DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

FTA Fiscal Year 1998 Apportionments, Allocations and Program Information

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Transportation (DOT) and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998 (Pub. L. 105–66), was signed into law by President Clinton on October 27, 1997. Pending further consideration of a multi-year authorization next Spring, Congress has passed a six-month extension of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), known as the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 1997. This act, signed by President Clinton on December 1, 1997, provides additional funding authorizations for the transit, highway, and highway safety programs for the period October 1, 1997, through March 31, 1998. The previous authorizations, under ISTEA, were effective through September 30, 1997.

Funding for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is derived from two sources: the general funds of the Treasury and motor fuel taxes deposited into the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund. The 1998 DOT Appropriations Act provides $240,000,000 in general funds for the formula programs under 49 U.S.C. Sections 5307, 5311, and 5310. It also provides general funds in the amount of $52,250,000 for the transit planning and research programs of 49 U.S.C. Sections 5303, 5313(b), and 5311(b). The Surface Transportation Extension Act of 1997 provides an additional $1,328,400,000 for formula programs in the form of contract authority from the Mass Transit Account for a total of $1,568,400,000 for the formula programs.

The capital programs are funded exclusively with trust funded resources. The Surface Transportation Extension Act of 1997 provides $1,131,600,000 in new contract authority, consisting of $452,640,000 each for the Fixed Guideway Modernization and New Starts categories and $226,320,000 for the Bus category. The obligational authority for New Starts when combined with $392,000,000 in unobligated contract authority for New Starts remaining under ISTEA exceeds the obligation limitation in the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act of $800,000,000. Therefore, this notice contains allocations to make $800,000,000 for New Starts available for obligation.

This Notice contains (1) a listing of the full amount of the fiscal year 1998 apportionments and allocations for the formula, capital, and transit planning and research programs, including both trust funds and general funds, based on the 1998 Appropriations Act and Federal transit laws; and (2) a listing of apportionments and allocations based on the fiscal year 1998 available funds for the Urbanized Area Formula Program, the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program, the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program, the Rural Transit Assistance Program, the Capital Program, the Metropolitan Planning Program, and the State Planning and Research program, in accordance with the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act and the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 1997. As soon as authorizing legislation covering the remainder of the fiscal year, April 1, 1998, through September 30, 1998, has been enacted, the entire apportionment will be made available. If the reauthorization act affects the distribution of funds within the programs, FTA will republish the apportionments and allocations in their entirety, taking the provisions of both the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act and the reauthorization act into consideration. In any case, even though the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 1997 provides contract authorizations for the period October 1, 1997, through March 31, 1998, funding is available to grantees throughout the typical period of availability for each specific program. For example, Urbanized Area Formula Program funding is available to the grantees for fiscal year 1998 plus the next three years through fiscal year 2001. In the interim, grantees are able to obligate the fiscal year 1998 available apportionments, allocations, and carryover balances remaining under the various FTA formula and capital programs.

Also included in this Notice is a listing of prior year unobligated earmarks for the Section 5309 New Starts and Bus Programs as in previous year notices. In addition, the FTA policy regarding pre-award authority to incur project costs, as well as other pertinent program information, is included.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The appropriate FTA Regional Administrator for grant-specific information and issues; Patricia Levine, Director, Office of Resource Management and State Programs, (202) 366–2053, for general information about the Urbanized Area Formula Program, the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program, the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program, the Rural Transit Assistance Program, or the Capital Program; or Robert Stout, Director, Office of Planning Operations, (202) 366–6385, for general information concerning the Metropolitan Planning Program and the State Planning and Research Program.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND
II. OVERVIEW OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANT PROGRAMS
A. General
B. Funds Available for Obligation
C. Project Management Oversight
III. EXPANDED DEFINITION OF CAPITAL
A. Preventive Maintenance
B. Operating Assistance for Urbanized Areas Less Than 200,000 In Population
IV. DEPARTMENTAL INITIATIVES
A. FTA Home Page on the Internet
B. State Infrastructure Banks
V. SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM
A. Total Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments
B. Data Used for Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments
C. Adjustments for Energy and Operating Efficiencies
D. Urbanized Area Formula Fiscal Year 1998 Apportionments to Governors
E. Urbanized Area Formula Operating Assistance Limitations
F. Statewide Operating Assistance Limitations
G. Designated Transportation Management Areas
H. Urbanized Area Formula Funds Used for Highway Purposes
VI. SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM AND SECTION 5311(b) RURAL TRANSIT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (RTAP)
A. Nonurbanized Area Formula Program
B. Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP)
VII. SECTION 5310 ELDERLY AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES PROGRAM
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. SECTION 5309 CAPITAL PROGRAM
A. Fixed Guideway Modernization
B. New Starts
C. Bus
X. UNIT VALUES OF DATA FOR SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM, SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM, AND SECTION 5309 FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION PROGRAM
XI. SECTION 5303 METROPOLITAN PLANNING PROGRAM AND SECTION 5313(b) STATE PLANNING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM

A. Metropolitan Planning Program
B. State Planning and Research Program
C. Data Used for Metropolitan Planning Apportionments and State Planning and Research Apportionments
D. FHWA Metropolitan Planning Program and State Planning and Research Program
E. Local Match Waiver for Job Access Planning Activities
F. Planning Emphasis Areas
G. Federal Planning Certification Reviews
H. Consolidated Planning Grant
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, Planning and Other Requirements
XIV. RAIL FIXED GUIDEWAY SYSTEMS: STATE SAFETY OVERSIGHT (49 CFR PART 659)
XV. ELECTRONIC GRANT MAKING AND MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES
A. Background
B. Graphical User Interface
C. Fiscal Year 1998 Emphasis
XVI. 1998 ANNUAL LIST OF CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES
XVII. QUARTERLY APPROVAL OF GRANTS
XVIII. GRANT APPLICATION PROCEDURES
TABLES
1. FTA FY 1998 APPROPRIATIONS AND FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR GRANT PROGRAMS
2. FTA FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS
3. FTA FY 1998 SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS, AND SECTION 5311(b) RURAL TRANSIT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (RTAP) ALLOCATIONS
4. FTA FY 1998 Section 5310 elderly and persons with disabilities apportionments
5. FTA FY 1998 sectuib 5309 fixed guideway modernization apportionments
6. FTA FY 1998 section 5309 new start allocations
6A. FTA prior year unobligated section 5309 new start allocations
7. FTA FY 1998 section 5309 bus allocations
7A. FTA prior year unobligated section 5309 BUS allocations
8. FTA FY 1998 section 5303 metropolitan planning apportionments and section 5313(b) state planning and research apportionments
9. Unit values of data—FTA FY 1998 formula grant apportionments

I. 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, operating and administrative 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 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 1998 DOT Appropriations Act and Bus fund allocations in the accompanying Conference Report are also included in this Notice.

II. Overview of Appropriations for Grant Programs

A. General

In fiscal year 1998, the appropriation and obligation limitation for the Urbanized Area Formula Program and the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program is $2,437,780,611. Of this amount, 94.50 percent ($2,303,702,677) would be available to the Urbanized Area Formula Program, and 5.50 percent ($134,077,934) would be 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); $62,219,389 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 $2,000,000,000 in obligation limitation for the Capital Program. Of the Capital Program amount, $800,000,000 is for Fixed Guideway Modernization, $800,000,000 is for New Starts, and $400,000,000 is for Bus.

Table 1 displays the amounts of obligation limitation and appropriations for these programs, including adjustments and final apportionment and allocation amounts. Also included is a listing of amounts for the formula and capital programs based on the fiscal year 1998 available funds. The following text provides a narrative explanation for the funding levels and other factors affecting these apportionments and allocations.

B. Funds Available for Obligation

Because the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 1997 only provides contract authority through March 31, 1998, FTA is publishing both (1) the apportionment and allocation tables that contain the full program levels in the DOT Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1998; and (2) the apportionments and allocations based on the fiscal year 1998 available funds for the various programs. The column titled ''FY 1998 Apportionment'' includes both trust funds (contract authority) and general funds, and does not represent the amount that is actually available for obligation at this time. Rather, it reflects the total dollar amount of obligation limitation and appropriations in the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act, once a full year contract authority is made available. Only funds shown in the column titled ''FY 1998 Available Apportionment,'' may be obligated pending further reauthorizing legislation.

C. Project Management Oversight

49 U.S.C. Section 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.

The 1998 DOT Appropriations Act states ''That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the execution of contracts under section 5327(c) of title 49, United States Code, in an aggregate amount that exceeds $15,000,000.'' Accordingly, the Project Management Oversight (PMO) amount takes into account both the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act and Federal transit laws. The obligation limitation and appropriations for the Sections 5307, 5311, and 5309 Programs, and the National Capital Transportation Act, as amended, total $4,637,780,611. The higher amount as authorized under Federal transit laws was reduced to the $15,000,000 required by the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act by taking a pro rata reduction across all categories of the four programs. Therefore, .32343056 of one percent of the funds appropriated within the obligation limitation and appropriation for the Urbanized Area Formula Program; the Nonurbanized

Area Formula Program; the Capital Program; and the National Capital Transportation Act, as amended, for fiscal year 1998, have been reserved for these purposes before apportionment of the funds.

III. Expanded Definition of Capital

A. Preventive Maintenance

Effective for fiscal year 1998, preventive maintenance will be eligible for Federal assistance as a capital expense with a Federal/local share ratio of 80/20 in the FTA formula programs. Thus preventive maintenance is an eligible capital cost under the Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program; the Section 5310 Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program; and the Section 5311 Nonurbanized Area Formula Program. This provision does not apply to the Section 5309 Capital Program. This change implements Section 316 of the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act, in which Congress amended the definition of an eligible capital project under the FTA formula programs to add preventive maintenance.

Since the DOT Appropriations Act covers only Federal fiscal year 1998, this new policy applies only to funds within the obligation limitation and appropriation in the DOT Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1998. It does not apply to carryover funds apportioned in previous years.

Preventive maintenance costs for fiscal year 1998 are defined as all maintenance costs. For general guidance as to the definition of eligible maintenance costs, the grantee should refer to the definition of maintenance in the most recent National Transit Database (NTD) reporting manual. During fiscal year 1998 a grantee may continue to request assistance for capital expenses under the FTA policies governing associated capital maintenance items (spare parts), maintenance of vehicles leased under contract, and vehicle overhauls; or a grantee may choose to capture all maintenance under preventive maintenance, and also may continue to request operating assistance within the grantee's operating assistance limitation at the 50/50 match share. However, a grantee may not count the same costs twice. Preventive maintenance costs eligible for FTA capital assistance from fiscal year 1998 appropriations are those costs incurred by a grantee within a local fiscal year ending during calendar 1997, or thereafter. If a grantee purchases service instead of operating service directly, and maintenance is included in the contract for that purchased service, then the grantee may apply for capital assistance under preventive maintenance for the actual maintenance costs of the purchased service.

For accounting purposes, the grantee is cautioned not to confuse the fact that an item generally considered to be an operating expense is now eligible for FTA capital assistance. Generally accepted accounting principles and the grantee's accounting system determine those costs that are to be accounted for as operating costs. The National Transit Database Reporting System (NTD) follows generally accepted accounting principles, and so a grantee reporting to the NTD must report the operating costs the grantee has incurred as operating regardless of grant eligibility as capital. Nevertheless, under provisions of the fiscal year 1998 Appropriations Act, some of those operating costs, while continuing to be accounted for as operating costs in the grantee's accounting records, are now eligible for FTA capital assistance.

B. Operating Assistance for Urbanized Areas Less Than 200,000 in Population

Section 316 of the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act further amended the definition of a capital project to include ''financing the operating costs of equipment and facilities used in mass transportation in urbanized areas with a population of less than 200,000''.

A grantee in an urbanized area of less than 200,000 in population may elect to employ this amended definition of capital and request 80 percent Federal assistance for funding net operating expenses, or the grantee may choose to use the fiscal year 1998 operating assistance limitations published in this notice and apply for operating assistance at the 50 percent Federal share. If operating expenses are applied for as capital costs, the operating assistance limitation does not apply. The net operating expenses eligible for capital funding under the amended definition of capital will be determined according to guidance in FTA Circular 9030.1B, Appendix D. As for preventive maintenance, only fiscal year 1998 funds may be used for operating assistance as a capital cost.

IV. Departmental Initiatives

A. FTA Home Page on the Internet

FTA provides extended customer service by making available transit information on the FTA Home Page web site, including this Apportionment Notice. Also posted on the web site are FTA program circulars: C9030.1B, Urbanized Area Formula Program: Grant Application Instructions, dated October 10, 1996; C9040.1D, Nonurbanized Area Formula Program Guidance and Grant Application Instructions, dated May 8, 1997; C9070.1D, Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program Guidance and Application Instructions, dated October 22, 1997; C9300.1, Capital Program: Grant Application Instructions, dated September 29, 1995; 4220.1D, Third Party Contracting Requirements, dated April 15, 1996; C5010.1B, Grant Management Guidelines, dated September 7, 1995; and C8100.1B, Program Guidance and Application Instructions for Metropolitan Planning Program Grants, dated October 25, 1996. The fiscal year 1998 Annual List of Certifications and Assurances is also posted on the FTA web site. Other documents on the FTA web site of particular interest to public transit providers and users include the 1996 Statistical Summaries of FTA Grant Assistance Programs, and the National Transit Database Profiles.

The FTA Home Page may be accessed at: http://www.fta.dot.gov. FTA circulars and other guidance are at: http://www.fta.dot.gov/program.

Grantees should check our web site frequently to keep up to date on new postings.

B. State Infrastructure Banks

The State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) pilot program was authorized in the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995. It allows the creation of state-level institutions that can use Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and FTA funds to make loans and loan guarantees (and other forms of credit enhancement) to transit and highway projects. The SIBs may earn interest on deposits of Federal funds, and they may charge below-market interest rates on long-term loans.

In 1996, ten (10) states were designated to establish SIBs. On June 19, 1997, an additional 29 states were designated to participate in the SIB Pilot Program. The Secretary of Transportation has awarded $150,000,000 in capitalization funding to these 29 designated states.

V. Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program

A. Total Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments

In addition to the appropriated fiscal year 1998 Urbanized Area Formula funds of $2,303,702,677, the apportionment also includes $7,162,381 in deobligated funds 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 .32343056 of one percent for PMO is reserved ($7,450,879), the amount appropriated for this program is $2,296,251,798. The funds to be reapportioned, described in the previous paragraph, have then been added. Thus, the total amount apportioned for this program is $2,303,414,179.

Table 2 also shows by urbanized area and state the amount of funds which are currently available. The total of $1,444,234,826 includes $1,441,735,458 in fiscal year 1998 trust funded contract authority and general fund appropriation, $7,162,381 in deobligated funds from previous years which have become available for reapportionment, minus $4,663,013 for PMO. The available operating assistance limitation in the amount of $150,000,000 is also shown on Table 2.

B. Data Used for Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments

Data from the 1996 NTD (49 U.S.C. 5335) Report Year submitted in late 1996 and early 1997 have been used to calculate the fiscal year 1998 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.

