,830	953,579	*1,577,238*	*1,992,976*
Kankakee, IL.	441,072	262,596	*619,021*	*548,825*
Round Lake Beach-McHenry, IL-WI (IL)	640,034	209,575	*898,254*	*438,011*
Springfield, IL.	897,172	580,828	*1,259,135*	*1,213,927*
INDIANA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$5,191,946	$3,063,742	*$7,286,630*	*$6,403,206*
Anderson, IN	419,655	303,284	*588,965*	*633,863*
Bloomington, IN	626,233	287,968	*878,886*	*601,851*
Elkhart-GosheN, IN	627,641	288,505	*880,862*	*602,973*
Evansville, IN-KY (IN)	1,162,703	712,185	*1,631,794*	*1,488,464*
Kokomo, IN	422,610	265,091	*593,111*	*554,040*
Lafayette-West Lafayette, IN	840,174	439,016	*1,179,141*	*917,542*
Muncie, IN	617,633	435,588	*866,816*	*910,377*
Terre Haute, IN	475,297	332,105	*667,055*	*694,097*
IOWA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$2,826,428	$1,777,815	*$3,966,747*	*$3,715,625*
Cedar Rapids, IA	878,360	542,576	*1,232,733*	*1,133,981*
Dubuque, IA-IL (IA)	427,531	302,695	*600,018*	*632,631*
Iowa City, IA	506,089	207,305	*710,271*	*433,267*
Sioux City, IA-NE-SD (IA)	467,423	311,588	*656,004*	*651,218*
Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA	547,025	413,651	*767,721*	*864,528*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
KANSAS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,372,321	$759,970	*$1,925,983*	*$1,588,334*
Lawrence, KS	519,670	217,653	*729,331*	*454,895*
St. Joseph, MO-KS (KS)	4,290	3,866	*6,020*	*8,081*
Topeka, KS	848,361	538,451	*1,190,632*	*1,125,359*
KENTUCKY:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,081,613	$635,567	*$1,517,989*	*$1,328,331*
Clarksville, TN-KY (KY)	131,978	73,054	*185,225*	*152,683*
Evansville, IN-KY (KY)	162,067	45,056	*227,453*	*94,166*
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH ((KY)	323,189	218,446	*453,579*	*456,550*
Owensboro, KY	464,379	299,011	*651,732*	*624,931*
LOUISIANA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$3,203,290	$1,868,922	*$4,495,650*	*$3,906,039*
Alexandria, LA	467,451	326,140	*656,043*	*681,632*
Houma, LA	328,804	192,233	*461,459*	*401,767*
Lafayette, LA	808,805	428,989	*1,135,116*	*896,585*
Lake Charles, LA	649,698	413,989	*911,817*	*865,235*
Monroe, LA	617,764	393,577	*866,999*	*822,574*
Slidell, LA	330,768	113,994	*464,216*	*238,246*
MAINE:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,394,127	$808,464	*$1,956,587*	*$1,689,686*
Bangor, ME	286,469	152,758	*402,045*	*319,264*
Lewiston-Auburn, ME	332,873	215,633	*467,170*	*450,672*
Portland, ME	711,761	409,648	*998,921*	*856,162*
Portsmouth-Dover-Rochester, NH-ME (ME)	63,024	30,425	*88,451*	*63,589*
MARYLAND:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,550,341	$751,514	*$2,175,825*	*$1,570,661*
Annapolis, MD	504,949	228,635	*708,670*	*477,846*
Cumberland, MD-WV (MD)	268,559	180,307	*376,908*	*376,842*
Frederick, MD	364,345	125,567	*511,340*	*262,434*
Hagerstown, MD-PA-WV (MD)	412,488	217,005	*578,907*	*453,540*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
KANSAS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,372,321	$759,970	*$1,925,983*	*$1,588,334*
Lawrence, KS	519,670	217,653	*729,331*	*454,895*
St. Joseph, MO-KS (KS)	4,290	3,866	*6,020*	*8,081*
Topeka, KS	848,361	538,451	*1,190,632*	*1,125,359*
KENTUCKY:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,081,613	$635,567	*$1,517,989*	*$1,328,331*
Clarksville, TN-KY (KY)	131,978	73,054	*185,225*	*152,683*
Evansville, IN-KY (KY)	162,067	45,056	*227,453*	*94,166*
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH ((KY)	323,189	218,446	*453,579*	*456,550*
Owensboro, KY	464,379	299,011	*651,732*	*624,931*
LOUISIANA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$3,203,290	$1,868,922	*$4,495,650*	*$3,906,039*
Alexandria, LA	467,451	326,140	*656,043*	*681,632*
Houma, LA	328,804	192,233	*461,459*	*401,767*
Lafayette, LA	808,805	428,989	*1,135,116*	*896,585*
Lake Charles, LA	649,698	413,989	*911,817*	*865,235*
Monroe, LA	617,764	393,577	*866,999*	*822,574*
Slidell, LA	330,768	113,994	*464,216*	*238,246*
MAINE:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,394,127	$808,464	*$1,956,587*	*$1,689,686*
Bangor, ME	286,469	152,758	*402,045*	*319,264*
Lewiston-Auburn, ME	332,873	215,633	*467,170*	*450,672*
Portland, ME	711,761	409,648	*998,921*	*856,162*
Portsmouth-Dover-Rochester, NH-ME (ME)	63,024	30,425	*88,451*	*63,589*
MARYLAND:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,550,341	$751,514	*$2,175,825*	*$1,570,661*
Annapolis, MD	504,949	228,635	*708,670*	*477,846*
Cumberland, MD-WV (MD)	268,559	180,307	*376,908*	*376,842*
Frederick, MD	364,345	125,567	*511,340*	*262,434*
Hagerstown, MD-PA-WV (MD)	412,488	217,005	*578,907*	*453,540*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
MISSOURI:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$2,209,077	$1,205,239	*$3,100,327*	*$2,518,944*
Columbia, MO	436,128	222,473	*612,083*	*464,968*
Joplin, MO	306,282	158,607	*429,851*	*331,488*
Springfield, MO	1,028,877	512,465	*1,443,976*	*1,071,049*
St. Joseph, MO-KS (MO)	437,790	311,694	*614,417*	*651,439*
MONTANA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,470,589	$865,821	*$2,063,897*	*$1,809,562*
Billings, MT	567,146	332,854	*795,961*	*695,665*
Great Falls, MT	528,877	324,442	*742,252*	*678,081*
Missoula, MT	374,566	208,525	*525,684*	*435,816*
NEBRASKA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,634,847	$783,608	*$2,294,424*	*1,637,737*
Lincoln, NE	1,564,126	747,115	*2,195,171*	*1,561,466*
Sioux City, IA-NE-SD (NE)	70,721	36,493	*99,253*	*76,270*
NEVADA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$0	$0	*$0*	*$0*
NEW HAMPSHIRE:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,976,286	$930,889	*$2,786,248*	*1,945,554*
Lowell, MA-NH (NH)	4,063	1,136	*5,703*	*2,375*
Manchester, NH	832,265	425,529	*1,168,041*	*889,354*
Nashua, NH	656,535	270,768	*934,044*	*565,903*
Portsmouth-Dover-Rochester, NH-ME (NH)	483,423	233,456	*678,460*	*487,922*
NEW JERSEY:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,504,218	$1,162,152	*$2,111,093*	*$2,428,892*
Atlantic City, NJ	1,084,198	913,408	*1,521,616*	*1,909,019*
Vineland-Millville, NJ	420,020	248,744	*589,477*	*519,874*
NEW MEXICO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$819,128	$346,371	*$1,149,605*	*723,913*
Las Cruces, NM	455,029	185,079	*638,610*	*386,814*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS	
			SECTION 5307	OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION
NEW MEXICO (Continued):				
Santa Fe, NM	$364,099	$161,292	$510,995	$337,099
NEW YORK:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$4,544,794	$2,887,397	$6,378,383	$6,034,647
Binghamton, NY	1,140,763	753,963	1,601,002	1,575,780
Danbury, CT-NY (NY)	15,462	4,225	21,700	8,830
Elmira, NY	468,433	328,474	657,422	686,509
Glens Falls, NY	322,133	163,510	452,097	341,736
Ithaca, NY	325,123	112,051	456,293	234,186
Newburgh, NY	422,181	203,473	592,509	425,258
Poughkeepsie, NY	886,848	630,599	1,244,645	1,317,950
Stamford, CT-NY (NY)	105	109	147	227
Utica-Rome, NY	963,746	690,993	1,352,568	1,444,171
NORTH CAROLINA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$7,378,023	$3,807,386	$10,354,680	$7,957,418
Asheville, NC	569,489	313,739	799,248	655,713
Burlington, NC	413,116	238,562	579,787	498,594
Gastonia, NC	604,900	363,032	848,947	758,736
Goldsboro, NC	314,139	162,993	440,878	340,654
Greensboro, NC	1,301,026	686,529	1,825,923	1,434,845
Greenville, NC	361,699	124,657	507,625	260,532
Hickory, NC	344,959	173,702	484,133	363,036
High Point, NC	581,730	357,277	816,429	746,708
Jacksonville, NC	561,638	205,012	788,231	428,475
Kannapolis, NC	405,454	207,368	569,034	433,397
Rocky Mount, NC	324,112	111,702	454,875	233,456
Wilmington, NC	530,128	259,914	744,008	543,219
Winston-Salem, NC	1,065,633	602,897	1,495,562	1,260,053
NORTH DAKOTA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,433,544	$694,941	$2,011,905	$1,452,424
Bismarck, ND	413,373	217,303	580,147	454,162
Fargo-Moorhead, ND-MN (ND)	597,844	285,401	839,044	596,487
Grand Forks, ND-MN (ND)	422,327	192,237	592,714	401,775
OHIO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$3,941,572	$2,454,959	$5,531,795	$5,130,852
Hamilton, OH	814,689	413,830	1,143,375	864,904
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH (OH)	207,463	123,238	291,164	257,566
Lima, OH	445,253	296,760	624,890	620,226

