DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

FTA Fiscal Year 1997 Apportionments and Allocations

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Transportation (DOT) and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (Pub. L. 104–205), signed into law by President Clinton on September 30, 1996, provides fiscal year 1997 appropriations for the Federal Transit Administration transit assistance programs. Based upon this Act, this Notice contains a comprehensive list of apportionments and allocations of the various transit programs.

This Notice includes the apportionment of fiscal year 1997 funds for the Urbanized Area Formula Program, the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program, the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program, the Capital Program for Fixed Guideway Modernization, the Metropolitan Planning Program and the State Planning and Research Program, based on the 1997 DOT Appropriations Act and Federal transit laws. This Notice also contains the allocations of funds for the New Starts and Bus categories under the Capital Program. Statutory limitations on the use of operating assistance are also included in this Notice. As in fiscal year 1996, this Notice also includes the funding level authorized by the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) for each program.

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

For the first time, for information purposes, this Notice also contains the estimated state apportionment of fiscal year 1997 funds for the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Metropolitan Planning Program and State Planning and Research Program.

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The appropriate FTA Regional Administrator for grant specific information and issues; Melton Baxter, Manager, Urbanized Area Formula Program and FTA Apportionments, Office of Resource Management and State Programs, (202) 366–2053, for general information about the Urbanized Area Formula Program (49 U.S.C. 5307), the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program (49 U.S.C. 5311), the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program (49 U.S.C. 5310), or the Capital Program (49 U.S.C. 5309); or Robert Stout, Director, Office of Planning Operations, (202) 366–6385, for general information concerning the Metropolitan Planning Program (49 U.S.C. 5303) and State Planning and Research Program (49 U.S.C. 5313(b)).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. Codification of Federal Transit Laws
II. Background
III. Overview of Appropriations for Grant Programs
  A. General
  B. ISTEA Authorized Program Levels
  C. Project Management Oversight
IV. Departmental Initiatives
  A. Livable Communities
  B. Intelligent Transportation Systems
  C. ADA Paratransit Service Implementation
  D. Consolidated Planning Grant
  E. Transit Oriented Development
  F. FTA Home Page on Internet
V. Urbanized Area Formula Program (49 U.S.C. 5307)
  A. Total Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments
  B. Data Used for Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments
  C. Adjustments for Energy and Operating Efficiencies
  D. Designation of New Urbanized Area
  E. Urbanized Area Formula Fiscal Year 1997 Apportionments to Governors
  F. Urbanized Area Formula Operating Assistance Limitations
  G. Statewide Operating Assistance Limitations
  H. Designated Transportation Management Areas
  I. Urbanized Area Formula Funds Used for Highway Purposes
VI. Nonurbanized Area Formula Program (49 U.S.C. 5311) and Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP) (49 U.S.C. 5311(b)(2)
  A. Nonurbanized Area Formula Program
  B. Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP)
VII. Elderly and Persons With Disabilities Program (49 U.S.C. 5310)
VIII. Surface Transportation Program ''Flexible'' Funds used for Transit Purposes (Title 23, U.S.C.)
  A. Transfer Process
  B. Matching Share for Flexible Funds
  C. Other Funds Transferred to FTA
IX. Capital Program (49 U.S.C. 5309)
  A. Fixed Guideway Modernization
  B. New Starts
  C. Bus
X. Unit Values of Data for Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program,, Section 5311 Nonurbanized Area Formula Programs, and Section 5309(m)(1)(A) Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula
XI. Metropolitan Planning Program (49 U.S.C. 5303) and State Planning and Research Program (49 U.S.C. 5313(b))
  A. Metropolitan Planning Urbanized Area Program
  B. State Planning and Research Program
  C. Data Used for Metropolitan Planning and State Planning and Research Apportionments
  D. FHWA Metropolitan Planning Program and State Planning and Research Program
  E. Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs)
XII. Period of Availability of Funds
XIII. Notice of Pre-Award Authority to Incur Project Costs
  A. Background
  B. Current Coverage
  C. Conditions
  D. Environmental and Other Requirements
XIV. Electronic Grant Making and Management Initiatives: Fiscal Year 1997 and Beyond
  A. Background
  B. On-Line Grantee Program
  C. Electronic Grant Making and Management (EGMM)
  D. Electronic Signature of Certifications and Assurances
  E. Future EGMM Expansion
XV. Quarterly approval of grants
XVI. Grant application procedures