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 1998 Urbanized Area Formula apportionment reflect the amount the recipient would have received without the reductions in mileage.

D. Urbanized Area Formula Fiscal Year 1998 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 G, 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.

E. Urbanized Area Formula Operating Assistance Limitations

The fiscal year 1998 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 1998 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 1996, published by the Department of Labor (DOL), establishes that the calendar year 1996 CPI increase for all urban consumers is 3.3 percent. This increase was applied against the base operating assistance limitation calculated in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5336(d)(2).

These adjustments result in an overall national fiscal year 1998 authorized operating assistance limitation level of $1,178,642,366. However, the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act limits the nationwide availability for operating assistance to a maximum of $150,000,000. Further, it maintains the level of transit operating assistance to urbanized areas of less than 200,000 in population at 75 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 1998 DOT Appropriations Act and Federal transit laws. Therefore, the higher operating assistance limitation as authorized under Federal transit laws ($1,178,642,366) was reduced to the $150,000,000 required by the 1998 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 75 percent of the amount of their fiscal year 1995 level of $123,933,070.

The operating assistance limitation of $85,791 for Flagstaff, Arizona (a newly designated urbanized area under 200,000 in fiscal year 1996), was then added to the amount of the fiscal year 1995 level, thereby increasing the fiscal year 1998 level for these areas to $93,035,594. The remaining $56,964,406 of the $150,000,000 was prorated to urbanized areas above 200,000 in population, as authorized by the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act.

Consistent with the 1998 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.

F. 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.

G. 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. Section 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, 1997, 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 Seventh 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.
Orlando, Florida	Kissimmee, Florida.
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).

H. 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 of 1990 (ADA); 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. Section 5311 Nonurbanized Area Formula Program and Section 5311(b) Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP)

A. Nonurbanized Area Formula Program

The fiscal year 1998 Nonurbanized Area Formula apportionments to the states totaling $134,819,045 are displayed in Table 3. Of the $134,077,934 appropriated, .32343056 of one percent ($433,649) was reserved for PMO. In addition to the current appropriation and obligation limitation, the funds available for apportionment include $1,174,760 in deobligated funds from fiscal years prior to 1996.

Table 3 also shows a state-by-state apportionment of the amount of funds which are currently available. The total of $84,813,897 includes $83,910,529 in fiscal year 1998 trust funded contract authority and general fund appropriation, $1,174,760 in prior year carryover available to be reapportioned, minus $271,392 for PMO.

The population figures used in calculating these apportionments are from the 1990 Census.

The Nonurbanized Formula Program provides capital, operating and administrative assistance for areas less than 50,000 in population. Each state must spend no less than 15 percent of its fiscal year 1998 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 1998 Nonurbanized Area Formula grant applications must reflect this level of programming for intercity bus or include a certification from the Governor.

B. Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP)

The fiscal year 1998 RTAP allocations to the states totaling $4,678,778 are also displayed on Table 3. This amount includes $4,500,000 in fiscal year 1998 appropriated funds, and $178,778 in prior year deobligated funds, which have become available for reallocation for this program.

Table 3 also shows a state-by-state allocation of RTAP funds. RTAP is totally general funded in fiscal year 1998; therefore, the entire appropriated amount of $4,500,000 is currently available plus $178,778 in reapportioned funds.

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 $62,221,661 is apportioned to the states for fiscal year 1998 for the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program. In addition to the fiscal year 1998 appropriation of $62,219,389, the fiscal year 1998 apportionment also includes $2,272 in prior year unobligated funds which have become available for reapportionment for the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program. Table 4 shows each state's apportionment.

Table 4 also shows a state-by-state allocation of the amount of funds which are currently available. The total of $42,756,285 includes $42,754,013 in fiscal year 1998 trust funded contract authority and general fund appropriation, and $2,272 in reapportioned funds.

The formula for apportioning these funds uses 1990 Census population data for persons aged 65 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.

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 metropolitan 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, Nonurbanized Area, or Elderly and Persons with Disabilities.

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 10 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. Section 5309 Capital Program

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 1998, there is a $800,000,000 obligation limitation for fixed guideway modernization. After deducting the .32343056 of one percent for oversight ($2,587,445), $797,412,555 would be available for apportionment to the specified urbanized areas for Fixed Guideway Modernization funding. Table 5 displays these apportionments.

Table 5 also shows a state and area allocation of the fiscal year 1998 funds which are currently available. The total of $451,176,024 includes $452,640,000 in fiscal year 1998 trust funded contract authority, minus $1,463,976 for PMO, distributed on a pro rata basis as directed in the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 1997.

Funds apportioned for this section must be used for capital projects to modernize or improve fixed guideway systems. The expanded definition of capital to include preventive maintenance does not apply to the Fixed Guideway Modernization Program.

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 NTD 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 NTD are not included. Urbanized areas should be aware that the formula allocating Fixed Guideway Modernization funds may be changed under a new authorization act.

B. New Starts

The fiscal year 1998 obligation limitation for New Starts is $800,000,000.

The Project Management Oversight (PMO) reduction was applied to this amount and subtracted on a pro rata basis from all 65 projects specified in the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act. For fiscal year 1998, this amount is $2,587,445. This amount was computed by applying .32343056 of one percent to the obligation limitation. After subtracting this amount from the $800,000,000, a total of $797,412,555 is available for obligation. The final allocation for each of these projects, which also reflects the PMO reduction, is contained in Table 6 of this **Federal Register** notice.

The Surface Transportation Extension Act of 1997 provides $452,640,000 for New Starts. This obligational authority for New Starts when combined with $392,000,000 in unobligated contract authority for New Starts remaining under ISTEA exceeds the obligation limitation in the 1998 Appropriations Act of $800,000,000. Therefore, $800,000,000 minus $2,587,445 for PMO is currently available.

Prior year unobligated appropriations for New Starts in the amount of $299,434,442 remain available for obligation in fiscal year 1998. These allocations are displayed in Table 6A.

C. Bus

The fiscal year 1998 obligation limitation for Bus is $400,000,000. In addition Congress reprogrammed $975,000 in unobligated Bus funds originally appropriated in fiscal year 1995, yielding an overall total of $400,975,000. This entire amount was allocated to projects specified in the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act. After deducting the .32343056 of one percent for oversight ($1,293,722) from the 1998 appropriated amount ($400,000,000), $399,681,278 remains available for projects.

The Conference Report accompanying the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act earmarked all of the fiscal year 1998 Bus funds to specified states or localities for bus and bus-related projects. Where funds were earmarked to states, in most cases, there were additional suballocations to local entities. In Louisiana the suballocation is included in the Conference Report; however, a letter dated October 14, 1997, from Chairman Frank R. Wolf of the House Appropriations Committee clarifies the amount of suballocations within the State. This clarification is reflected in the Bus allocations displayed in Table 7.

The conference report directs the FTA to make available to the state of Michigan for the procurement of buses and bus-related equipment funds ($4,000,000) originally provided in the fiscal year 1995 Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for a passenger intermodal transit center in Detroit, Michigan.

The Conferees also direct the FTA to reallocate funds in the amount of $4,962,500, made available in Public Law 103–331 for the Twin Cities Central Corridor project and not obligated by the end of fiscal year 1997, and make these funds available for similar bus and bus facilities projects in the Twin Cities Central Corridor.

Also shown in Table 7 is a state and area allocation of the fiscal year 1998 funds which are currently available. The total of $226,563,012 includes $226,320,000 in fiscal year 1998 trust funded contract authority, $975,000 in reprogrammed funds, minus $731,988 for PMO.

All bus projects must be eligible for FTA funding under FTA Circular 9300.1 in order to be approved by FTA. In previous years, there have been funds allocated for projects which were subsequently found to be ineligible for FTA assistance. Applicants with projects listed in Table 7 are advised to consult early in the fiscal year with the appropriate regional office regarding the project to ensure its eligibility for funding. This early consultation is especially critical when exercising pre-award authority.

Because the .32343056 of one percent for PMO was subtracted from the amount appropriated, each bus project identified in the Conference Report receives .32343056 of one 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 1998 Bus funds by state and area.

Prior year unobligated appropriations for Bus in the amount of $188,761,911 remain available for obligation in fiscal year 1998, and are displayed in Table 7A.

X. Unit Values of Data for the Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program, Section 5311 Nonurbanized Area Formula Program, and Section 5309 Capital Fixed Guideway Modernization

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

XI. Section 5303 Metropolitan Planning Program and 5313(b) State Planning and Research Program

A. Metropolitan Planning Program

The fiscal year 1998 Metropolitan Planning apportionment to states for MPOs to be used in urbanized areas totals $39,625,587. This amount includes $39,500,000 in fiscal year 1998 appropriated funds, and $125,587 in prior year deobligated funds which have become available for reallocation for this program. A basic allocation of 80 percent of this amount ($31,700,470) is distributed to the states based on a statutory formula for subsequent state distribution to each urbanized area, or parts thereof, within each state. A supplemental allocation of the remaining 20 percent ($7,925,117) 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, the state or MPO must submit the new formula to the appropriate FTA Regional Office for prior approval.

The Metropolitan Planning Program is totally general funded in fiscal year 1998; therefore, the entire appropriated amount of $39,500,000 is currently available plus $125,587 in reapportioned funds.

B. State Planning and Research Program

The fiscal year 1998 apportionment for the State Planning and Research Program totals $8,472,086. This amount includes $8,250,000 in fiscal year 1998 appropriated funds, and $222,086 in prior year deobligated funds which have become available for reallocation to this program. Final state apportionments, based on a statutory formula for this program, are also contained on Table 8. These funds may be used for a variety of purposes such 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.

The State Planning and Research Program is totally general funded in fiscal year 1998; therefore, the entire appropriated amount of $8,250,000 is currently available plus $222,086 in reapportioned funds.

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. FHWA Metropolitan Planning Program and State Planning and Research Program

Last year, estimated apportionments for the corresponding FHWA planning programs were provided along with the FTA apportionments. This year, no information will be available for the FHWA apportionments since their programs have not been reauthorized.

E. Local Match Waiver for Job Access Planning Activities

Federal, state, and local welfare reform initiatives may require the development of new and innovative public and other transportation services to ensure that former welfare recipients have adequate mobility for reaching employment opportunities. In recognition of the key role that transportation plays in ensuring the success of welfare-to-work initiatives, FTA and FHWA are permitting the waiver of the local match requirement for job access planning activities undertaken with Metropolitan Planning Program and State Planning and Research Program funds. FTA and FHWA will support requests for waivers when they are included in metropolitan Unified Planning Programs and State Planning and Research Programs and meet all other appropriate requirements.

F. Planning Emphasis Areas

This notice includes newly developed transportation Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs). The PEAs were prepared to advise state and local officials and transit operators of the national issues that warrant consideration in carrying out the metropolitan and statewide transportation planning process. The four major PEA themes were developed to promote general consistency between the planning initiatives being advanced in the metropolitan and statewide planning processes and national policy goals likely to be included in the reauthorized transportation legislation, as well as consistency with the USDOT Strategic Plan currently being finalized. Consideration of the PEAs in each state and metropolitan area, as appropriate in the Unified Planning Work Programs and State Planning Work Programs, is expected to reflect their unique challenges and goals. The Office of Planning anticipates working with a broad cross-section of stakeholders in preparing clarifying language and possible ways to relate the PEAs to the statewide and metropolitan planning processes.

Goals developed as part of USDOT's strategic planning process are designed to ensure the highest quality of surface transportation which promotes the Nation's economic and community vitality and environmental quality. Towards these goals, transportation Planning Emphasis Areas are prepared to advise state and local officials of the national issues that warrant consideration in carrying out the metropolitan and statewide transportation planning process (the planning process). Consideration of the emphasis areas in each state and metropolitan area is expected to reflect their unique challenges and goals. MPOs, states and transit operators may want to explore opportunities for local governments, the private sector, academic and research centers, environmental and human service agencies and other stakeholders to participate in the transportation planning process.

1. System Management and Operation

Planning for effective and efficient transportation system management and operation with ongoing performance monitoring preserves capacity, maximizes personal mobility and freight movement, ensures user safety and system security, and improves and maintains structural integrity. Innovative technologies, such as those included in Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), can improve communications, operational efficiencies, safety and system performance. Effectively managed transportation systems support the national Welfare-to-Work initiative by providing access to employment opportunities and support economic development by reducing the time for moving people and freight. The development of non-traditional transportation services to meet emerging new markets would help improve accessibility and mobility.

2. Financial Planning

A cooperative planning process which considers innovative funding sources, such as State Infrastructure Banks (SIBs), assists with developing sound transportation financial planning processes with accurate estimates of reasonably available funds, costs for system expansion, and future operation and maintenance costs. Coordinated activities to develop transportation plans will be improved with rigorous analysis of the financial dimensions of proposed major infrastructure investments.

3. Environmental and Community Impact

Local planning processes are encouraged to give early consideration of the natural environment and communities affected by transportation planning and project activities. Air quality issues are a key concern in some metropolitan areas. Coordinated planning for transportation and land use management will help to create sustainable communities with protection of natural resources, concentration of new development in suitable areas, and control of sprawl with infill development of under-utilized areas. State and local officials may choose to evaluate their decisionmaking process to determine how well it responds to community needs, as called for in the Livable Communities initiative. Consideration may be given to joint development of

transportation infrastructure projects along with facilities providing goods and services to communities and neighborhoods.

4. Transportation and Equity

Transportation planning processes should address the equitable distribution of mobility benefits and possible adverse environmental and health impacts created by federally funded transportation investments and activities. The benefits of Federal transportation investments should be equitably distributed as required by Title VI. Planning processes should evaluate proposed transportation investments to ensure they do not disproportionately create adverse human health and environmental impacts on low-income and minority populations.

G. Federal Planning Certification Reviews

Federal certification of the planning process is conducted in a Transportation Management Area (TMA), which is an urbanized area over 200,000 in population or other urbanized area designated by the Secretary of Transportation (the Secretary). The Secretary is responsible for certifying, at least once every three years, that the metropolitan transportation planning process in the TMA is being carried out under applicable provisions of Federal law. More detail on these reviews can be found in the September 8, 1997, **Federal Register** notice, which announced the metropolitan planning processes that will jointly be reviewed by FTA and FHWA and requested comments on the metropolitan planning processes under review.

Dates for site visits for the TMAs to be reviewed in fiscal year 1998 are being established and are available on the FTA Home Page at http://www.fta.gov/office/planning.

For further information regarding Federal certifications of the planning process contact: For FTA: Mr. Charles Goodman, FTA Metropolitan Planning Division (TPL–12), 202–366–1944; or Scott Biehl, FTA Office of Chief Counsel (TCC–30), 202–366–4063. For FHWA: Mr. Sheldon Edner, FHWA Metropolitan Planning Division (HEP–20), 202–366–4066; or Reid Alsop, FHWA Office of the Chief Counsel (HCC–31), 202–366–1371.