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS	
			SECTION 5307	OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION
OHIO (Continued):				
Mansfield, OH	$429,874	$297,105	$603,306	$620,948
Middletown, OH	560,141	286,086	786,129	597,918
Newark, OH	341,288	171,899	478,980	359,268
Parkersburg, WV-OH (OH)	50,537	31,162	70,926	65,129
Sharon, PA-OH (OH)	33,325	20,995	46,770	43,880
Springfield, OH	647,935	453,628	909,343	948,079
Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV-PA (OH)	233,102	194,158	327,147	405,789
Wheeling, WV-OH (OH)	177,965	166,098	249,765	347,145
OKLAHOMA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$613,484	$386,416	$860,994	$807,607
Fort Smith, AR-OK (OK)	10,762	6,655	15,104	13,908
Lawton, OK	602,722	379,761	845,890	793,699
OREGON:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$3,199,315	$1,425,107	$4,490,075	$2,978,467
Eugene-Springfield, OR	1,505,988	725,646	2,113,577	1,516,596
Longview, WA-OR (OR)	10,015	5,369	14,056	11,221
Medford, OR	465,419	194,556	653,192	406,622
Salem, OR	1,217,893	499,536	1,709,250	1,044,028
PENNSYLVANIA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$8,363,573	$5,129,718	$11,737,846	10,721,085
Altoona, PA	571,348	408,051	801,858	852,824
Erie, PA	1,469,783	929,251	2,062,766	1,942,131
Hagerstown, MD-PA-WV (PA)	5,035	3,855	7,066	8,057
Johnstown, PA	526,872	437,207	739,438	913,760
Lancaster, PA	1,328,871	607,678	1,865,002	1,270,044
Monessen, PA	361,637	211,581	507,539	442,204
Pottstown, PA	343,175	118,272	481,628	247,188
Reading, PA	1,551,229	1,108,504	2,177,070	2,316,765
Sharon, PA-OH (PA)	240,254	184,335	337,184	385,259
State College, PA	500,029	250,976	701,765	524,539
Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV-PA (PA)	1,746	681	2,451	1,424
Williamsport, PA	419,158	277,812	588,267	580,626
York, PA	1,044,436	591,515	1,465,812	1,236,263
PUERTO RICO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$7,726,196	$3,312,130	$10,843,303	$6,922,336
Aguadilla, PR	675,935	245,837	948,641	513,799
Arecibo, PR	631,577	284,696	886,386	595,014