Tables
  1. FTA FY 1997 appropriations and ISTEA authorizations for grant programs
  2. FTA FY 1997 section 5307 urbanized area formula apportionments and ISTEA authorized levels
  3. FTA FY 1997 section 5311 nonurbanized area formula apportionments, section 5311(b) rural transit assistance program (RTAP) allocatons, and ISTEA authorized levels
  4. FTA FY 1997 section 5310 elderly and persons with disabilities apportionments and ISTEA authorized levels
  5. FTA FY 1997 section 5309(m)(1)(A) fixed guideway modernization formula apportionments and ISTEA authorized levels
  6. FTA FY 1997 section 5309 new start allocations
  7. FTA FY 1997 section 5309(m)(1)(C) bus allocations
  8. FTA FY 1997 section 5303 Metropolitan Planning Program and section 5313(b) state planning and research program
  9. FHWA FY 1997 Metropolitan Planning Program and FY 1997 State Planning and Research Program
  10. Federal Transit Administration—Unit values of data—FY 1997 formula grant apportionments

I. Codification of Federal Transit Laws

On July 5, 1994, President Clinton signed Public Law 103–272, which codifies Federal transit laws at title 49, chapter 53 of the United States Code.

The enactment of Public Law 103–272 repeals the FT Act of 1992, as amended (the Act), without substantive changes to programs. The original meaning of the Act's provisions are unchanged by this codification, even though the new Public Law 103–272 language, in some instances, differs from that of the Act. The codification now includes laws enacted through July 5, 1994. Additional provisions enacted after that date, and revisions to title 49, chapter 53, will be reflected in subsequent legislation now being considered in Congress. This Notice accordingly uses the new form of citation. Listed below are the most commonly used citations:

Subject	49 U.S.C. section
Capital Program	5309
Metropolitan Planning Program	5303
Urbanized Area Formula Program.	5307
Transit Employee Protective Certification.	5333(b)
National Transit Database	5335
Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program.	5310
Nonurbanized Area Formula Program.	5311
Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP).	5311(b)(2)
State Planning and Research Program.	5313(b)

II. Background

Urbanized Area Formula Program funds are apportioned by statutory formula to urbanized areas and to the Governors to provide capital, operating and planning assistance in urbanized areas. Nonurbanized Area Formula Program funds are apportioned by statutory formula to the Governors for capital and operating assistance in nonurbanized areas. The Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program funds are apportioned by statutory formula to the Governors to provide capital assistance to organizations providing transportation service for the elderly and persons with disabilities. Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula funds are apportioned by statutory formula to specified urbanized areas for capital improvements in rail and other fixed guideways. Funds appropriated for the Metropolitan Planning Program are apportioned by a statutory formula to the Governors for allocation by them to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in urbanized areas or portions thereof. Appropriated funds for the State Planning and Research Program also are apportioned to States by a statutory formula. New Start funds identified for specific projects in the 1997 DOT Appropriations Act and Bus fund allocations in the accompanying Conference Report are also included in this Notice.

III. Overview of Appropriations for Grant Programs

A. General

In fiscal year 1997, the appropriation for the Urbanized Area Formula Program and the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program is $2,093,143,761. Of this amount, 94.50 percent ($1,978,020,854) is made available to the Urbanized Area Formula Program, and 5.50 percent ($115,122,907) is made available to the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program. The other program appropriations contained in this Notice are as follows: $4,500,000 for the Rural Tra Transit Assistance Program (RTAP); $56,041,239 for the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program; $39,500,000 for the Metropolitan Planning Program; $8,250,000 for the State Planning and Research Program; and $1,900,000,000 for the Capital Program. Of the Capital Program amount, $760,000,000 is for Fixed Guideway Modernization, $760,000,000 is for New Starts, and $380,000,000 is for Bus.

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

B. ISTEA Authorized Program Levels

As in fiscal year 1996, FTA is publishing the formula apportionment and allocation tables that compare the maximum program level proposed in the ISTEA authorization law for fiscal year 1997 and the actual program funds appropriated by Congress for fiscal year 1997. The first set of columns shows the actual appropriation as apportioned for this fiscal year, and the second set of columns shows the authorization level. The funding level available to an urbanized area or State for obligation is the appropriated amount as apportioned to the area. The authorized level does not represent funds that are actually available during the fiscal year. Rather, it reflects the maximum dollar amount authorized in ISTEA for which funds can be appropriated by Congress for a particular fiscal year.

C. Project Management Oversight

49 U.S.C. 5327 allows the Secretary of Transportation to use not more than one-half of one percent of the funds made available under the Capital Program, the Urbanized Area Formula Program, the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program, the National Capital Transportation Act, as amended, and an additional one-quarter of one percent of Capital Program funds, to contract with any person to oversee the construction of any major project under these statutory programs and to conduct safety, procurement, management and financial reviews and audits. Therefore, one-half of one percent of the funds appropriated for the Urbanized Area Formula Program, the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program and the National Capital Transportation Act, as amended, for fiscal year 1997, and three-quarters of one percent of Capital Program funds have been reserved for these purposes before apportionment of the funds.