H. Consolidated Planning Grant

In fiscal year 1997, FTA and FHWA began offering states the option of participating in a pilot Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG) program. Thirteen states have agreed to participate in the pilot. In fiscal year 1997, more than $33.9 million was obligated for 11 CPG pilot states. The total obligations are approximately two-thirds FHWA planning funds and one-third FTA planning funds. One of our original goals in developing the CPG pilot was to give states and MPOs more control over their planning resources with a combination of broader financial controls and greater flexibility in the management of their planning activities. As part of the pilot, grants can be made with a ''blended'' ratio, if appropriate, to address different FTA and FHWA Federal matches. The blended ratio would allow billing at a single ratio determined on the relative shares of FTA and FHWA planning funds.

To further reduce paperwork for our customers, the CPG pilot offers the states two options for carrying the CPGs over from year to year. The first option is to treat the CPG much as FHWA grants are treated currently; that is, as basically annual grants with a yearly close-out, deobligation and reobligation cycle. The second option is to treat the CPG more like an FTA grant, but with even greater flexibility. Under this second option, the CPG grant would stay open for a multi-year period to be determined by the state (and MPO, jointly, for Metropolitan Planning funds) with the approval of the Federal Government. New apportionments will be added by a grant amendment as the funds become available. So far, over one-half of the current CPG grantees plan to follow this second option.

The FTA is exploring with FHWA the potential for extending FTA's pre-award authority to the entire CPG program. This would allow states to continue their planning program activities from year to year with the assurance (granted to all FTA grantees in the annual **Federal Register** notice) that eligible costs can later be converted to a regularly funded Federal project without the need for prior approval or authorization from the granting agency.

FTA will also be providing an enhancement to its Electronic Grant Making and Management (EGMM) program that is now used to request planning grants, obligate funds, monitor fund balances and grant status, and file financial and status reports for the CPG. These enhancements will benefit all grants including the CPG. For further information on participating in the CPG Pilot, contact Ms. Candace Noonan, Intermodal and Statewide Planning Division (TPL–11) at (202) 366–1648.

XII. Period of Availability of Funds

The funds apportioned under the Urbanized Area Formula Program, the Fixed Guideway Modernization Program, the Metropolitan Planning Program and the State Planning and Research Program in this notice will remain available to be obligated by FTA to recipients for three fiscal years following fiscal year 1998. Any of these apportioned funds unobligated at the close of business on September 30, 2001, 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 fiscal years following fiscal year 1998. Any such funds remaining unobligated at the close of business on September 30, 2000, 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, 1998. 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 1998 DOT Appropriations Act includes a provision requiring that fiscal year 1998 New Starts and Bus funds not obligated for their original purpose as of September 30, 2000, shall be made available for other discretionary projects within the respective categories of the Capital Program. Similar provisions in the 1997 and 1996 DOT Appropriations Acts required that fiscal year 1997 Bus and New Starts funds that are not obligated by September 30, 1999, shall also be made available for other discretionary Bus or New Start projects, respectively, and fiscal year 1996 Bus and New Starts funds unobligated by September 30, 1998, shall be made available for other discretionary Bus or New Start projects, respectively.

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

A. Background

Since fiscal year 1994, FTA has provided grantees pre-award authority to cover planning and capital costs prior to grant award. Previous to this grantees had authority to incur costs for operating assistance prior to grant award. 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. In order to ensure eligibility for future FTA funds, grantees are encouraged to consult with the appropriate regional office prior to exercising pre-award authority.

B. Current Coverage

In fiscal year 1998, 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 is provided to fiscal year 1998 funds apportioned and allocated in this notice. This pre-award authority also applies to Capital Bus funds identified in this notice. Pre-award authority for carryover amounts for these programs was provided in the *FTA Fiscal Year 1997 Apportionments and Allocations Federal Register* notice. This pre-award authority is also extended to projects intended to be funded with STP or CMAQ funds transferred to FTA in fiscal year 1998. Pre-award authority applies to FTA funds and flexible funds provided the conditions in C and D below are met. The pre-award authority does not apply to Capital New Start funds. Preaward authority also applies to preventive maintenance costs incurred within a local fiscal year ending during calendar year 1997, or thereafter, under the formula programs cited above.

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 1998 funds.

D. Environmental, Planning and Other Federal 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), and the planning requirements. 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 locally adopted metropolitan transportation improvement program and federally approved statewide transportation improvement program must be followed before the project may be advanced with non federal funds. In addition, 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 1998, 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. Rail Fixed Guideway Systems: State Safety Oversight (49 CFR Part 659)

There are 19 states and the District of Columbia in which rail fixed guideway transit systems operate. These states and the District of Columbia must comply with 49 U.S.C. Section 5330, by designating an agency to oversee the safety and security for those rail fixed guideway systems, which are not regulated by the Federal Railroad Administration. On December 27, 1995, FTA issued a final regulation implementing the State Safety Oversight provisions of Section 5330. Compliance with safety provisions of the rule was required by January 1, 1997. Compliance with the security provisions of the final rule is required by January 1, 1998. Codified at 49 CFR part 659, the State Safety Oversight regulation delineates responsibilities of the state, the oversight agency, the transit agency, and the FTA.

A State Oversight Agency must establish a ''System Safety and Security Program Standard,'' review and approve a transit agency's System Safety and Security Program Plan, conduct investigations of accidents and unacceptable hazards, conduct on-sight safety reviews, and report annually to FTA. Rail transit systems must develop and implement a System Safety and Security Program Plan, classify and report accidents and unacceptable hazards, develop corrective action plans, and conduct on-going safety audits. On-site safety reviews by the State Oversight Agency and audits by the transit agency must measure the effectiveness of the Plan and identify how and where to improve the system safety and security process.

The Administrator of the FTA may withhold up to five percent of the amount required to be apportioned for use in any state or affected urbanized area in such state under FTA's formula program for urbanized areas for any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1997, if the state in the previous fiscal year has not met the requirements of this part and the Administrator determines that the state is not making adequate efforts to comply with this part. States which are not in compliance have been notified of their status. Affected grantees will be notified of any fiscal year 1998 funds to be withheld for non-compliance.

XV. Electronic Grant Making and Management Initiatives

A. Background

In 1994 FTA began the Electronic Grant Making and Management (EGMM) initiative. The EGMM program is a paperless electronic grant application, review, approval, acceptance and management process. This program started as a pilot effort and involved 10 grantees nationwide to serve as pilots. By fiscal year 1997 120 grantees were participating in the FTA EGMM program for the grant application process. Over 558 grantees were on line for various management activities such as filing of financial status reports and narrative status reports. In addition, grantees may use EGMM for the electronic signature of annual certifications and assurances.

B. Graphical User Interface

The latest enhancement to the EGMM program is the Graphical User Interface program, otherwise known as GUI. GUI is a windows based program and therefore is more user friendly than the original EGMM system. With GUI, the user can rely on a limited number of windows, each with a user friendly menu bar. As this windows based environment is not directly interfacing with the FTA mainframe computer, problems of slowness of the connection are eliminated. In addition, GUI will provide greater compatibility with other systems, allowing more data migration by providing opportunities to simplify the information entry process. GUI is now being tested with a limited number of grantees. Following this testing, it will be made available to all EGMM grantees. Please contact the FTA Regional office to learn about this new enhancement to EGMM and the hardware and software requirements.

C. Fiscal Year 1998 Emphasis

In fiscal year 1998 FTA continues to strongly encourage grantees to become EGMM grantees for grant application and approval as well as for grant management activities if they have not already done so. We also encourage all grantees to file the fiscal year 1998 Certifications and Assurances electronically using the EGMM system. A major goal is the completion of the pilot phase of GUI and the conversion of our EGMM grantees to the new enhanced EGMM system.

XVI. 1998 Annual List of Certifications and Assurances

The Fiscal Year 1998 Annual List of Certifications and Assurances for Federal Transit Administration Grants and Cooperative Agreements notice was published in the **Federal Register** on October 14, 1997. It appears as Part IV on pages 53512 through 53522. This October 14 document contains two major changes to the previous year's **Federal Register** publication. (1) Starting with fiscal year 1998, all applicants for FTA Capital Program or Formula Program assistance, and current grantees with an active project financed with FTA Capital Program or Formula Program assistance will be required to provide the Appendix A Certifications and Assurances within 90 days from the date of the October 14 publication or with its first grant application in fiscal year 1998, whichever comes first. (2) The attorney signature from previous years on the single signature page will no longer be acceptable. FTA requires a current attorney's affirmation of the applicant's legal authority to certify compliance with fiscal year 1998 FTA funding assistance. This does not affect the electronic opportunity for a grant applicant's authorized representative to electronically enter a PIN in the On-Line Program, offered to applicants through the Grant Management Information System (GMIS), indicating that a current valid 1998 attorney's signature is on file. The fiscal year 1998 Annual List of Certifications and Assurances is accessible on the Internet at www.fta.dot.gov/. Any questions regarding this document may be addressed to the appropriate Regional Office or to Pat Berkley, Office of Program Management, Federal Transit Administration, (202) 366–6470.

XVII. 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 from the Department of Labor (DOL) 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.

XVIII. 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 Program: Grant Application Instructions—C9040.1B, October 10, 1996; Nonurbanized Area Formula Program Guidance and Grant Application Instructions—C9040.1D, May 8, 1997; Section 5310 Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program Guidance and Application Instructions—C9070.1D, October 22, 1997; Section 5309 Capital Program: Grant Application Instructions—C9300.1, September 29, 1995; and Program Guidance and Application Instructions for Metropolitan Planning Program Grants—C8100.1B, October 25, 1996. 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 State Planning and Research funds

may be obtained from each FTA Regional Office. Copies of circulars are available from FTA Regional Offices as well as the FTA Home Page on the Internet.

Issued on: December 2, 1997.

Gordon J. Linton,

Administrator.

BILLING CODE 4910–57–U

TABLE 1

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 APPROPRIATIONS AND FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR GRANT PROGRAMS

SOURCES OF FUNDS	FY 1998 APPROPRIATIONS	*FY 1998 FUNDS AVAILABLE*
SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM AND SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM	$2,437,780,611	*$1,525,645,987*
SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM	$2,303,702,677	*$1,441,735,458*
94.5% of Total Available for Urbanized Area Formula and Nonurbanized Area Formula Programs		
Less Oversight (.32343056 of 1 percent)	(7,450,879)	*(4,663,013)*
Reapportioned Funds Added	*7,162,381*	*7,162,381*
Total Apportioned	$2,303,414,179	*$1,444,234,826*
Operating Assistance Limitation	$150,000,000	*$150,000,000*
SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM	$134,077,934	*$83,910,529*
5.5% of Total Available for Urbanized Area Formula and Nonurbanized Area Formula Programs		
Less Oversight (.32343056 of 1 percent)	(433,649)	*(271,392)*
Reapportioned Funds Added	*1,174,760*	*1,174,760*
Total Apportioned	$134,819,045	*$84,813,897*
SECTION 5311(b) RTAP PROGRAM	$4,500,000	*$4,500,000*
Reapportioned Funds Added	178,778	*178,778*
Total Apportioned	$4,678,778	*$4,678,778*
SECTION 5310 ELDERLY AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES PROGRAM	$62,219,389	*$42,754,013*
Reapportioned Funds Added	2,272	*2,272*
Total Apportioned	$62,221,661	*$42,756,285*
SECTION 5309 CAPITAL PROGRAM	$2,000,000,000	*$1,478,960,000*
SECTION 5309 FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION	$800,000,000	*$452,640,000*
Less Oversight (.32343056 of 1 percent)	(2,587,445)	*(1,463,976)*
Total Apportioned	$797,412,555	*$451,176,024*
SECTION 5309 NEW STARTS	$800,000,000	*$800,000,000*
Less Oversight (.32343056 of 1 percent)	(2,587,445)	*(2,587,445)*
Total Allocated	$797,412,555	*$797,412,555*
SECTION 5309 BUS	$400,000,000	*$226,320,000*
Less Oversight (.32343056 of 1 percent)	(1,293,722)	*(731,988)*
Reprogrammed Funds	975,000	*975,000*
Total Allocated	$399,681,278	*$226,563,012*
SECTION 5303 METROPOLITAN PLANNING PROGRAM	$39,500,000	*$39,500,000*
Reapportioned Funds Added	125,587	*125,587*
Total Apportioned	$39,625,587	*$39,625,587*
SECTION 5313(b) STATE PLANNING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM	$8,250,000	*$8,250,000*
Reapportioned Funds Added	222,086	*222,086*
Total Apportioned	$8,472,086	*$8,472,086*
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS (Above Grant Programs)	$4,552,250,000	*$3,099,610,000*

97FR-T1C/D586

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
OVER 1,000,000 IN POPULATION	$1,695,106,078	$44,501,476	*$1,062,827,196*	*$44,501,476*
200,000-1,000,000 IN POPULATION	386,848,509	12,462,930	*242,553,029*	*12,462,930*
50,000-200,000 IN POPULATION	221,459,592	93,035,594	*138,854,601*	*93,035,594*
NATIONAL TOTAL	$2,303,414,179	$150,000,000	*$1,444,234,826*	*$150,000,000*