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
PUERTO RICO (Continued):				
Caguas, PR	$1,654,016	$615,765	$2,321,327	$1,286,946
Cayey, PR	489,031	168,563	686,331	352,295
Humacao, PR	423,246	145,877	594,004	304,882
Mayaguez, PR	909,345	453,778	1,276,219	948,394
Ponce, PR	2,023,581	1,056,142	2,839,973	2,207,331
Vega Baja-Manati, PR	919,465	341,472	1,290,422	713,675
RHODE ISLAND:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$491,793	$246,288	$690,206	514,740
Fall River, MA-RI (RI)	112,740	54,179	158,225	113,234
Newport, RI	379,053	192,109	531,981	401,506
SOUTH CAROLINA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$2,082,677	$1,013,149	$2,922,932	$2,117,477
Anderson, SC	280,103	158,795	393,111	331,881
Florence, SC	288,108	166,525	404,345	348,036
Myrtle Beach, SC	302,135	104,116	424,031	217,603
Rock Hill, SC	320,803	149,201	450,231	311,829
Spartanburg, SC	559,230	319,995	784,851	668,787
Sumter, SC	332,298	114,517	466,363	239,341
SOUTH DAKOTA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,034,113	$523,345	$1,451,325	$1,093,789
Rapid City, SD	329,349	177,805	462,224	371,611
Sioux City, IA-NE-SD (SD)	9,234	4,219	12,960	8,817
Sioux Falls, SD	695,530	341,321	976,141	713,361
TENNESSEE:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,600,470	$887,865	$2,246,176	$1,855,633
Bristol, TN-Bristol, VA (TN)	149,596	90,241	209,950	188,602
Clarksville, TN-KY (TN)	364,740	167,264	511,894	349,581
Jackson, TN	276,074	148,661	387,455	310,701
Johnson City, TN	420,826	228,788	590,607	478,166
Kingsport, TN-VA (TN)	389,234	252,911	546,270	528,583
TEXAS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$14,818,915	$7,687,065	$20,797,591	$16,065,929
Abilene, TX	525,749	322,174	737,862	673,342
Amarillo, TX	975,152	544,163	1,368,575	1,137,297

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
TEXAS (Continued):				
Beaumont, TX	$670,691	$436,937	$941,280	$913,196
Brownsville, TX	974,832	343,413	1,368,127	717,732
Bryan-College Station, TX	652,977	248,808	916,420	520,007
Denton, TX	352,719	121,558	495,024	254,039
Galveston, TX	374,156	263,556	525,109	550,830
Harlingen, TX	479,101	213,740	672,394	446,716
Killeen, TX	916,390	322,616	1,286,107	674,267
Laredo, TX	1,157,373	440,079	1,624,314	919,762
Lewisville, TX	407,184	140,316	571,462	293,260
Longview, TX	400,618	205,890	562,247	430,310
Lubbock, TX	1,140,942	634,745	1,601,253	1,326,614
Midland, TX	499,903	258,553	701,588	540,374
Odessa, TX	554,572	408,081	778,314	852,888
Port Arthur, TX	604,956	418,221	849,024	874,080
San Angelo, TX	519,838	269,195	729,566	562,616
Sherman-Denison, TX	260,211	197,337	365,193	412,433
Temple, TX	295,412	147,551	414,596	308,381
Texarkana, TX-AR (TX)	238,374	142,859	334,546	298,574
Texas City, TX	633,643	308,822	889,286	645,437
Tyler, TX	495,493	272,311	695,400	569,129
Victoria, TX	343,487	202,360	482,066	422,931
Waco, TX	748,295	436,203	1,050,194	911,662
Wichita Falls, TX	596,847	387,585	837,644	810,051
UTAH:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$296,183	$102,073	$415,678	$213,332
Logan, UT	296,183	102,073	415,678	213,332
VERMONT:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$519,715	$244,385	$729,393	$510,764
Burlington, VT	519,715	244,385	729,393	510,764
VIRGINIA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$3,449,838	$2,010,460	$4,841,670	$4,201,851
Bristol, TN-Bristol, VA (VA)	106,501	54,597	149,469	114,108
Charlottesville, VA	496,053	258,207	696,186	539,650
Danville, VA	281,697	182,428	395,347	381,273
Fredericksburg, VA	330,721	113,974	464,149	238,206
Kingsport, TN-VA (VA)	20,107	15,609	28,219	32,622
Lynchburg, VA	471,917	290,441	662,312	607,020
Petersburg, VA	598,264	414,079	839,632	865,423
Roanoke, VA	1,144,578	681,125	1,606,356	1,423,548