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
Amounts Apportioned to Urbanized Areas Over 1,000,000 in Population:				
Atlanta, GA	$33,563,442	$522,720	*$21,044,192*	*$522,720*
Baltimore, MD	27,966,141	836,655	*17,534,698*	*836,655*
Boston, MA	64,000,425	1,570,816	*40,128,104*	*1,570,816*
Chicago, IL-Northwestern IN	152,550,404	4,351,943	*95,648,715*	*4,351,943*
Cincinnati, OH-KY	11,424,379	453,194	*7,163,056*	*453,194*
Cleveland, OH	19,893,765	829,196	*12,473,340*	*829,196*
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	31,015,068	743,577	*19,446,368*	*743,577*
Denver, CO	20,582,640	507,634	*12,905,263*	*507,634*
Detroit, MI	27,626,734	1,840,863	*17,321,891*	*1,840,863*
Ft Lauderdale-Hollywood-Pompano Bch, FL.	15,689,474	631,351	*9,837,261*	*631,351*
Houston, TX	34,105,533	781,343	*21,384,082*	*781,343*
Kansas City, MO-KS	7,848,454	384,002	*4,920,961*	*384,002*
Los Angeles, CA	155,482,274	4,909,929	*97,486,990*	*4,909,929*
Miami-Hialeah, FL	30,084,773	721,206	*18,863,076*	*721,206*
Milwaukee, WI	14,457,431	469,900	*9,064,773*	*469,900*
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN	20,739,471	626,541	*13,003,595*	*626,541*
New Orleans, LA	12,931,516	568,363	*8,108,028*	*568,363*
New York, NY-Northeastern NJ	492,969,034	11,371,052	*309,090,332*	*11,371,052*
Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA	10,116,875	361,027	*6,343,255*	*361,027*
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	87,660,336	2,737,314	*54,962,808*	*2,737,314*
Phoenix, AZ	18,302,162	404,818	*11,475,410*	*404,818*
Pittsburgh, PA	24,978,923	817,085	*15,661,721*	*817,085*
Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA	18,665,277	378,598	*11,703,081*	*378,598*
Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	13,869,169	216,389	*8,695,933*	*216,389*
Sacramento, CA	10,643,675	299,264	*6,673,557*	*299,264*
San Antonio, TX	15,131,089	393,778	*9,487,155*	*393,778*
San Diego, CA	31,783,015	628,324	*19,927,869*	*628,324*
San Francisco-Oakland, CA	89,835,076	1,672,986	*56,326,363*	*1,672,986*
San Jose, CA	23,719,669	568,403	*14,872,172*	*568,403*
San Juan, PR	25,194,931	646,034	*15,797,157*	*646,034*
Seattle, WA	42,829,556	530,880	*26,854,022*	*530,880*
St. Louis, MO-IL	19,734,636	824,867	*12,373,567*	*824,867*
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	13,508,204	449,110	*8,469,610*	*449,110*
Washington, DC-MD-VA	76,202,527	1,452,314	*47,778,791*	*1,452,314*
TOTAL	$1,695,106,078	$44,501,476	*$1,062,827,196*	*$44,501,476*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
Amounts Apportioned to Urbanized Areas 200,000 to 1,000,000 in Population :				
Akron, OH	$4,841,196	$198,178	*$3,035,417*	*$198,178*
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	5,421,182	192,211	*3,399,067*	*192,211*
Albuquerque, NM	4,349,741	132,830	*2,727,276*	*132,830*
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	3,734,203	200,963	*2,341,335*	*200,963*
Anchorage, AK	1,894,060	65,584	*1,187,571*	*65,584*
Ann Arbor, MI	2,875,230	84,265	*1,802,762*	*84,265*
Augusta, GA-SC	1,450,360	67,126	*909,372*	*67,126*
Austin, TX	9,815,913	126,410	*6,154,552*	*126,410*
Bakersfield, CA	2,850,748	82,423	*1,787,412*	*82,423*
Baton Rouge, LA	2,412,064	110,143	*1,512,358*	*110,143*
Birmingham, AL	3,355,019	202,324	*2,103,588*	*202,324*
Bridgeport-Milford, CT	5,010,853	175,655	*3,141,793*	*175,655*
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	9,793,358	515,601	*6,140,411*	*515,601*
Canton, OH	1,459,419	97,050	*915,052*	*97,050*
Charleston, SC	2,336,928	92,013	*1,465,248*	*92,013*
Charlotte, NC	4,713,132	110,924	*2,955,122*	*110,924*
Chattanooga, TN-GA	1,972,468	83,621	*1,236,733*	*83,621*
Colorado Springs, CO	3,259,000	83,011	*2,043,385*	*83,011*
Columbia, SC	2,197,786	93,936	*1,378,005*	*93,936*
Columbus, GA-AL	1,361,748	70,383	*853,812*	*70,383*
Columbus, OH	8,895,475	373,955	*5,577,441*	*373,955*
Corpus Christi, TX	3,083,018	73,863	*1,933,045*	*73,863*
Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, IA-IL	2,322,844	96,107	*1,456,417*	*96,107*
Dayton, OH	9,256,807	248,838	*5,803,994*	*248,838*
Daytona Beach, FL	2,670,588	66,739	*1,674,452*	*66,739*
Des Moines, IA	2,062,061	93,603	*1,292,907*	*93,603*
Durham, NC	2,611,822	68,789	*1,637,605*	*68,789*
El Paso, TX-NM	7,017,166	153,097	*4,399,745*	*153,097*
Fayetteville, NC	1,343,417	63,304	*842,319*	*63,304*
Flint, MI	3,060,995	130,206	*1,919,235*	*130,206*
Fort Myers-Cape Coral, FL	1,765,640	48,615	*1,107,051*	*48,615*
Fort Wayne, IN	1,571,585	92,844	*985,380*	*92,844*
Fresno, CA	4,259,081	124,943	*2,670,433*	*124,943*
Grand Rapids, MI	3,221,334	132,060	*2,019,768*	*132,060*
Greenville, SC	1,462,028	63,831	*916,688*	*63,831*
Harrisburg, PA	1,793,157	96,402	*1,124,305*	*96,402*
Hartford-Middletown, CT	6,963,481	195,632	*4,366,085*	*195,632*
Honolulu, HI	16,712,601	242,285	*10,478,758*	*242,285*
Indianapolis, IN	7,411,257	325,542	*4,646,839*	*325,542*
Jackson, MS	1,600,808	76,957	*1,003,703*	*76,957*
Jacksonville, FL	6,337,864	172,487	*3,973,824*	*172,487*
Knoxville, TN	1,936,354	76,717	*1,214,090*	*76,717*
Lansing-East Lansing, MI	2,602,399	99,032	*1,631,697*	*99,032*
Las Vegas, NV	11,350,546	117,557	*7,116,764*	*117,557*
Lawrence-Haverhill, MA-NH	2,638,462	72,773	*1,654,308*	*72,773*
Lexington-Fayette, KY	1,556,842	110,392	*976,135*	*110,392*
Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR	2,315,467	88,271	*1,451,791*	*88,271*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
Amounts Apportioned to Urbanized Areas 200,000 to 1,000,000 in Population (continued):				
Lorain-Elyria, OH	1,081,127	66,587	*677,864*	*66,587*
Louisville, KY-IN	8,283,667	332,478	*5,193,838*	*332,478*
Madison, WI	3,736,106	84,931	*2,342,529*	*84,931*
McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX	1,119,999	70,560	*702,237*	*70,560*
Melbourne-Palm Bay, FL	2,801,174	59,990	*1,756,329*	*59,990*
Memphis, TN-AR-MS	7,411,453	308,137	*4,646,962*	*308,137*
Mobile, AL	1,704,668	85,867	*1,068,823*	*85,867*
Modesto, CA	2,334,390	84,510	*1,463,657*	*84,510*
Montgomery, AL	1,080,222	87,373	*677,297*	*87,373*
Nashville, TN	4,365,977	142,865	*2,737,457*	*142,865*
New Haven-Meriden, CT	7,983,564	197,384	*5,005,674*	*197,384*
Ogden, UT	2,488,159	59,658	*1,560,070*	*59,658*
Oklahoma City, OK	4,025,502	197,732	*2,523,980*	*197,732*
Omaha, NE-IA	4,596,831	202,787	*2,882,202*	*202,787*
Orlando, FL	11,301,675	149,215	*7,086,121*	*149,215*
Oxnard-Ventura, CA	5,754,319	115,722	*3,607,943*	*115,722*
Pensacola, FL	1,560,459	64,671	*978,404*	*64,671*
Peoria, IL	1,563,379	90,107	*980,235*	*90,107*
Providence-Pawtucket, RI-MA	12,952,750	405,070	*8,121,341*	*405,070*
Provo-Orem, UT	2,404,553	69,446	*1,507,648*	*69,446*
Raleigh, NC	2,435,612	62,317	*1,527,123*	*62,317*
Reno, NV	2,837,057	71,840	*1,778,827*	*71,840*
Richmond, VA	4,795,131	165,060	*3,006,535*	*165,060*
Rochester, NY	5,775,980	264,595	*3,621,525*	*264,595*
Rockford, IL	1,487,344	82,920	*932,561*	*82,920*
Salt Lake City, UT	10,228,839	209,274	*6,413,456*	*209,274*
Sarasota-Bradenton, FL	3,177,602	108,029	*1,992,349*	*108,029*
Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA	2,661,738	148,461	*1,668,903*	*148,461*
Shreveport, LA	2,190,645	89,975	*1,373,529*	*89,975*
South Bend-Mishawaka, IN-MI	1,798,966	98,290	*1,127,948*	*98,290*
Spokane, WA	4,827,840	95,376	*3,027,043*	*95,376*
Springfield, MA-CT	5,001,617	173,282	*3,136,001*	*173,282*
Stockton, CA	2,924,057	114,418	*1,833,377*	*114,418*
Syracuse, NY	3,785,163	162,453	*2,373,287*	*162,453*
Tacoma, WA	8,171,972	132,788	*5,123,806*	*132,788*
Toledo, OH-MI	4,060,306	191,849	*2,545,801*	*191,849*
Trenton, NJ-PA	4,046,743	169,388	*2,537,297*	*169,388*
Tucson, AZ	6,832,007	141,921	*4,283,651*	*141,921*
Tulsa, OK	3,695,897	134,373	*2,317,318*	*134,373*
West Palm Bch-Boca Raton-Delray Bch, FL	11,485,105	141,430	*7,201,131*	*141,430*
Wichita, KS	2,569,226	116,249	*1,610,898*	*116,249*
Wilmington, DE-NJ-MD-PA	4,983,717	171,931	*3,124,779*	*171,931*
Worcester, MA-CT	3,577,049	99,242	*2,242,801*	*99,242*
Youngstown-Warren, OH	2,021,415	152,887	*1,267,422*	*152,887*
TOTAL	$386,848,509	$12,462,930	*$242,553,029*	*$12,462,930*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
Amounts Apportioned 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:	$4,155,019	$1,970,561	*$2,605,188*	*$1,970,561*
Anniston, AL	400,780	231,980	*251,288*	*231,980*
Auburn-Opelika, AL	321,546	129,622	*201,609*	*129,622*
Decatur, AL	366983	152,422	*230,097*	*152,422*
Dothan, AL	308,237	133,304	*193,264*	*133,304*
Florence, AL	429,422	235,002	*269,247*	*235,002*
Gadsden, AL	379,537	233,057	*237,969*	*233,057*
Huntsville	1,204,818	504,984	*755,418*	*504,984*
Tuscaloosa, AL	743,696	350,190	*466,296*	*350,190*
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:	$1,087,601	$292,757	*$681,923*	*$292,757*
Flagstaff, AZ	427,864	85,791	*268,270*	*85,791*
Yuma, AZ-CA (AZ)	659,737	206,966	*413,653*	*206,966*
ARKANSAS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,587,516	$798,674	*$995,368*	*$798,674*
Fayetteville-Springdale, AR	438,127	168,344	*274,704*	*168,344*
Fort Smith, AR-OK (AR)	596,410	275,251	*373,947*	*275,251*
Pine Bluff, AR	403,041	269,436	*252,706*	*269,436*
Texarkana, TX-AR (AR)	149,938	85,643	*94,011*	*85,643*
CALIFORNIA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$24,317,143	$6,801,253	*$15,246,787*	*$6,801,253*
Antioch-Pittsburg, CA	1,375,193	345,636	*862,243*	*345,636*
Chico, CA	600,437	185,098	*376,473*	*185,098*
Davis, CA	728,893	213,010	*457,014*	*213,010*
Fairfield, CA	885,267	255,671	*555,060*	*255,671*
Hemet-San Jacinto, CA	738,574	195,698	*463,084*	*195,698*
Hesperia-Apple Valley-Victorville, CA	942,206	265,938	*590,761*	*265,938*
Indio-Coachella, CA	446,596	126,070	*280,014*	*126,070*
Lancaster-Palmdale, CA	1,584,815	162,437	*993,675*	*162,437*
Lodi, CA	620,447	175,169	*389,019*	*175,169*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
CALIFORNIA (Continued):				
Lompoc, CA	381,051	107,558	*238,918*	*107,558*
Merced, CA	677,434	188,067	*424,749*	*188,067*
Napa, CA	707,844	266,728	*443,817*	*266,728*
Palm Springs, CA	881,856	180,689	*552,921*	*180,689*
Redding, CA	509,904	149,645	*319,708*	*149,645*
Salinas, CA	1,341,823	423,192	*841,319*	*423,192*
San Luis Obispo, CA	635,440	179,409	*398,419*	*179,409*
Santa Barbara, CA	2,075,863	700,123	*1,301,561*	*700,123*
Santa Cruz, CA	1,073,405	376,707	*673,022*	*376,707*
Santa Maria, CA	976,594	227,014	*612,322*	*227,014*
Santa Rosa, CA	1,893,508	449,066	*1,187,225*	*449,066*
Seaside-Monterey, CA	1,272,398	521,884	*797,791*	*521,884*
Simi Valley, CA	1,204,416	306,429	*755,166*	*306,429*
Vacaville, CA	731,169	206,423	*458,441*	*206,423*
Visalia	835,155	225,542	*523,640*	*225,542*
Watsonville, CA	460,101	129,889	*288,482*	*129,889*
Yuba City, CA	734,140	236,597	*460,304*	*236,597*
Yuma, AZ-CA (CA)	2,614	1,564	*1,639*	*1,564*
COLORADO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$4,480,672	$1,839,230	*$2,809,370*	*$1,839,230*
Boulder, CO	997,017	412,508	*625,127*	*412,508*
Fort Collins, C0	830,420	294,588	*520,671*	*294,588*
Grand Junction, CO	472,808	189,506	*296,450*	*189,506*
Greeley, CO	664,183	283,630	*416,441*	*283,630*
Longmont, CO	605,263	170,885	*379,498*	*170,885*
Pueblo, CO	910,981	488,113	*571,183*	*488,113*
CONNECTICUT:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$14,702,762	$4,543,229	*$9,218,594*	*$4,543,229*
Bristol, CT	706,223	297,793	*442,800*	*297,793*
Danbury, CT-NY (CT)	2,460,646	492,302	*1,542,818*	*492,302*
New Britain, CT	1,322,395	626,111	*829,138*	*626,111*
New London-Norwich, CT	1,064,141	533,937	*667,213*	*533,937*
Norwalk, CT	2,607,937	676,464	*1,635,170*	*676,464*
Stamford, CT-NY (CT)	3,318,354	1,016,038	*2,080,600*	*1,016,038*
Waterbury, CT	3,223,066	900,584	*2,020,855*	*900,584*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
DELAWARE:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$338,034	$95,414	*$211,946*	*$95,414*
Dover, DE	338,034	95,414	*211,946*	*95,414*
FLORIDA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$10,302,524	$3,152,975	*$6,459,657*	*$3,152,975*
Deltona, FL	342,555	96,684	*214,781*	*96,684*
Fort Pierce, F	820,583	205,216	*514,504*	*205,216*
Fort Walton Beach, FL	795,448	258,405	*498,744*	*258,405*
Gainesville, FL	1,019,417	351,847	*639,172*	*351,847*
Kissimmee, FL	474,813	134,039	*297,707*	*134,039*
Lakeland, FL	1,042,155	345,542	*653,429*	*345,542*
Naples, FL	685,880	146,868	*430,045*	*146,868*
Ocala, FL	460,737	147,105	*288,881*	*147,105*
Panama City, FL	691,440	234,999	*433,531*	*234,999*
Punta Gorda, FL	452,160	127,629	*283,503*	*127,629*
Spring Hill, FL	345,652	97,565	*216,723*	*97,565*
Stuart, FL	603,105	170,246	*378,145*	*170,246*
Tallahassee, FL	1,162,085	393,861	*728,624*	*393,861*
Titusville, FL.	332,656	93,895	*208,575*	*93,895*
Vero Beach, FL	421,297	118,916	*264,152*	*118,916*
Winter Haven, FL.	652,541	230,158	*409,141*	*230,158*
GEORGIA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$4,510,706	$2,169,758	*$2,828,201*	*$2,169,758*
Albany, GA.	558,708	316,131	*350,308*	*316,131*
Athens, GA.	535,672	197,454	*335,865*	*197,454*
Brunswick, GA	308,261	87,007	*193,279*	*87,007*
Macon, GA.	1,001,396	542,798	*627,873*	*542,798*
Rome, GA.	314,255	149,674	*197,037*	*149,674*
Savannah, GA	1,310,221	689,903	*821,505*	*689,903*
Warner Robins, GA	482,193	186,791	*302,334*	*186,791*
HAWAII:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,198,826	$475,852	*$751,661*	*$475,852*
Kailua, HI	1,198,826	475,852	*751,661*	*475,852*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
IDAHO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$2,372,693	$809,759	*$1,487,673*	*$809,759*
Boise City, ID	1,451,884	469,898	*910,328*	*469,898*
Idaho Falls, ID	520,472	146,933	*326,335*	*146,933*
Pocatello, ID	400,337	192,928	*251,010*	*192,928*
ILLINOIS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$10,868,126	$5,371,412	*$6,814,287*	*$5,371,412*
Alton, IL	587,346	372,784	*368,265*	*372,784*
Aurora, IL	1,644,985	723,464	*1,031,401*	*723,464*
Beloit, WI-IL (IL)	75,067	25,498	*47,067*	*25,498*
Bloomington-Normal, IL	946,216	382,645	*593,275*	*382,645*
Champaign-Urbana, IL	1,335,295	616,763	*837,227*	*616,763*
Crystal Lake, IL	536,136	151,340	*336,156*	*151,340*
Decatur, IL	751,643	446,782	*471,278*	*446,782*
Dubuque, IA-IL (IL)	17,509	8,765	*10,978*	*8,765*
Elgin, IL	1,186,612	636,793	*744,002*	*636,793*
Joliet, IL	1,372,067	953,579	*860,283*	*953,579*
Kankakee, IL.	538,497	262,596	*337,636*	*262,596*
Round Lake Beach-McHenry, IL-WI (IL)	781,410	209,575	*489,942*	*209,575*
Springfield, IL.	1,095,343	580,828	*686,777*	*580,828*
INDIANA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$6,338,764	$3,063,742	*$3,974,388*	*$3,063,742*
Anderson, IN	512,352	303,284	*321,244*	*303,284*
Bloomington, IN	764,556	287,968	*479,374*	*287,968*
Elkhart-GosheN, IN	766,279	288,505	*480,455*	*288,505*
Evansville, IN-KY (IN)	1,419,525	712,185	*890,038*	*712,185*
Kokomo, IN	515,957	265,091	*323,504*	*265,091*
Lafayette-West Lafayette, IN	1,025,753	439,016	*643,144*	*439,016*
Muncie, IN	754,058	435,588	*472,792*	*435,588*
Terre Haute, IN	580,284	332,105	*363,837*	*332,105*
IOWA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$3,450,748	$1,777,815	*$2,163,611*	*$1,777,815*
Cedar Rapids, IA	1,072,377	542,576	*672,378*	*542,576*
Dubuque, IA-IL (IA)	521,966	302,695	*327,272*	*302,695*
Iowa City, IA	617,876	207,305	*387,407*	*207,305*
Sioux City, IA-NE-SD (IA)	570,671	311,588	*357,809*	*311,588*
Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA	667,858	413,651	*418,745*	*413,651*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
KANSAS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,675,445	$759,970	*$1,050,501*	*$759,970*
Lawrence, KS	634,456	217,653	*397,803*	*217,653*
St. Joseph, MO-KS (KS)	5,237	3,866	*3,284*	*3,866*
Topeka, KS	1,035,752	538,451	*649,414*	*538,451*
KENTUCKY:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,320,524	$635,567	*$827,966*	*$635,567*
Clarksville, TN-KY (KY)	161,131	73,054	*101,029*	*73,054*
Evansville, IN-KY (KY)	197,865	45,056	*124,061*	*45,056*
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH ((KY)	394,576	218,446	*247,398*	*218,446*
Owensboro, KY	566,952	299,011	*355,478*	*299,011*
LOUISIANA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$3,910,860	$1,868,922	*$2,452,098*	*$1,868,922*
Alexandria, LA	570,706	326,140	*357,831*	*326,140*
Houma, LA	401,434	192,233	*251,698*	*192,233*
Lafayette, LA	987,459	428,989	*619,134*	*428,989*
Lake Charles, LA	793,209	413,989	*497,340*	*413,989*
Monroe, LA	754,221	393,577	*472,894*	*393,577*
Slidell, LA	403,831	113,994	*253,201*	*113,994*
MAINE:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,702,077	$808,464	*$1,067,198*	*$808,464*
Bangor, ME	349,748	152,758	*219,291*	*152,758*
Lewiston-Auburn, ME	406,402	215,633	*254,813*	*215,633*
Portland, ME	868,981	409,648	*544,849*	*409,648*
Portsmouth-Dover-Rochester, NH-ME (ME)	76,946	30,425	*48,245*	*30,425*
MARYLAND:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,892,791	$751,514	*$1,186,775*	*$751,514*
Annapolis, MD	616,485	228,635	*386,534*	*228,635*
Cumberland, MD-WV (MD)	327,880	180,307	*205,580*	*180,307*
Frederick, MD	444,824	125,567	*278,904*	*125,567*
Hagerstown, MD-PA-WV (MD)	503,602	217,005	*315,757*	*217,005*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
MASSACHUSETTS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$7,496,319	$4,010,979	*$4,700,172*	*$4,010,979*
Brockton, MA	1,369,355	966,707	*858,582*	*966,707*
Fall River, MA-RI (MA)	1,335,566	628,972	*837,397*	*628,972*
Fitchburg-Leominster, MA	541,231	265,581	*339,350*	*265,581*
Hyannis, MA	386,496	109,085	*242,332*	*109,085*
Lowell, MA-NH (MA)	1,695,046	997,173	*1,062,789*	*997,173*
New Bedford, MA	1,468,840	695,995	*920,959*	*695,995*
Pittsfield, MA	349,869	211,988	*219,367*	*211,988*
Taunton, MA	349,916	135,478	*219,396*	*135,478*
MICHIGAN:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$6,397,059	$3,283,763	*$4,010,940*	*$3,283,763*
Battle Creek, MI	534,275	313,820	*334,989*	*313,820*
Bay City, MI	596,871	343,896	*374,237*	*343,896*
Benton Harbor, MI	431,733	211,224	*270,695*	*211,224*
Holland, MI	484,541	136,779	*303,806*	*136,779*
Jackson, MI	596,543	327,621	*374,031*	*327,621*
Kalamazoo, MI	1,288,207	614,106	*807,703*	*614,106*
Muskegon, MI	785,753	414,697	*492,665*	*414,697*
Port Huron, MI	517,120	218,257	*324,233*	*218,257*
Saginaw, MI	1,162,016	703,363	*728,581*	*703,363*
MINNESOTA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$2,279,724	$1,090,931	*$1,429,380*	*$1,090,931*
Duluth, MN-WI (MN)	554,756	358,439	*347,830*	*358,439*
Fargo-Moorhead, ND-MN (MN)	320,764	152,304	*201,118*	*152,304*
Grand Forks, ND-MN (MN)	70,300	37,533	*44,078*	*37,533*
La Crosse, WI-MN (MN)	34,437	12,455	*21,592*	*12,455*
Rochester, MN	625,708	287,183	*392,317*	*287,183*
St. Cloud, MN	673,759	243,017	*422,445*	*243,017*
MISSISSIPPI:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,957,190	$906,680	*$1,227,154*	*$906,680*
Biloxi-Gulfport, MS	1,211,753	552,169	*759,766*	*552,169*
Hattiesburg, MS	377,667	166,061	*236,797*	*166,061*
Pascagoula, MS	367,770	188,450	*230,591*	*188,450*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
MISSOURI:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$2,697,035	$1,205,239	*$1,691,032*	*$1,205,239*
Columbia, MO	532,464	222,473	*333,853*	*222,473*
Joplin, MO	373,937	158,607	*234,457*	*158,607*
Springfield, MO	1,256,141	512,465	*787,597*	*512,465*
St. Joseph, MO-KS (MO)	534,493	311,694	*335,125*	*311,694*
MONTANA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,795,419	$865,821	*$1,125,723*	*$865,821*
Billings, MT	692,421	332,854	*434,146*	*332,854*
Great Falls, MT	645,696	324,442	*404,850*	*324,442*
Missoula, MT	457,302	208,525	*286,727*	*208,525*
NEBRASKA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,995,955	$783,608	*$1,251,458*	*$783,608*
Lincoln, NE	1,909,613	747,115	*1,197,322*	*747,115*
Sioux City, IA-NE-SD (NE)	86,342	36,493	*54,136*	*36,493*
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:	$2,423,808	$930,889	*$1,519,722*	*$930,889*
Lowell, MA-NH (NH)	4,961	1,136	*3,111*	*1,136*
Manchester, NH	1,016,099	425,529	*637,091*	*425,529*
Nashua, NH	812,541	270,768	*509,461*	*270,768*
Portsmouth-Dover-Rochester, NH-ME (NH)	590,207	233,456	*370,059*	*233,456*
NEW JERSEY:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,836,483	$1,162,152	*$1,151,470*	*$1,162,152*
Atlantic City, NJ	1,323,682	913,408	*829,945*	*913,408*
Vineland-Millville, NJ	512,801	248,744	*321,525*	*248,744*
NEW MEXICO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,000,064	$346,371	*$627,038*	*$346,371*
Las Cruces, NM	555,540	185,079	*348,322*	*185,079*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
NEW MEXICO (Continued):				
Santa Fe, NM	444,524	161,292	*278,716*	*161,292*
NEW YORK:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$5,548,675	$2,887,397	*$3,479,005*	*$2,887,397*
Binghamton, NY	1,392,738	753,963	*873,243*	*753,963*
Danbury, CT-NY (NY)	18,877	4,225	*11,836*	*4,225*
Elmira, NY	571,903	328,474	*358,582*	*328,474*
Glens Falls, NY	393,289	163,510	*246,591*	*163,510*
Ithaca, NY	396,938	112,051	*248,879*	*112,051*
Newburgh, NY	515,436	203,473	*323,177*	*203,473*
Poughkeepsie, NY	1,082,741	630,599	*678,876*	*630,599*
Stamford, CT-NY (NY)	128	109	*80*	*109*
Utica-Rome, NY	1,176,625	690,993	*737,741*	*690,993*
NORTH CAROLINA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$9,007,746	$3,807,386	*$5,647,834*	*$3,807,386*
Asheville, NC	695,284	313,739	*435,941*	*313,739*
Burlington, NC	504,369	238,562	*316,238*	*238,562*
Gastonia, NC	738,517	363,032	*463,048*	*363,032*
Goldsboro, NC	383,529	162,993	*240,472*	*162,993*
Greensboro, NC	1,588,403	686,529	*995,925*	*686,529*
Greenville, NC	441,593	124,657	*276,877*	*124,657*
Hickory, NC	421,158	173,702	*264,065*	*173,702*
High Point, NC	710,228	357,277	*445,311*	*357,277*
Jacksonville, NC	685,698	205,012	*429,931*	*205,012*
Kannapolis, NC	495,015	207,368	*310,373*	*207,368*
Rocky Mount, NC	395,704	111,702	*248,106*	*111,702*
Wilmington, NC	647,229	259,914	*405,811*	*259,914*
Winston-Salem, NC	1,301,019	602,897	*815,736*	*602,897*
NORTH DAKOTA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,750,190	$694,941	*$1,097,366*	*$694,941*
Bismarck, ND	504,681	217,303	*316,434*	*217,303*
Fargo-Moorhead, ND-MN (ND)	729,898	285,401	*457,645*	*285,401*
Grand Forks, ND-MN (ND)	515,611	192,237	*323,287*	*192,237*
OHIO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$4,812,213	$2,454,959	*$3,017,246*	*$2,454,959*
Hamilton, OH	994,642	413,830	*623,638*	*413,830*
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH (OH)	253,289	123,238	*158,812*	*123,238*
Lima, OH	543,603	296,760	*340,838*	*296,760*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
OHIO (Continued):				
Mansfield, OH	524,828	297,105	*329,066*	*297,105*
Middletown, OH	683,870	286,086	*428,785*	*286,086*
Newark, OH	416,674	171,899	*261,254*	*171,899*
Parkersburg, WV-OH (OH)	61,700	31,162	*38,686*	*31,162*
Sharon, PA-OH (OH)	40,687	20,995	*25,510*	*20,995*
Springfield, OH	791,053	453,628	*495,988*	*453,628*
Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV-PA (OH)	284,592	194,158	*178,438*	*194,158*
Wheeling, WV-OH (OH)	217,275	166,098	*136,231*	*166,098*
OKLAHOMA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$748,995	$386,416	*$469,618*	*$386,416*
Fort Smith, AR-OK (OK)	13,140	6,655	*8,239*	*6,655*
Lawton, OK	735,855	379,761	*461,379*	*379,761*
OREGON:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$3,905,989	$1,425,107	*$2,449,045*	*$1,425,107*
Eugene-Springfield, OR	1,838,634	725,646	*1,152,819*	*725,646*
Longview, WA-OR (OR)	12,228	5,369	*7,667*	*5,369*
Medford, OR	568,223	194,556	*356,274*	*194,556*
Salem, OR	1,486,904	499,536	*932,285*	*499,536*
PENNSYLVANIA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$10,210,946	$5,129,718	*$6,402,238*	*$5,129,718*
Altoona, PA	697,550	408,051	*437,362*	*408,051*
Erie, PA	1,794,431	929,251	*1,125,104*	*929,251*
Hagerstown, MD-PA-WV (PA)	6,147	3,855	*3,854*	*3,855*
Johnstown, PA	643,250	437,207	*403,316*	*437,207*
Lancaster, PA	1,622,398	607,678	*1,017,239*	*607,678*
Monessen, PA	441,519	211,581	*276,831*	*211,581*
Pottstown, PA	418,977	118,272	*262,698*	*118,272*
Reading, PA	1,893,866	1,108,504	*1,187,449*	*1,108,504*
Sharon, PA-OH (PA)	293,323	184,335	*183,913*	*184,335*
State College, PA	610,476	250,976	*382,767*	*250,976*
Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV-PA (PA)	2,132	681	*1,337*	*681*
Williamsport, PA	511,743	277,812	*320,862*	*277,812*
York, PA	1,275,134	591,515	*799,506*	*591,515*
PUERTO RICO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$9,432,754	$3,312,130	*$5,914,311*	*$3,312,130*
Aguadilla, PR	825,239	245,837	*517,423*	*245,837*
Arecibo, PR	771,083	284,696	*483,467*	*284,696*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
PUERTO RICO (Continued):				
Caguas, PR	2,019,356	615,765	*1,266,131*	*615,765*
Cayey, PR	597,049	168,563	*374,348*	*168,563*
Humacao, PR	516,734	145,877	*323,991*	*145,877*
Mayaguez, PR	1,110,203	453,778	*696,094*	*453,778*
Ponce, PR	2,470,532	1,056,142	*1,549,016*	*1,056,142*
Vega Baja-Manati, PR	1,122,558	341,472	*703,841*	*341,472*
RHODE ISLAND:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$600,421	$246,288	*$376,462*	*$246,288*
Fall River, MA-RI (RI)	137,642	54,179	*86,301*	*54,179*
Newport, RI	462,779	192,109	*290,161*	*192,109*
SOUTH CAROLINA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$2,542,719	$1,013,149	*$1,594,279*	*$1,013,149*
Anderson, SC	341,975	158,795	*214,418*	*158,795*
Florence, SC	351,748	166,525	*220,545*	*166,525*
Myrtle Beach, SC	368,874	104,116	*231,283*	*104,116*
Rock Hill, SC	391,665	149,201	*245,573*	*149,201*
Spartanburg, SC	682,759	319,995	*428,088*	*319,995*
Sumter, SC	405,698	114,517	*254,372*	*114,517*
SOUTH DAKOTA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,262,534	$523,345	*$791,607*	*$523,345*
Rapid City, SD	402,098	177,805	*252,115*	*177,805*
Sioux City, IA-NE-SD (SD)	11,274	4,219	*7,069*	*4,219*
Sioux Falls, SD	849,162	341,321	*532,423*	*341,321*
TENNESSEE:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$1,953,999	$887,865	*$1,225,152*	*$887,865*
Bristol, TN-Bristol, VA (TN)	182,640	90,241	*114,515*	*90,241*
Clarksville, TN-KY (TN)	445,308	167,264	*279,207*	*167,264*
Jackson, TN	337,056	148,661	*211,333*	*148,661*
Johnson City, TN	513,782	228,788	*322,140*	*228,788*
Kingsport, TN-VA (TN)	475,213	252,911	*297,957*	*252,911*
TEXAS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$18,092,227	$7,687,065	*$11,343,782*	*$7,687,065*
Abilene, TX	641,883	322,174	*402,459*	*322,174*
Amarillo, TX	1,190,549	544,163	*746,472*	*544,163*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
TEXAS (Continued):				
Beaumont, TX	818,839	$436,937	*513,410*	*$436,937*
Brownsville, TX	1,190,154	343,413	*746,224*	*343,413*
Bryan-College Station, TX	797,211	248,808	*499,850*	*248,808*
Denton, TX	430,632	121,550	*270,005*	*121,550*
Galveston, TX	456,802	263,556	*286,414*	*263,556*
Harlingen, TX	584,929	213,740	*366,749*	*213,740*
Killeen, TX	1,118,807	322,616	*701,489*	*322,616*
Laredo, TX	1,413,013	440,079	*885,956*	*440,079*
Lewisville, TX	497,127	140,316	*311,697*	*140,316*
Longview, TX	489,111	205,890	*306,671*	*205,890*
Lubbock, TX	1,392,961	634,745	*873,383*	*634,745*
Midland, TX	610,326	258,553	*382,673*	*258,553*
Odessa, TX	677,073	408,081	*424,523*	*408,081*
Port Arthur, TX	738,584	418,221	*463,090*	*418,221*
San Angelo, TX	634,663	269,195	*397,932*	*269,195*
Sherman-Denison, TX	317,690	197,337	*199,191*	*197,337*
Temple, TX	360,666	147,551	*226,137*	*147,551*
Texarkana, TX-AR (TX)	291,029	142,859	*182,474*	*142,859*
Texas City, TX	773,610	308,822	*485,051*	*308,822*
Tyler, TX	604,941	272,311	*379,297*	*272,311*
Victoria, TX	419,359	202,360	*262,937*	*202,360*
Waco, TX	913,586	436,203	*572,816*	*436,203*
Wichita Falls, TX	728,682	387,585	*456,882*	*387,585*
UTAH:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$361,607	$102,073	*$226,727*	*$102,073*
Logan, UT	361,607	102,073	*226,727*	*102,073*
VERMONT:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$634,513	$244,385	*$397,838*	*$244,385*
Burlington, VT	634,513	244,385	*397,838*	*244,385*
VIRGINIA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$4,211,866	$2,010,460	*$2,640,828*	*$2,010,460*
Bristol, TN-Bristol, VA (VA)	130,027	54,597	*81,527*	*54,597*
Charlottesville, VA	605,623	258,207	*379,724*	*258,207*
Danville, VA	343,921	182,428	*215,638*	*182,428*
Fredericksburg, VA	403,773	113,974	*253,164*	*113,974*
Kingsport, TN-VA (VA)	24,549	15,609	*15,392*	*15,609*
Lynchburg, VA	576,161	290,441	*361,251*	*290,441*
Petersburg, VA	730,413	414,079	*457,967*	*414,079*
Roanoke, VA	1,397,399	681,125	*876,165*	*681,125*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION*
WASHINGTON:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$3,980,286	$1,441,915	*$2,495,628*	*$1,441,915*
Bellingham, WA	468,956	178,042	*294,034*	*178,042*
Bremerton, WA	908,455	218,876	*569,599*	*218,876*
Longview, WA-OR (WA)	396,812	172,874	*248,800*	*172,874*
Olympia, WA	706,785	220,296	*443,152*	*220,296*
Richland-Kennewick-Pasco, WA	737,333	328,900	*462,306*	*328,900*
Yakima, WA	761,945	322,927	*477,737*	*322,927*
WEST VIRGINIA				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$3,059,049	$1,811,406	*$1,918,016*	*$1,811,406*
Charleston, WV	1,230,605	668,361	*771,586*	*668,361*
Cumberland, MD-WV (WV)	14,718	10,483	*9,228*	*10,483*
Hagerstown, MD-PA-WV (WV)	3,717	2,443	*2,331*	*2,443*
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH (WV)	690,910	434,965	*433,199*	*434,965*
Parkersburg, WV-OH (WV)	444,344	275,348	*278,602*	*275,348*
Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV-PA (WV)	191,176	128,467	*119,867*	*128,467*
Wheeling, WV-OH (WV)	483,579	291,339	*303,203*	*291,339*
WISCONSIN:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$8,374,272	$3,935,089	*$5,250,647*	*$3,935,089*
Appleton-Neenah, WI	1,533,477	655,709	*961,486*	*655,709*
Beloit, WI-IL (WI)	328,704	155,628	*206,097*	*155,628*
Duluth, MN-WI (WI)	143,981	94,707	*90,276*	*94,707*
Eau Claire, WI	600,643	237,885	*376,602*	*237,885*
Green Bay, WI	1,164,686	506,229	*730,255*	*506,229*
Janesville, WI	442,039	194,329	*277,157*	*194,329*
Kenosha, WI	804,867	483,440	*504,650*	*483,440*
La Crosse, WI-MN (WI)	638,971	276,146	*400,633*	*276,146*
Oshkosh, WI	557,642	282,563	*349,640*	*282,563*
Racine, WI	1,243,118	621,866	*779,432*	*621,866*
Round Lake Beach-McHenry, IL-WI (WI)	466	99	*292*	*99*
Sheboygan, WI	525,400	238,772	*329,424*	*238,772*
Wausau, WI	390,278	187,716	*244,703*	*187,716*
WYOMING:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	$876,704	461,199	*$549,691*	*$461,199*
Casper, WY	402,166	247,399	*252,157*	*247,399*
Cheyenne, WY	474,538	213,800	*297,534*	*213,800*
TOTAL	$221,459,592	$93,035,594	*$138,854,601*	*$93,035,594*

TABLE 3

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS, AND SECTION 5311(b) RURAL TRANSIT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (RTAP) ALLOCATIONS

STATE	FY 1998 SECTION 5311 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 RTAP ALLOCATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE SECTION 5311 APPORTIONMENT*	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE RTAP ALLOCATION*
Alabama	$3,220,398	$99,894	*$2,025,934*	*$99,894*
Alaska	480,231	57,440	*302,110*	*57,440*
America Samoa	68,448	11,060	*43,060*	*11,060*
Arizona	1,409,806	71,842	*886,901*	*71,842*
Arkansas	2,574,574	89,888	*1,619,650*	*89,888*
California	6,283,697	147,355	*3,953,038*	*147,355*
Colorado	1,341,318	70,781	*843,816*	*70,781*
Connecticut	1,216,702	68,851	*765,420*	*68,851*
Delaware	303,538	54,703	*190,954*	*54,703*
Florida	4,039,438	112,584	*2,541,187*	*112,584*
Georgia	4,708,565	122,951	*2,962,131*	*122,951*
Guam	194,855	13,019	*122,582*	*13,019*
Hawaii	528,465	58,188	*332,454*	*58,188*
Idaho	1,066,162	66,518	*670,716*	*66,518*
Illinois	4,319,845	116,928	*2,717,590*	*116,928*
Indiana	4,172,872	114,651	*2,625,130*	*114,651*
Iowa	2,684,033	91,584	*1,688,510*	*91,584*
Kansas	2,135,063	83,079	*1,343,156*	*83,079*
Kentucky	3,524,523	104,606	*2,217,257*	*104,606*
Louisiana	2,915,035	95,163	*1,833,832*	*95,163*
Maine	1,406,618	71,793	*884,896*	*71,793*
Maryland	1,756,095	77,208	*1,104,750*	*77,208*
Massachusetts	1,882,001	79,158	*1,183,956*	*79,158*
Michigan	5,096,780	128,965	*3,206,355*	*128,965*
Minnesota	2,932,902	95,440	*1,845,072*	*95,440*
Mississippi	2,862,132	94,344	*1,800,551*	*94,344*
Missouri	3,416,076	102,926	*2,149,034*	*102,926*
Montana	863,675	63,381	*543,333*	*63,381*
Nebraska	1,303,176	70,190	*819,821*	*70,190*
Nevada	425,467	56,592	*267,659*	*56,592*
New Hampshire	1,126,526	67,453	*708,691*	*67,453*
New Jersey	1,610,693	74,955	*1,013,278*	*74,955*
New Mexico	1,266,249	69,618	*796,590*	*69,618*
New York	5,669,833	137,844	*3,566,860*	*137,844*
North Carolina	6,023,037	143,316	*3,789,058*	*143,316*
North Dakota	638,726	59,896	*401,819*	*59,896*
Northern Marianas	63,431	10,983	*39,904*	*10,983*
Ohio	6,131,870	145,002	*3,857,525*	*145,002*
Oklahoma	2,621,311	90,612	*1,649,052*	*90,612*
Oregon	2,081,344	82,247	*1,309,362*	*82,247*
Pennsylvania	6,840,165	155,976	*4,303,109*	*155,976*
Puerto Rico	2,044,057	81,669	*1,285,905*	*81,669*
Rhode Island	261,847	54,057	*164,726*	*54,057*
South Carolina	3,014,560	96,705	*1,896,443*	*96,705*
South Dakota	778,557	62,062	*489,786*	*62,062*
Tennessee	3,891,452	110,291	*2,448,091*	*110,291*
Texas	8,215,938	177,294	*5,168,602*	*177,294*
Utah	590,189	59,144	*371,285*	*59,144*
Vermont	696,098	60,785	*437,911*	*60,785*
Virgin Islands	148,988	12,308	*93,727*	*12,308*
Virginia	3,450,150	103,454	*2,170,470*	*103,454*
Washington	2,417,477	87,454	*1,520,821*	*87,454*
West Virginia	2,055,552	81,847	*1,293,136*	*81,847*
Wisconsin	3,551,752	105,028	*2,234,387*	*105,028*
Wyoming	496,753	57,696	*312,504*	*57,696*
TOTAL	$134,819,045	$4,678,778	*$84,813,897*	*$4,678,778*

TABLE 4

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5310 ELDERLY AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES APPORTIONMENTS

STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*
Alabama	$1,077,810	*$742,859*
Alaska	181,002	*161,315*
America Samoa	52,205	*51,430*
Arizona	951,875	*661,195*
Arkansas	757,127	*534,909*
California	5,779,667	*3,791,821*
Colorado	741,333	*524,667*
Connecticut	847,523	*593,527*
Delaware	266,369	*216,672*
District of Columbia	264,493	*215,455*
Florida	3,904,479	*2,575,839*
Georgia	1,393,604	*947,639*
Guam	132,334	*129,756*
Hawaii	335,184	*261,296*
Idaho	342,701	*266,171*
Illinois	2,528,718	*1,683,714*
Indiana	1,333,137	*908,428*
Iowa	812,931	*571,096*
Kansas	683,692	*487,289*
Kentucky	1,033,493	*714,121*
Louisiana	1,036,792	*716,261*
Maine	425,119	*319,615*
Maryland	1,041,632	*719,399*
Massachusetts	1,494,391	*1,012,995*
Michigan	2,165,445	*1,448,146*
Minnesota	1,056,129	*728,799*
Mississippi	735,946	*521,174*
Missouri	1,351,757	*920,503*
Montana	315,531	*248,552*
Nebraska	486,010	*359,100*
Nevada	365,018	*280,642*
New Hampshire	345,580	*268,037*
New Jersey	1,791,409	*1,205,599*
New Mexico	429,057	*322,169*
New York	4,133,305	*2,724,224*
North Carolina	1,583,068	*1,070,498*
North Dakota	270,598	*219,414*
Northern Marianas	52,014	*51,306*
Ohio	2,638,426	*1,754,855*
Oklahoma	893,710	*623,477*
Oregon	831,823	*583,346*
Pennsylvania	3,160,669	*2,093,509*
Puerto Rico	789,789	*556,089*
Rhode Island	379,870	*290,273*
South Carolina	864,320	*604,419*
South Dakota	291,138	*232,734*
Tennessee	1,270,199	*867,615*
Texas	3,263,857	*2,160,422*
Utah	400,751	*303,814*
Vermont	243,008	*201,524*
Virgin Islands	134,312	*131,038*
Virginia	1,320,844	*900,457*
Washington	1,185,993	*813,011*
West Virginia	635,202	*455,845*
Wisconsin	1,210,555	*828,938*
Wyoming	208,717	*179,287*
TOTAL.....	$62,221,661	*$42,756,285*

TABLE 5

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5309 FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION APPORTIONMENTS

STATE/AREA	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*
AZ Phoenix	$907,346	*$514,402*
CA Los Angeles	12,028,480	*6,818,828*
CA Sacramento	1,080,265	*612,306*
CA San Diego	4,167,132	*2,362,146*
CA San Francisco	52,132,486	*29,511,727*
CA San Jose	4,912,242	*2,784,726*
CO Denver	981,069	*556,103*
CT Hartford	559,246	*317,052*
CT Southwestern Connecticut	32,620,129	*18,463,443*
DE Wilmington	362,872	*205,709*
DC Washington	20,508,350	*11,623,316*
FL Ft. Lauderdale	1,316,125	*746,104*
FL Jacksonville	41,142	*23,319*
FL Miami	3,802,009	*2,154,920*
FL Tampa	36,475	*20,678*
FL West Palm Beach	990,760	*561,643*
GA Atlanta	8,442,657	*4,784,576*
HI Honolulu	297,537	*168,694*
IL Chicago/Northwestern Indiana	109,299,655	*61,886,453*
LA New Orleans	2,190,348	*1,223,907*
MD Baltimore	3,279,666	*1,858,852*
MD Baltimore Commuter Rail	13,539,895	*7,668,197*
MA Boston	54,945,005	*31,110,851*
MA Lawrence-Haverhill	539,690	*305,948*
MA Worcester	488,029	*276,679*
MI Detroit	201,347	*114,110*
MN Minneapolis	2,430,250	*1,377,621*
MO St. Louis	1,442,803	*817,776*
NJ Northeastern New Jersey	67,904,285	*38,357,140*
NJ Trenton	347,752	*197,093*
NY Buffalo	460,905	*261,235*
NY New York	275,002,766	*155,608,453*
OH Cleveland	10,886,614	*6,161,618*
OH Dayton	1,777,917	*1,007,920*
PA Philadelphia/Southern New Jersey	77,245,242	*43,708,761*
PA Pittsburgh	15,446,826	*8,615,655*
PR San Juan	620,717	*351,849*
OR Portland	1,270,565	*720,128*
RI-MA- Providence	886,604	*502,552*
TN Chattanooga	30,646	*17,374*
TX Dallas	562,895	*319,085*
TX Houston	2,610,328	*1,479,729*
VA Norfolk	495,637	*281,000*
WA Seattle	7,590,294	*4,302,749*
WA Tacoma	452,708	*256,665*
WI Madison	276,844	*156,932*
TOTAL	$797,412,555	*$451,176,024*

Page 1 of 2 pages.