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
WASHINGTON:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$3,260,161	$1,441,915	*$4,575,468*	*3,013,595*
Bellingham, WA	384,111	178,042	*539,080*	*372,107*
Bremerton, WA	744,095	218,876	*1,044,300*	*457,450*
Longview, WA-OR (WA)	325,020	172,874	*456,148*	*361,304*
Olympia, WA	578,911	220,296	*812,472*	*460,417*
Richland-Kennewick-Pasco, WA	603,931	328,900	*847,586*	*687,400*
Yakima, WA	624,093	322,927	*875,882*	*674,917*
WEST VIRGINIA				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$2,505,599	$1,811,406	*$3,516,480*	*$3,785,830*
Charleston, WV	1,007,960	668,361	*1,414,621*	*1,396,872*
Cumberland, MD-WV (WV)	12,055	10,483	*16,919*	*21,909*
Hagerstown, MD-PA-WV (WV)	3,045	2,443	*4,273*	*5,106*
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH (WV)	565,909	434,965	*794,224*	*909,075*
Parkersburg, WV-OH (WV)	363,952	275,348	*510,789*	*575,476*
Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV-PA (WV)	156,588	128,467	*219,763*	*268,495*
Wheeling, WV-OH (WV)	396,090	291,339	*555,891*	*608,897*
WISCONSIN:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$6,859,182	$3,935,089	*$9,626,514*	*8,224,316*
Appleton-Neenah, WI	1,256,040	655,709	*1,762,788*	*1,370,429*
Beloit, WI-IL (WI)	269,233	155,628	*377,856*	*325,262*
Duluth, MN-WI (WI)	117,931	94,707	*165,510*	*197,938*
Eau Claire, WI	491,973	237,885	*690,459*	*497,178*
Green Bay, WI	953,966	506,229	*1,338,843*	*1,058,016*
Janesville, WI	362,064	194,329	*508,139*	*406,146*
Kenosha, WI	659,249	483,440	*925,223*	*1,010,386*
La Crosse, WI-MN (WI)	523,367	276,146	*734,519*	*577,144*
Oshkosh, WI	456,753	282,563	*641,030*	*590,554*
Racine, WI	1,018,213	621,866	*1,429,010*	*1,299,697*
Round Lake Beach-McHenry, IL-WI (WI)	382	99	*536*	*206*
Sheboygan, WI	430,344	238,772	*603,965*	*499,033*
Wausau, WI	319,667	187,716	*448,636*	*392,326*
WYOMING:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$718,088	461,199	*$1,007,800*	*$963,904*
Casper, WY	329,405	247,399	*462,303*	*517,063*
Cheyenne, WY	388,683	213,800	*545,497*	*446,841*
TOTAL	$181,182,511	$92,949,803	*$254,292,585*	*$194,264,640*

TABLE 3

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS, SECTION 5311(b) RURAL TRANSIT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (RTAP) ALLOCATIONS, AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5311 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 RTAP ALLOCATION	ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS SECTION 5311 APPORTIONMENT	ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS RTAP ALLOCATION
Alabama	$2,652,238	$97,295	$3,671,980	$171,702
Alaska	395,506	57,053	547,571	68,148
America Samoa	56,372	11,005	78,046	12,587
Arizona	1,216,348	71,690	1,684,014	105,814
Arkansas	2,120,354	87,810	2,935,595	147,296
California	5,175,093	142,282	7,164,831	287,468
Colorado	1,104,676	69,699	1,529,405	100,690
Connecticut	1,002,045	67,868	1,387,315	95,981
Delaware	249,986	54,458	346,102	61,471
Florida	3,326,778	109,323	4,605,870	202,655
Georgia	3,877,855	119,150	5,368,825	227,942
Guam	160,478	12,862	222,179	17,364
Hawaii	435,230	57,761	602,569	69,971
Idaho	878,064	65,658	1,215,665	90,291
Illinois	3,589,344	113,923	4,925,597	213,252
Indiana	3,436,672	111,283	4,758,015	207,698
Iowa	2,210,501	89,418	3,060,402	151,433
Kansas	1,758,384	81,356	2,434,453	130,686
Kentucky	2,902,708	101,761	4,018,751	183,196
Louisiana	2,400,749	92,810	3,323,798	160,162
Maine	1,158,455	70,658	1,603,862	103,158
Maryland	1,446,276	75,790	2,002,345	116,365
Massachusetts	1,549,968	77,639	2,145,905	121,123
Michigan	4,197,578	124,851	5,811,478	242,613
Minnesota	2,415,464	93,073	3,344,170	160,838
Mississippi	2,357,179	92,033	3,263,476	158,163
Missouri	2,813,393	100,168	3,895,097	179,097
Montana	711,301	62,684	984,784	82,639
Nebraska	1,073,263	69,138	1,485,915	99,248
Nevada	350,404	56,248	485,129	66,079
New Hampshire	927,778	66,544	1,284,493	92,573
New Jersey	1,326,526	73,655	1,836,553	110,870
New Mexico	1,042,850	68,596	1,443,809	97,853
New York	4,669,530	133,267	6,464,887	264,269
North Carolina	4,960,420	138,454	6,867,620	277,617
North Dakota	526,039	59,380	728,292	74,138
Northern Marianas	52,240	10,932	72,326	12,397
Ohio	5,050,053	140,053	6,991,715	281,730
Oklahoma	2,190,596	88,980	2,988,886	149,062
Oregon	1,714,142	80,567	2,373,202	128,656
Pennsylvania	5,633,387	150,455	7,799,331	308,498
Puerto Rico	1,683,433	80,019	2,330,686	127,247
Rhode Island	215,650	53,845	298,565	59,895
South Carolina	2,482,715	94,272	3,437,278	163,924
South Dakota	641,200	61,434	887,731	79,423
Tennessee	3,204,902	107,150	4,437,133	197,062
Texas	6,766,441	170,658	9,368,019	360,492
Utah	486,065	58,668	672,949	72,304
Vermont	573,288	60,223	793,708	76,306
Virgin Islands	122,703	12,188	169,880	15,630
Virginia	2,841,456	100,669	3,933,949	180,385
Washington	1,990,972	85,503	2,756,468	141,359
West Virginia	1,692,900	80,188	2,343,792	127,682
Wisconsin	2,925,133	102,161	4,049,799	184,225
Wyoming	409,113	57,295	566,410	68,773
TOTAL	$111,152,194	$4,571,903	$153,800,625	$7,687,500