TABLE 6

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5309 NEW START ALLOCATIONS

PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION		FY 1998 AVAILABLE ALLOCATION
AZ	Phoenix- Metropolitan Area Transit	3,987,062
CA	Los Angeles- Metrorail- MOS-3 Project	61,301,090
CA	San Bernardino Metrolink Project	996,766
CA	Orange County Transitway Project	1,993,530
CA	Sacramento- LRT Extension	20,234,344
CA	San Diego Mid-Coast Corridor Project	1,495,150
CA	San Diego Mission Valley East Corridor Project	996,766
CA	San Diego Oceanside-Escondido Light Rail Project	2,990,300
CA	San Francisco- BART Extension to the Airport Project	29,803,294
CA	San Jose- Tasman West LRT Project	21,330,786
CO	Denver- Southwest Corridor Project	22,925,610
CO	Roaring Fork Valley Rail	1,993,530
FL	Fort Lauderdale- Tri-County Commuter Rail Project	7,974,126
FL	Miami- North 27th Avenue Project	4,983,828
FL	Miami- Metro Dade East-West Corridor Project	4,983,828
FL	Orlando- Lynx Light Rail Project	31,697,150
FL	Tampa Bay Regional Rail Project	996,766
GA	Atlanta- North Springs Project	44,455,750
GA	Atlanta- DeKalb County Light Rail Project	996,766
IL	Chicago- Wisconsin Central Commuter Rail Project [METRA]	2,990,300
IN	Northern Indiana South Shore Commuter Rail Project	3,987,062
IN	Indianapolis- Northeast Corridor Project	1,245,957
LA	New Orleans- Canal Street Corridor Project	5,980,594
LA	New Orleans- Desire Streetcar Project	1,993,530
MA	Boston- South Boston Piers (MOS-2) Transitway Project	46,100,413
MA	Boston- Urban Ring	996,766
MD	MARC- Commuter Rail Improvements	30,899,736
MN	Twin Cities Transitways Projects	11,961,188
MO	St. Louis- Metrolink St. Clair LRT Extension Project	29,902,970
MO	Springfield-Branson Commuter Rail	498,383
MS	Jackson- Intermodal Corridor project	2,990,300
NC	Charlotte- South Corridor Transitway Project	996,766
NC	Research Triangle Park Project	11,961,188

TABLE 6

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5309 NEW START ALLOCATIONS

	PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE ALLOCATION*
NJ	Urban Core (Secaucus Transfer)	*26,912,674*
NJ	Urban Core (Hudson-Bergen)	*59,805,941*
NV	Las Vegas Clark County- Fixed Guideway Project	*4,983,828*
NY	New York- East Side Access Project	*19,935,314*
NY	New York- St. George Ferry Terminal Project	*2,491,914*
NY	New York- Whitehall Ferry Terminal	*2,491,914*
NY	Nassau Hub Rail Link EIS	*498,383*
OH	Canton-Akron-Cleveland [Northeast Ohio] Commuter Rail	*1,993,530*
OH	Cleveland- Blue Line Extension to Highland Hills Project	*797,413*
OH	Cleveland- Berea Red Line Extension to Hopkins Int. Airport	*697,736*
OH	Cleveland- Waterfront Line Extension	*996,766*
OH	Toledo Rail Project	*996,766*
OH	Cincinnati- Northeast/Northern Kentucky Rail Line Project	*498,383*
OK	Oklahoma City- MAPS Corridor Transit Project	*1,594,825*
OR	Portland- Westside/Hillboro Project	*63,194,945*
PA	Pittsburgh- Airport Busway Project	*4,983,828*
PA	Strawberry Hill/Diamond Branch Rail Project	*498,383*
PR	San Juan- Tren Urbano	*14,951,485*
SC	Charleston- Monobeam Rail Project	*1,495,150*
TN	Memphis- Regional Rail Project	*996,766*
TX	Austin- Capital Metro	*996,766*
TX	Dallas- North Central Light Rail Extension Project	*10,964,424*
TX	Dallas- Ft. Worth RAILTRAN Project	*7,974,126*
TX	Galveston- Rail Trolley [Diesel] System Project	*1,993,530*
TX	Houston- Regional Bus Project	*50,934,727*
TX	Houston- Advanced Regional Bus Project	*996,766*
UT	Salt Lake City- South LRT Project	*63,194,945*
UT	Salt Lake City- Regional Commuter Rail	*3,987,062*
VA	Tidewater [Norfolk] Rail Project	*1,993,530*
VA	Virginia Railway Express- Commuter Rail Project	*1,993,530*
VT	Burlington-Essex Commuter Rail	*4,983,828*
WA	Seattle-Tacoma Commuter and Light Rail Projects	*17,941,782*
	TOTAL (All Allocations Above).....	*$797,412,555*

TABLE 6A

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED SECTION 5309 NEW START ALLOCATIONS

	PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION	FY 1996 UNOBLIGATED ALLOCATION	FY 1997 UNOBLIGATED ALLOCATION	*TOTAL PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED ALLOCATION*
AK	Hollis- Ketchikan Ferry Project	0	6,345,416	*6,345,416*
AR	Little Rock- Junction Bridge Project	0	1,986,046	*1,986,046*
CA	Los Angeles- Metrorail- MOS-3	0	69,511,602	*69,511,602*
CA	Orange County Transitway	0	2,979,069	*2,979,069*
CA	San Diego Mid-Coast Extension	0	1,489,534	*1,489,534*
CT	Hartford- Griffin Light Rail Project	0	993,023	*993,023*
FL	Jacksonville- Automated Skyway Express Extension	0	14,895,343	*14,895,343*
FL	Miami- North 27th Avenue Project	0	993,023	*993,023*
FL	Miami- Metro Dade East-West Corridor Project	0	1,489,534	*1,489,534*
GA	Atlanta- North Springs Project	0	63,960,604	*63,960,604*
IL	Chicago- Transit Improvements	0	22,343,015	*22,343,015*
LA	New Orleans- Canal Street Corridor Project	4,939,902	7,944,183	*12,884,085*
LA	New Orleans- Desire Streetcar Project	0	1,986,046	*1,986,046*
MO	St. Louis- Metrolink Project	0	3,405,809	*3,405,809*
MS	Jackson- Intermodal Corridor	0	5,461,626	*5,461,626*
NC	Research Triangle Park- Regional Transit Plan	0	1,986,046	*1,986,046*
NJ	Burlington-Gloucester Line [*]	0	0	*1,488,750*
NY	New York- Whitehall Ferry Terminal [*]	2,469,951	3,723,836	*8,675,037*
OK	Oklahoma City- MAPS Corridor Transit System	0	1,986,046	*1,986,046*
PR	San Juan- Tren Urbano	0	6,058,367	*6,058,367*
TN	Memphis- Regional Rail Plan	1,234,976	3,017,796	*4,252,772*
TX	Dallas- Ft. Worth RAILTRAN	0	15,143,599	*15,143,599*
TX	Houston- Regional Bus Plan	0	40,306,799	*40,306,799*
VA	Virginia Railway Express- Commuter Rail Project	0	2,979,069	*2,979,069*
VT	Burlington-Charlotte Commuter Rail	1,862,090	993,023	*2,855,113*
WA	Seattle-Renton-Tacoma Light Rail Project	0	2,979,069	*2,979,069*
	TOTAL (All Allocations Above)	$10,506,919	$284,957,523	*$299,434,442*

---

[*] Carryover totals include FY 1995 funds in the amount of $3,970,000 extended for obligation by the FY 1998 Appropriations Conference Report for New York City - Whitehall Ferry [$2,481,250]; and Burlington - Glouchester Commuter Rail [$1,488,750]

TABLE 7

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	PURPOSE	FY 1998 ALLOCATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE ALLOCATION*
ALABAMA			
Birmingham/Jefferson County	Buses	$2,990,320	*$1,695,090*
Birmingham	Downtown intermodal transportation facility, phase 2	5,980,641	*3,390,182*
Gadsden	Buses and vans	99,677	*56,525*
Huntsville	Intermodal center, phase 1	4,983,868	*2,825,151*
Mobile	Southern market historic intermodal center	996,774	*565,030*
Mobile	Municipal pier intermodal waterfront access rehabilitation project	996,774	*565,030*
Mobile	Bus replacement	1,495,160	*847,545*
Mobile	Intermodal facility	5,482,254	*3,107,666*
Montgomery	Bus replacement	1,495,160	*847,545*
Tuscaloosa	Bus replacement	996,774	*565,030*
ARIZONA			
Phoenix	Buses and bus facilities	4,485,481	*2,542,636*
Tuscon	Intermodal center	996,774	*565,030*
CALIFORNIA			
Folsom	Multimodal facility	1,495,160	*847,545*
Foothill	Transit bus maintenance facility	8,970,962	*5,085,272*
I-5 Consortium Cities Joint Powers Authority	Facilities	4,983,868	*2,825,151*
Inglewood	Transit center project	498,387	*282,515*
Lake Tahoe	Intermodal center	996,774	*565,030*
Long Beach	Buses and bus facilities	1,495,160	*847,545*
Marina/Ft. Ord	Buses and multimodal center	996,774	*565,030*
Mendocino County	Buses	797,419	*452,024*
Modesto	Bus maintenance facility	1,744,354	*988,803*
Rialto	Metrolink depot	1,096,451	*621,533*
Riverside County	Buses and bus facility	2,342,418	*1,327,821*
Riverside County	Transit vehicle ITS communications	996,774	*565,030*
Sacramento	Bus facility	996,774	*565,030*
San Joaquin (Stockton)	Bus facilities	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
Santa Clara	Buses	2,491,934	*1,412,576*
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District	Buses and bus facility	996,774	*565,030*
San Ysidro Border	Intermodal center	498,387	*282,515*
Solano County	Buses and bus-related equipment	1,196,128	*678,036*
Sonoma County	Bus facilities	996,774	*565,030*
Unitrans	Maintenance facility	996,774	*565,030*
Woodland	Transfer facility	199,355	*113,006*

TABLE 7

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	PURPOSE	FY 1998 ALLOCATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE ALLOCATION*
CALIFORNIA (cont'd)			
Yolo County	Buses and paratransit vehicles	996,774	*565,030*
Yosemite area	Regional transportation solution	498,387	*282,515*
COLORADO	Buses and bus facilities	5,482,254	*3,107,666*
CONNECTICUT			
Bridgeport	Buses and bus facilities	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
Bridgeport	Intermodal center	3,737,901	*2,118,863*
New Haven	Bus facility	1,196,128	*678,036*
DELAWARE	New Castle bus facility	1,495,160	*847,545*
FLORIDA			
Daytona Beach	Intermodal facility	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
Florida Citrus Connection	Buses	1,495,160	*847,545*
Lakeland	Transit buses	996,774	*565,030*
Lakeworth	Buses and bus facilities	996,774	*565,030*
LYNX	Buses and bus facilities	2,990,321	*1,695,091*
Metro-Dade County	Buses and bus facilities	4,983,868	*2,825,151*
Orlando	Intermodal facility	996,774	*565,030*
Palm Beach County	Buses and bus facilities	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
Tampa (Hillsborough County)	HARTline buses and bus facilities	1,495,160	*847,545*
Volusia County	Buses and bus facilities	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
GEORGIA			
Chatham	Bus facility	3,987,094	*2,260,121*
MARTA	Buses	4,983,868	*2,825,151*
HAWAII: Honolulu	Buses and bus facilities	4,983,868	*2,825,151*
ILLINOIS	Buses and bus facilities	4,485,481	*2,542,636*
INDIANA			
Indianapolis	Buses	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
South Bend	Intermodal facility	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
IOWA			
Statewide	Buses and bus facilities	2,741,127	*1,553,833*
Sioux City	Park and ride facility	1,245,967	*706,288*
KANSAS	Johnson County bus maintenance/ operations facility	996,774	*565,030*
LOUISIANA	Statewide buses and bus facilities		
Baton Rouge	Bus related facilities	598,064	*339,018*
Jefferson Parish	Buses	1,196,128	*678,036*
Lafayette	Bus-related facility	747,580	*423,773*
Lake Charles	Buses	149,516	*84,755*
LA DOTD	Vans and equipment	697,741	*395,521*
Monroe	Buses and bus-related equipment	797,419	*452,024*
New Orleans	Buses and bus-related facilities	8,970,962	*5,085,272*

TABLE 7

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	PURPOSE	FY 1998 ALLOCATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE ALLOCATION*
LOUISIANA (cont'd)			
Shreveport	Buses and bus-related facility	398,709	*226,012*
St. Tammany Parish	Bus and bus-related facility	299,032	*169,509*
MARYLAND	Buses and bus facilities	7,974,188	*4,520,242*
MASSACHUSETTS			
Franklin RTA	Buses	498,387	*282,515*
Greenfield Montague Transportation Area	Buses	697,741	*395,521*
South Station	Intermodal transporation center	996,774	*565,030*
Springfield	Intermodal center	996,774	*565,030*
Worcester	Union station	2,990,321	*1,695,091*
MICHIGAN	Buses and bus facilities	7,475,801	*4,237,727*
MINNESOTA			
Metropolitan Council transit Operations	Buses and bus facilities	8,970,962	*5,085,272*
St. Paul	Snelling bus garage	1,495,160	*847,545*
MISSISSIPPI	Jackson bus facility	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
MISSOURI			
Kansas City	Buses and fare box collection system	3,488,707	*1,977,606*
Kansas City	Union Station intermodal center	4,485,481	*2,542,636*
State of Missouri	Buses and bus facilities	7,974,188	*4,520,242*
NEVADA			
Clark County	Buses	7,974,188	*4,520,242*
Reno, Washoe County Regional Transportation Commission	Buses and bus facilities	1,495,160	*847,545*
NEW JERSEY	NJ Transit alternative fuel buses	5,980,641	*3,390,182*
NEW MEXICO			
Albuquerque	Uptown transit center	996,774	*565,030*
	Demo of universal electric transportation subsystems (DUETS)	996,774	*565,030*
Las Cruces, Santa Fe and Albuquerque	Park and ride	996,774	*565,030*
Santa Fe	Buses and bus facilities	996,774	*565,030*
Statewide	Buses and bus facilities	3,737,901	*2,118,863*
NEW YORK			
Nassau County and Long Island	Buses and bus facilities (Goodwill Games)	996,774	*565,030*
Nassau County	Natural gas buses	4,983,868	*2,825,151*
New Rochelle	Intermodal facility	1,495,160	*847,545*
New York City	Natural gas buses	7,475,801	*4,237,727*
NFTA	HUBLINK program	996,774	*565,030*