TABLE 4

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5310 ELDERLY AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5310 APPORTIONMENT	ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS SECTION 5310
Alabama	$895,886	$1,188,857
Alaska	170,310	187,529
America Samoa	51,784	52,462
Arizona	793,996	1,048,244
Arkansas	636,433	830,799
California	4,699,994	6,438,691
Colorado	623,654	813,164
Connecticut	763,496	931,731
Delaware	239,377	282,845
District of Columbia	237,859	280,750
Florida	3,182,846	4,344,961
Georgia	1,151,384	1,541,455
Guam	130,934	133,189
Hawaii	295,052	359,680
Idaho	301,135	368,074
Illinois	2,069,766	2,808,862
Indiana	1,102,462	1,473,940
Iowa	681,581	893,107
Kansas	577,019	748,806
Kentucky	860,030	1,139,374
Louisiana	862,700	1,143,058
Maine	367,816	460,097
Maryland	866,616	1,148,462
Massachusetts	1,232,927	1,653,988
Michigan	1,775,854	2,403,250
Minnesota	878,344	1,164,648
Mississippi	619,295	807,149
Missouri	1,117,527	1,494,731
Montana	279,152	337,737
Nebraska	417,081	528,084
Nevada	319,191	392,992
New Hampshire	303,464	371,288
New Jersey	1,473,234	1,985,622
New Mexico	371,002	464,494
New York	3,367,982	4,600,457
North Carolina	1,304,673	1,753,000
North Dakota	242,798	287,567
Northern Marianas	51,629	52,249
Ohio	2,158,526	2,931,355
Oklahoma	746,937	983,300
Oregon	696,866	914,200
Pennsylvania	2,581,056	3,514,464
Puerto Rico	662,858	867,267
Rhode Island	331,207	409,574
South Carolina	723,158	950,484
South Dakota	259,417	310,501
Tennessee	1,051,541	1,403,667
Texas	2,664,541	3,629,678
Utah	348,101	432,889
Vermont	220,476	256,762
Virgin Islands	132,534	135,397
Virginia	1,092,517	1,460,215
Washington	983,413	1,309,647
West Virginia	537,787	694,663
Wisconsin	1,003,285	1,337,072
Wyoming	192,733	218,474
TOTAL	$51,703,234	$68,675,000

TABLE 5

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(A) FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

AREA	FY 1996 SECTION 5309 (m) (1) (A) APPORTIONMENT	*ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS SECTION 5309(m)(1)(A)*
AZ Phoenix	$430,648	*$737,988*
CA Los Angeles	6,615,338	*10,884,462*
CA Sacramento	767,811	*1,226,898*
CA San Diego	1,593,503	*2,507,902*
CA San Francisco	43,212,203	*53,887,831*
CA San Jose	3,065,766	*5,117,792*
CO Denver	348,697	*564,945*
CT Hartford	394,463	*668,180*
CT Southwestern Connecticut	30,625,453	*33,909,183*
DE Wilmington	249,238	*415,917*
DC Washington	13,984,659	*21,759,041*
FL Ft. Lauderdale	904,437	*1,507,903*
FL Jacksonville	28,705	*45,514*
FL Miami	2,536,010	*3,999,325*
FL West Palm Beach	693,955	*1,149,236*
GA Atlanta	5,798,258	*8,821,106*
HI Honolulu	198,564	*344,614*
IL Chicago/Northwestern Indiana	93,730,447	*111,641,249*
LA New Orleans	1,970,462	*2,245,579*
MD Baltimore	2,199,246	*3,464,153*
MD Baltimore Commuter Rail	11,265,859	*14,538,404*
MA Boston	46,806,426	*55,848,740*
MA Lawrence-Haverhill	379,171	*632,251*
MI Detroit	146,476	*224,810*
MN Minneapolis	1,038,597	*1,703,063*
MO Kansas City	15,859	*26,846*
MO St. Louis	779,988	*1,241,800*
NJ Northeastern New Jersey	59,571,625	*69,837,170*
NJ Trenton	444,762	*679,835*
NY Buffalo	333,695	*525,524*
NY New York	226,842,214	*286,244,341*
OH Cleveland	10,195,655	*10,980,941*
OH Dayton	1,302,116	*2,189,873*
PA Philadelphia/Southern New Jersey	68,178,208	*78,754,380*
PA Pittsburgh	14,520,301	*15,502,563*
PR San Juan	672,231	*1,077,415*
OR Portland	817,199	*1,289,131*
RI Providence	779,570	*1,267,260*
TN Chattanooga	16,174	*27,093*
TX Dallas	231,097	*385,211*
TX Houston	1,752,065	*2,892,435*
VA Norfolk	357,986	*610,399*
WA Seattle	4,868,138	*8,050,515*
WA Tacoma	149,557	*256,172*
WI Madison	192,168	*315,010*
TOTAL	$661,005,000	*$820,000,000*