TABLE 7

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	PURPOSE	FY 1998 ALLOCATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE ALLOCATION*
NEW YORK (cont'd)			
Poughkeepsie	Intermodal facility	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
Rensselaer County	Intermodal facility	1,868,950	*1,059,432*
Staten Island/Brooklyn	Mobility project	996,774	*565,030*
Suffolk County	Buses	2,143,063	*1,214,815*
Syracuse	Buses	4,286,126	*2,429,630*
Westchester County	Buses	4,983,868	*2,825,151*
Yonkers	Intermodal facility	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
NORTH CAROLINA			
Chapel Hill University of North Carolina	Buses	996,774	*565,030*
Statewide	Buses and bus facilities	4,983,868	*2,825,151*
OHIO	Buses and bus facilities	12,459,669	*7,062,878*
OREGON			
Eugene-Springfield-Land County	Buses and bus facilities	996,774	*565,030*
Lane Transit District	Bus system	996,774	*565,030*
Salem and Corvallis	Buses and bus facilities	996,774	*565,030*
PENNSYLVANIA			
Allegheny County	Buses	996,774	*565,030*
Armstrong Mid-County	Buses and bus facility	199,355	*113,006*
Berks Area Reading	Transit intermodal facility	498,387	*282,515*
Cambria County	Buses and bus facilities	797,419	*452,024*
Fayette and Somerset	Buses, vans, and bus facilities	598,064	*339,018*
Indiana County	Buses	498,387	*282,515*
Lackawanna County	Paratransit vans	299,032	*169,509*
Lawrence County	Buses	996,774	*565,030*
Lehigh and Northampton	Buses	996,774	*565,030*
Mid Mon Valley transit authority	Buses	747,580	*423,773*
New Castle area transit authority	Buses	747,580	*423,773*
North Philadelphia	Intermodal facility	996,774	*565,030*
Philadelphia Eastwick	Intermodal center	996,774	*565,030*
Schuykill County	Buses	199,355	*113,006*
Scranton	Buses and bus facility	1,495,160	*847,545*
SEPTA	Buses	7,475,802	*4,237,727*
Towanda Borough	Intermodal bus facility	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
Wilkes-Barre	Intermodal facility	1,495,160	*847,545*
Williamsport	Buses and bus facility	1,245,967	*706,288*
Statewide	Bus and bus facilities projects	3,987,094	*2,260,121*

TABLE 7

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	PURPOSE	FY 1998 ALLOCATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE ALLOCATION*
SOUTH CAROLINA			
Columbia	Buses and facility	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
Pee Dee Regional Planning Authority	Buses and facilities	2,990,320	*1,695,090*
Virtual Transit Enterprise	Integration of transit information processing systems	996,774	*565,030*
SOUTH DAKOTA	Statewide bus and bus facilities	2,242,740	*1,271,318*
TENNESSEE	Buses and bus facilities	7,974,188	*4,520,242*
TEXAS			
Austin	Buses	2,990,320	*1,695,090*
Brazos Transit Authority	Transit facilities and buses	2,990,320	*1,695,090*
Corpus Christi	Bus facilities	1,943,708	*1,101,809*
El Paso	Buses	996,774	*565,030*
Fort Worth	Buses	1,495,160	*847,545*
Galveston	Alternatively fueled vehicles	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
Rural Texas	Bus replacement program	2,491,934	*1,412,576*
UTAH			
Utah Transit Authority Olympic	Park and ride lots	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
Park City Transit	Buses	398,709	*226,012*
Utah Transit Authority	Bus acquisition	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
Utah Transit Authority Olympic	Intermodal transportation centers	2,491,934	*1,412,576*
Statewide	Buses and bus facilities	1,993,547	*1,130,061*
VERMONT			
Burlington	Multimodal center	1,495,160	*847,545*
Statewide	Bus and bus facilities	996,774	*565,030*
VIRGINIA			
Clarendon canopy project		249,193	*141,258*
Falls Church	Electric buses	398,709	*226,012*
Dulles corridor	Buses and bus facilities	2,491,934	*1,412,576*
Richmond	Multimodal center	2,491,934	*1,412,576*
WASHINGTON			
Bremerton	Buses and transportation center	996,774	*565,030*
Chelan- Douglas	Multimodal center	996,774	*565,030*
Community Transit	Kasch Park facility	1,495,160	*847,545*
	Intermodal center	2,491,934	*1,412,576*
King County	Multimodal facility	996,774	*565,030*
King County	Metro commuter intermodal connector	1,495,160	*847,545*
King County	Park and ride lots	4,983,868	*2,825,151*

TABLE 7

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	PURPOSE	FY 1998 ALLOCATION	*FY 1998 AVAILABLE ALLOCATION*
WASHINGTON (cont'd)			
Olympic Peninsula International Gateway	Transportation Center	996,774	*565,030*
Snohomish County	Buses	2,491,934	*1,412,576*
Tacoma Dome station project		1,495,160	*847,545*
Thurston County	Intercity buses	996,774	*565,030*
Whatcom Transportation Authority	Facilities	1,495,160	*847,545*
WEST VIRGINIA			
Huntington	Intermodal Facility and buses	6,977,415	*3,955,212*
Statewide	Buses and bus facilities, communications and computer systems	9,220,155	*5,226,530*
WISCONSIN			
Milwaukee	Rail station rehabilitation	996,774	*565,030*
Wisconsin Transit System	Buses	12,958,055	*7,345,393*
TOTAL		$399,681,278	*$226,563,012*

Table 7A

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	*PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED ALLOCATION*
FY 1997:	
AR Statewide	*$2,679,750*
AR Little Rock	*992,500*
CA Eureka	*992,500*
CA Fairfield City	*1,389,500*
CA Folsom	*496,250*
CA Foothill	*4,714,375*
CA Lake Tahoe	*1,256,505*
CA North Orange County	*198,500*
CA Norwalk	*992,500*
CA Riverside County	*992,500*
CA San Joaquin	*2,729,375*
CA Santa Barbara (MTD)	*1,985,000*
CA Santa Cruz (MTD)	*1,985,000*
CA San Ysidro Border	*992,500*
CA Sonoma County	*992,500*
CA Thousand Oaks	*595,500*
CA Yolo County	*1,985,000*
DE Statewide	*6,947,500*
FL Miami Beach	*992,500*
FL Tampa (Hillsborough area RTD)	*2,779,000*
FL Ybor	*992,500*
GA Chatham	*1,052,050*
GA MARTA	*1,985,000*
IA Statewide	*3,693,668*
IA Fort Dodge	*688,160*
IA Ottumwa	*60,940*
IA Sioux City	*2,143,800*
IA Iowa Department of Transportation	*1,261,368*
IN Indianapolis (metro)	*992,500*
IN South Bend	*5,455,322*

Table 7A

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	*PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED ALLOCATION*
FY 1997 (Cont'd):	
KS Statewide	*992,500*
KS Johnson City	*2,183,500*
KY Statewide	*3,970,000*
KY Owensboro	*99,250*
LA Statewide	*10,087,104*
MA Boston	*$992,500*
MA Hyannis/Cape Cod	*3,225,625*
MA Lowell	*992,500*
MI Statewide	*4,722,500*
MS Jackson	*992,500*
MS Jackson	*3,473,750*
MO Kansas City	*6,451,250*
MO Statewide	*4,290,225*
MO St. Louis	*1,736,875*
NY Buffalo	*992,500*
NY New Rochelle	*1,240,625*
NY Syracuse	*1,985,000*
NY Westchester County	*496,250*
NC Statewide	*1,170,000*
OR Hood River	*173,688*
OR Salem	*1,836,125*
PA Statewide	*634,300*
PA Armstrong County MID-County	*260,035*
PA Berks Area Reading Transit	*397,000*
PA Erie	*1,985,000*
PA Indiana County	*674,900*
SC Spartanburg	*1,488,750*
TX El Paso	*2,481,250*
TX Galveston	*496,250*
TX Liberty, Montgomery, Polk Counties	*1,013,170*

Table 7A

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	*PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED ALLOCATION*
FY 1997 (Cont'd):	
UT Salt Lake City	*5,458,750*
UT Logan	*2,382,000*
VT Statewide	*188,125*
VT Burlington	*1,488,750*
VT Urban & Rural	*169,375*
VA Reston	*496,250*
VA Virginia Beach	*992,500*
WA Bremerton	*1,985,000*
WA Everett	*2,977,500*
WA Port Angeles	*992,500*
WA Seattle Metro/King County	*$3,970,000*
WI Statewide	*1,572,325*
WY Freemont County	*992,500*
TOTAL FY 1997 Allocations	*$140,214,560*
FY 1996:	
AR Statewide	*$794,000*
CA Coachella Valley	*496,250*
CA San Diego	*4,674,500*
CT Norwich	*1,488,750*
HI Honolulu	*3,970,000*
IL Statewide	*1,428,601*
LA New Orleans	*2,977,500*
LA St. Bernard Parish	*1,488,750*
MO Kansas City	*6,171,250*
NY Albany	*4,962,500*
NY Buffalo	*496,250*
NY Rensselaer	*5,833,750*
NY New Rochelle	*744,375*

Table 7A

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	*PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED ALLOCATION*
FY 1996 (Cont'd):	
NY Westchester County	*2,233,125*
NC State	*1,250,000*
OH State	*2,200,000*
PA Philadelphia	*992,500*
PA Erie	*3,970,000*
TN Nashville	*297,750*
TX El Paso	*1,465,000*
VT Marble Valley	*612,500*
TOTAL FY 1996 Allocations	*$48,547,351*
TOTAL (All Allocations Above)	*$188,761,911*

TABLE 8

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

1998 SECTION 5303 METROPOLITAN PLANNING AND SECTION 5313(b) STATE PLANNING AND RESEARCH APPORTIONMENTS

STATE	*FY 1998 SECTION 5303 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*	*FY 1998 SECTION 5313(b) AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT*
Alabama	*$344,882*	*$92,758*
Alaska	*158,502*	*42,360*
Arizona	*618,722*	*133,897*
Arkansas	*158,502*	*42,360*
California	*6,661,928*	*1,283,833*
Colorado	*514,015*	*119,873*
Connecticut	*453,689*	*123,799*
Delaware	*158,502*	*42,360*
District of Columbia	*212,404*	*42,360*
Florida	*2,112,873*	*513,084*
Georgia	*754,563*	*164,380*
Hawaii	*158,502*	*42,360*
Idaho	*158,502*	*42,360*
Illinois	*2,312,151*	*427,436*
Indiana	*564,428*	*135,746*
Iowa	*176,442*	*47,522*
Kansas	*202,912*	*51,351*
Kentucky	*245,802*	*64,370*
Louisiana	*438,000*	*112,321*
Maine	*158,502*	*42,360*
Maryland	*920,920*	*180,552*
Massachusetts	*1,119,360*	*238,473*
Michigan	*1,470,219*	*293,024*
Minnesota	*585,964*	*119,526*
Mississippi	*158,502*	*42,360*
Missouri	*695,407*	*140,286*
Montana	*158,502*	*42,360*
Nebraska	*158,502*	*42,360*
Nevada	*170,912*	*45,931*
New Hampshire	*158,502*	*42,360*
New Jersey	*1,955,753*	*334,215*
New Mexico	*158,502*	*42,360*
New York	*3,975,833*	*711,632*
North Carolina	*463,930*	*126,681*
North Dakota	*158,502*	*42,360*
Ohio	*1,371,909*	*335,598*
Oklahoma	*252,356*	*68,276*
Oregon	*286,490*	*71,589*
Pennsylvania	*1,909,473*	*363,351*
Rhode Island	*165,658*	*42,360*
South Carolina	*263,305*	*71,926*
South Dakota	*158,502*	*42,360*
Tennessee	*414,485*	*111,816*
Texas	*2,663,133*	*573,309*
Utah	*242,743*	*66,523*
Vermont	*158,502*	*42,360*
Virginia	*868,837*	*193,069*
Washington	*698,557*	*162,065*
West Virginia	*158,502*	*42,360*
Wisconsin	*557,792*	*124,254*
Wyoming	*158,502*	*42,360*
Puerto Rico	*423,708*	*107,140*
TOTAL	*$39,625,587*	*$8,472,086*

TABLE 9

Federal Transit Administration - Unit Values of Data
Fiscal Year 1998 Formula Grant Apportionments

			FY 1998 APPORTIONMENTS	*FY 1998 FUNDS AVAILABLE*
Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program - Bus Tier				
Urbanized Areas Over 1,000,000:				
Population			$2.43741676	*$1.52825411*
Population x Density			$0.00062516	*$0.00039197*
Bus Revenue Vehicle Mile			$0.34472062	*$0.21613895*
Urbanized Areas Under 1,000,000:				
Population			$2.20274993	*$1.38111858*
Population x Density			$0.00097008	*$0.00060824*
Bus Revenue Vehicle Mile			$0.42276377	*$0.26507181*
Bus Incentive (PM denotes Passenger Mile):				
Bus PM x Bus PM = Operating Cost			$0.00412867	*$0.00258867*
Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program - Fixed Guideway Tier				
Fixed Guideway Revenue Vehicle Mile			$0.46535454	*$0.29177611*
Fixed Guideway Route Mile			$26,427	*$16,569*
- Commuter Rail Floor	$4,986,111	*$3,126,279*		
Fixed Guideway Incentive:				
Fixed Guideway PM x Fixed Guideway PM = Operating Cost			$0.00039964	*$0.00025057*
- Commuter Rail Incentive Floor	$228,941	*$143,545*		
Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program - Areas Under 200,000				
Population			$3.97701806	*$2.49358020*
Population x Density			$0.00198731	*$0.00124604*
Section 5311 Nonurbanized Area Formula Program				
Areas Under 50,000				
Population			$1.46340428	*$0.92061934*

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

	Tier 3	Tier 4
Legislatively Specified Areas:		**All Areas:**
Revenue Vehicle Mile	$0.02988368	$0.13418473
Route Mile	$2,093.71	$7,584.44
Other Areas:		
Revenue Vehicle Mile	$0.15951697	
Route Mile	$4,438.10	

[FR Doc. 97–31910 Filed 12–2–97; 1:48 pm]
BILLING CODE 4910–57–C