TABLE 6

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(B) NEW START ALLOCATIONS

	PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION	FY 1996 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(B) ALLOCATION	PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED ALLOCATION	TOTAL AVAILABLE
CA	Los Angeles- Metrorail- MOS-3	$83,978,341	$0	$83,978,341
CA	Los Angeles - San Diego (LOSSAN)	8,397,834	0	8,397,834
CA	Orange County Transitway	0	20,346,250	20,346,250
CA	Sacramento- LRT Extension	1,975,961	0	1,975,961
CA	San Diego Mid-Coast Extension	0	948,000	948,000
CA	San Francisco- BART Extension to SFO/Tasman	9,879,805	33,235,246	43,115,051
CA	San Jose to Gilroy Commuter Rail	0	4,000,000	4,000,000
FL	Fort Lauderdale- Tri-County Commuter Rail	9,879,805	0	9,879,805
FL	Jacksonville- Automated Skyway Express	9,603,788	0	9,603,788
FL	Miami- North 27th Avenue	1,975,961	0	1,975,961
FL	Tampa-Lakeland Commuter Rail	493,990	496,250	990,240
GA	Atlanta- North Springs	41,900,252	0	41,900,252
IL	Chicago- Wisconsin Central Commuter Rail	14,226,919	0	14,226,919
LA	New Orleans- Canal Street Corridor	4,939,902	7,734,800	12,674,702
MA	Boston- South Boston Piers (MOS-2) Transitway	19,818,888	0	19,818,888
MA	New Bedford-Fall River Commuter Rail	0	744,375	744,375
MD	Baltimore- Central Corridor Extensions	15,130,921	0	15,130,921
MD	MARC- Commuter Rail	9,879,805	0	9,879,805
MI	Detroit LRT Project	0	5,110,000	5,110,000
MN	Twin Cities Central Corridor	0	4,962,500	4,962,500
MO	St. Louis- Metrolink LRT Project	12,349,756	5,955,000	18,304,756
NJ	Urban Core (Secaucus)	79,285,433	0	79,285,433
NJ	Burlington-Gloucester Line	0	1,488,750	1,488,750
NJ	Hawthorne-Warwick Commuter Rail	0	21,559,000	21,559,000
NY	New York- Queens Connection	125,201,949	0	125,201,949
NY	New York- Staten Island-Midtown Ferry	0	375,000	375,000
NY	New York- Whitehall Ferry Terminal	2,469,951	2,481,250	4,951,201
OH	Cincinnati- Northeast/Northern Kentucky Rail	987,981	0	987,981
OH	Cleveland- Dual Hub	0	4,023,030	4,023,030
OH	Canton-Akron-Cleveland [Northeast Ohio] Com	4,198,917	0	4,198,917
OR	Portland- Westside LRT	128,575,779	0	128,575,779
PA	Pittsburgh- Busway	22,357,998	0	22,357,998
PR	San Juan- Tren Urbano	7,409,854	0	7,409,854
TN	Memphis- Regional Rail Plan	1,234,976	0	1,234,976
TX	Dallas- Ft. Worth RAILTRAN	5,927,883	2,977,500	8,905,383
TX	Dallas- North Central LRT Ext.	2,963,941	1,281,250	4,245,191
TX	Dallas- South Oak Cliff Line	16,737,377	0	16,737,377
TX	Houston- Regional Bus Plan	22,357,998	0	22,357,998
UT	Salt Lake City- South LRT	9,642,195	0	9,642,195
VT	Burlington-Charlotte Commuter Rail	5,582,090	0	5,582,090
WI	Milwaukee- East-West Corridor	0	3,000,000	3,000,000
WA	Seattle-Tacoma Commuter Rail	0	3,952,375	3,952,375
WA	Seattle-Tacoma Commuter Rail	0	0	0
	TOTAL	$679,366,250	$124,670,576	$804,036,826

TABLE 7

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	PURPOSE	SUB-ALLOCATION	FY 1996 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) ALLOCATION
AR Statewide	Buses and intermodal and bus related facilities		$6,153,500
Arkansas Hwy. & Transp. Dept.		$496,250	
Central Arkansas Transit		794,000	
Hot Springs Transit		397,000	
Pine Bluff Transit		198,500	
South Central Arkansas		297,750	
Southeast Arkansas Transit		794,000	
University of Arkansas		3,176,000	
CA Coachella Valley	Sunline bus facility		496,250
CA Long Beach	Bus replacement and parts		1,488,850
CA Los Angeles	Gateway intermodal center		7,940,000
CA San Diego	San Ysidro intermodal center		4,962,500
CA San Francisco	Buses		6,689,450
CA San Francisco	Bart ADA compliance/paratransit		2,213,375
CA San Gabriel Valley	Foothill bus facilities		9,676,875
CA San Joaquin	RTD bus replacement		5,240,400
CA Santa Cruz	Bus facility		1,488,750
CA Sonoma County	Park and ride facility		1,240,625
CA Ventura County	Bus facility		595,500
CA Yolo County	Buses		1,488,750
CO Fort Collins and Greeley	Buses		1,240,625
CT Norwich	Intermodal center		1,488,750
DE State	Buses		1,339,875
FL Metropolitan Dade County	Buses		9,925,000
FL Orlando Lynx	Buses and bus operating facility		4,218,125
FL Palm Beach County	Bus facilities		1,985,000
FL Volusia County	Buses and park and ride facility		1,240,625
GA Atlanta	Buses		3,721,875
HI Honolulu, Oahu	Kuakini medical center parking facility		3,970,000
IL Statewide*	Replacement buses and transit facilities		16,723,625 *
Champaign-Urbana	Replacement buses	1,573,113	
Chicago Transit Authority	New bus communications system	5,955,000	
Decatur	Replacement buses	524,040	
Madison County	Replacement buses	2,272,825	
Pace	Replacement buses	1,652,513	
Peoria	Transfer facility	714,600	
Quincy	Replacement buses	524,040	
Rockford	Replacement buses	524,040	
Rock Island	Replacement buses	873,400	
South Central MTD	Bus facilities	794,000	
Springfield	Replacement buses	1,064,953	
IN State	Buses and bus facilities		6,451,250
IN Gary and Hammond	Buses		258,050
IN South Bend	Intermodal facility		2,481,250
IA State	Buses, equipment and facilities		4,247,900
IA Ames, Marshalltown, Ottumwa	Bus and bus facilities		2,332,375
IA Cedar Rapids	Hybrid electric bus consortium		1,191,000
IA Waterloo	Intermodal bus facility		664,975
KY Lexington	Buses		992,500
LA New Orleans	Buses		5,955,000
LA New Orleans	Bus facility		2,977,500
LA Saint Bernard Parish	Intermodal facility		1,488,750
MD MTA	Buses		12,902,500
MA Worchester	Intermodal Center		1,985,000

TABLE 7

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	PURPOSE	SUB-ALLOCATION	FY 1996 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) ALLOCATION
MI Statewide	ISTEA set-aside requirement		9,925,000
Flint	Buses and bus facilities	2,999,831	
Grand Rapids	Buses and bus facilities	2,999,831	
Lansing	Intermodal facility	925,507	
Suburban Mobility Auth. for Reg. Transp		2,999,831	
MI Lansing	Intermodal transportation center		2,074,325
MN MTC Minnesota	Articulated buses		7,443,750
MO State	Buses and bus facilities		6,947,500
MO Kansas City	Union Station intermodal		6,451,250
MO St. Louis	Metrolink bus purchase		3,473,750
NV Clark County	Buses and bus facility		16,872,500
NJ Garden State Parkway	Park-n-ride at Interchange 165		1,141,375
NJ Hamilton Township	Intermodal facility/bus maintenance		12,406,250
NY Albany	Buses		4,962,500
NY Buffalo	Transit station		496,250
NY Long Island	Buses, paratransit, and equipment		1,488,750
NY New Rochelle	Intermodal facility		744,375
NY New York City	Natural gas buses/fueling station		4,962,500
NY Rensselaer	Intermodal station		7,443,750
NY Rochester-Genessee	Buses		$694,750
NY Syracuse	Buses		992,500
NY Syracuse	Intermodal terminal		992,500
NY Utica	Buses		2,977,500
NY Westchester County	Bus facility		2,233,125
NC State	Buses and bus facilities		4,962,500
OH State	Buses		14,887,500
OH Cleveland	Triskett bus facility		1,240,625
OR Eugene Lane Transit District	Radio system		645,125
OR Wilsonville	Transit vehicles		248,125
PA Allegheny County	Busway system		8,932,500
PA Altoona	ISTEA set-aside requirement		992,500
PA Beaver County	Bus facility		2,431,625
PA Erie	Intermodal complex		3,970,000
PA North Philadelphia	Intermodal center		2,977,500
PA Philadelphia	Buses		1,488,750
PA Philadelphia	Chestnut Street/alternative fueled vehicles		992,500
PA Philadelphia	Lift equipped buses		7,443,750
TN Nashville	Electric buses		297,750
TX Corpus Christi	Buses, dispatching system and facilities		2,431,625
TX El Paso	Bus equipment		5,161,000
UT Utah Transit Authority	Buses		1,736,875
VA Richmond	Downtown intermodal station		4,962,500
VT State	Buses and bus facilities		2,977,500
VT Marble Valley	Bus upgrades		992,500
WA Everett	Intermodal center		3,473,750
WA Pierce County	Tacoma Dome station		4,962,500
WA King County/Seattle	Seattle metro bus purchase		6,203,125
WA Seattle	Metro/King County multimodal		1,985,000
WI State	Buses		9,925,000
TOTAL			$330,502,500

* Of the total amount allocated to the State of Illinois, $251,101 is not included in the suballocations.

TABLE 7A

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED SECTION 5309 (m) (1) (C) BUS ALLOCATIONS

	STATE/AREA	PRIOR YEAR SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) UNOBLIGATED ALLOCATION
FY 1995		
	AK Marine Highway System	$2,000,000
	AR Little Rock	1,000,000
	CA San Francisco	3,878,288
	CA Santa Cruz	1,000,000
	CO Eagle County	1,000,000
	CT Norwich	2,000,000
	FL Orlando	828,400
	HI Kauai	1,500,000
	IL Statewide	4,724,000
	IA Cedar Rapids	3,000,000
	LA New Orleans	2,000,000
	MI Detroit	4,000,000
	MI Southeast (SMART)	9,000,000
	MO Kansas City	5,000,000
	NJ Camden	150,000
	NM Albuquerque	3,750,000
	NY Bronx	1,000,000
	NY Buffalo	800,000
	NC State	3,600,000
	OR Albany	306,000
	OR Salem	1,000,000
	PA Philadelphia	2,500,000
	TX El Paso	9,000,000
	VA Northern Virginia-Dulles	950,000
	WA Edmonds	400,000
	WI Milwaukee	1,000,000
FY 1994		
	AR Little Rock	2,100,000
	CA Lake Tahoe	1,944,000
	CA San Francisco	956,400
	CA Santa Barbara	3,000,000
	HI Kauai	1,510,000
	IL Statewide	1,857,600
	IN South Bend	3,428
	KS Topeka	768,000
	ME Statewide	433,612
	MD Silver Spring	1,500,000
	NJ Camden	800,000
	NM Albuquerque	1,750,000
	OR Salem	3,800,000
	PA Philadelphia	1,000,000
	PR San Juan	2,500,000
	TX El Paso	3,057,902
FY 1992		
	AR Eureka Springs	32,100
	CA San Francisco	1,250,000
	TOTAL	$93,649,730

TABLE 8

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1996 SECTION 5303 METROPOLITAN PLANNING PROGRAM AND SECTION 5313(b) STATE PLANNING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM APPORTIONMENTS, AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

STATE	FY 1996 SECTION 5303 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1996 SECTION 5313(b) APPORTIONMENT	*ISTEA FY 1996 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5303	*SECTION 5313(b)*
Alabama	$343,637	$90,327	*$606,010*	*$160,124*
Alaska	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
Arizona	615,559	130,387	*1,102,152*	*231,140*
Arkansas	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
California	6,632,289	1,250,167	*11,795,754*	*2,216,212*
Colorado	512,345	116,731	*900,201*	*206,932*
Connecticut	451,330	120,554	*808,806*	*213,709*
Delaware	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
District/Col	211,644	41,250	*373,110*	*73,125*
Florida	2,101,510	499,635	*3,772,728*	*885,716*
Georgia	751,237	160,071	*1,335,556*	*283,763*
Hawaii	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
Idaho	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
Illinois	2,305,044	416,231	*4,042,806*	*737,864*
Indiana	564,428	132,187	*981,466*	*234,332*
Iowa	175,738	46,276	*310,471*	*82,035*
Kansas	202,032	50,005	*358,914*	*88,645*
Kentucky	245,039	62,683	*429,910*	*111,119*
Louisiana	438,000	109,377	*742,908*	*193,895*
Maine	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
Maryland	920,920	175,819	*1,606,285*	*311,679*
Massachusetts	1,115,798	232,221	*1,959,166*	*411,665*
Michigan	1,470,219	285,343	*2,523,938*	*505,835*
Minnesota	584,145	116,393	*1,024,858*	*206,332*
Mississippi	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
Missouri	695,407	136,609	*1,133,113*	*242,170*
Montana	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
Nebraska	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
Nevada	170,271	44,727	*300,077*	*79,289*
New Hampshire	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
New Jersey	1,949,100	325,454	*3,429,974*	*576,941*
New Mexico	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
New York	3,962,781	692,977	*6,965,133*	*1,228,460*
North Carolina	461,482	123,360	*827,635*	*218,684*
North Dakota	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
Ohio	1,371,909	326,801	*2,384,316*	*579,328*
Oklahoma	251,281	66,487	*446,065*	*117,863*
Oregon	285,601	69,713	*501,053*	*123,582*
Pennsylvania	1,909,473	353,827	*3,092,394*	*627,238*
Rhode Island	165,658	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
South Carolina	261,905	70,041	*469,910*	*124,163*
South Dakota	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
Tennessee	412,851	108,885	*730,521*	*193,024*
Texas	2,652,169	558,280	*4,701,219*	*989,679*
Utah	241,365	64,779	*434,606*	*114,835*
Vermont	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
Virginia	864,477	188,008	*1,546,353*	*333,286*
Washington	695,722	157,816	*1,232,499*	*279,765*
West Virginia	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
Wisconsin	557,792	120,997	*862,913*	*214,494*
Wyoming	158,000	41,250	*276,750*	*73,125*
Puerto Rico	421,842	104,332	*749,930*	*184,952*
TOTAL	$39,500,000	$8,250,000	*$69,187,500*	*$14,625,000*

TABLE 9

Federal Transit Administration - Unit Values of Data
Fiscal Year 1996 Formula Grant Apportionments

Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program - Bus Tier

Urbanized Areas Over 1,000,000:

Population	$1.99324342
Population x Density	$0.00051123
Bus Revenue Vehicle Mile	$0.28862414

Urbanized Areas Under 1,000,000:

Population	$1.80134018
Population x Density	$0.00079330
Bus Revenue Vehicle Mile	$0.37097557

Bus Incentive (PM denotes Passenger Mile):

Bus PM x Bus PM = Operating Cost	$0.00320813

Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program - Fixed Guideway Tier

Fixed Guideway Revenue Vehicle Mile	$0.39174360
Fixed Guideway Route Mile	$23,272
- Commuter Rail Floor	$4,075,663

Fixed Guideway Incentive:

Fixed Guideway PM x Fixed Guideway PM= Operating Cost	$0.00040064
- Commuter Rail Incentive Floor	$187,137

Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program - Areas Under 200,000

Population	$3.25726661
Population x Density	$0.00162770

Section 5311 Nonurbanized Area Formula Program

Areas Under 50,000

Population	$1.20591027

Section 5309(m)(1)(A) Capital Program - Fixed Guideway Modernization

	Tier 3	Tier 4
Legislatively Specified Areas:		All Areas:
Revenue Vehicle Mile	$0.0306232	$0.0692831
Route Mile	$2,120.67	$4,042.86
Other Areas:		
Revenue Vehicle Mile	$0.17216962	
Route Mile	$5,323.40	

[FR Doc. 95–28803 Filed 11–21–95; 11:07 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–C