IV. Departmental Initiatives

A. Livable Communities

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

Community-sensitive transit is customer-friendly, community-oriented and designed to function effectively within the community. Customer-friendly transit provides readily available information, safety and security measures. Real-time customer information, monitoring devices, help zones and improved lighting are illustrative characteristics. Community-oriented transit incorporates on-site services such as child care, public safety, health care and retail conveniences. Well-designed transit, from the perspective of more livable communities, improves pedestrian access, increases the person-carrying capacity of local transportation networks, and reflects the aesthetic and historic character of communities. More community-sensitive transit may result in increased transit ridership, reduced single occupant vehicle trips and improved air quality. In fiscal year 1996, FTA awarded a number of capital grants to implement projects which reflected the characteristics of community-sensitive transit.

The Livable Communities Initiative recognizes the important role that local land use and transportation policy can play in improving the effectiveness of

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

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

B. Intelligent Transportation Systems

The Department of Transportation is actively promoting the development of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) which apply advanced computer, communication, information and navigation technologies to surface transportation. ITS technologies improve transit operating efficiency and make transit customer-friendly and easier to use.

ITS represents a significant step in the advancement of transit technology, and demonstration projects of the past few years have proven that significant benefits are possible. These initial successes have set the stage for the broader ITS deployments being developed today. As transit ITS expands from research and demonstration to full-scale implementation, transit operators around the country are recognizing that ITS offers as much—if not more—to the transit industry as it does to other transportation modes.

ITS improves transit operational efficiency in a variety of ways. In Kansas City, Automatic Vehicle Location technology has helped the Kansas City Area Transit Authority decrease capital costs by approximately $1.8 million and operating costs by $400,000 annually. The introduction of Smart Cards in the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority rail stations is estimated to save $2.4 million in annual cash handling costs. Several transit operators are also exploring the use of ITS vehicle location technology to assist with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance by coordinating timed transfers between fixed-route and paratransit services.

ITS improves customer service in a variety of ways. For example, at bus stops: letting customers know if the bus just left or is about to arrive; on board vehicles: using in-vehicle signs and enunciator systems informing passengers of upcoming stops; at transfer points: sending hold notification to vehicles so passengers do not miss their transfers; during emergencies: using an emergency response system to direct immediate help to vehicles in distress; and at the farebox: enabling patrons to use a common fare card for all transit services in a region.

It is important that transit agencies consider the application of these ITS technologies as current planning and capital programs are developed. Authorities planning to purchase equipment such as radios, in-vehicle signs, fare boxes, passenger counters or any other electronic hardware, should consider the gains from integrating state-of-the-art technologies.

Applications of ITS technologies are enhanced if they are integrated among multiple transit agencies and with ITS traffic management systems. Traveler information systems for all customers are enhanced by providing both transit and highway information. Such systems include data which is readily and freely shared between the transit and highway ITS systems.

By integrating these systems, an ''Intelligent Transportation Infrastructure'' of technology will be created providing maximum benefits to all travelers, including those who use transit within metropolitan areas.

As requests for funding assistance are received by the FTA and other USDOT modal administrations, they will be reviewed with an intent toward ensuring that all surface transportation modes using or planning ITS systems share data to realize the fullest advantages of these systems. Metropolitan Planning Organizations, state Departments of Transportation, and transit authorities are encouraged to cooperate in the planning, design, acquisition, deployment and operation of ITS systems and to recognize the great potential of transit ITS applications. These organizations are also encouraged to ensure that transit ITS is fully integrated among transit agencies and with other ITS applications such as traffic management and traffic information systems. It is important that decision makers keep their options open in specifying and procuring ITS systems so future enhancements and modal integrations may be readily added onto systems without costly modifications.

It is critical that consideration of ITS technologies occur within the context of the planning process, which includes long range planning, regional planning studies, corridor and subarea studies (major investment studies), preliminary engineering, operations planning and management systems. These considerations should be reflected in the transportation plan, the Transportation Improvement Program, and Unified Planning Work Program. Central to this process is the identification of problems and their underlying causes so that appropriate solutions can be found. ITS strategies should be considered along with traditional alternatives which address transportation problems. In this way the costs and benefits of ITS and other strategies can be assessed so that the optimum mix of solutions can be determined.

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

C. ADA Paratransit Service Implementation

Reduction of Paperwork for ADA Paratransit Plan Updates. To reduce paperwork and the administrative burden of regulation, on May 21, 1996 (see 61 Federal Register 25409), the DOT amended its regulation, 49 CFR Part 37, implementing the transportation provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). The DOT eliminated the annual ADA paratransit plan update submission requirement, 49 CFR Section 37.135(c), for those systems that have fully implemented ADA paratransit service. In 1996, almost all of the 530 systems report full implementation. ADA paratransit service is to be fully implemented by January 26, 1997. Full implementation means that all of the six ADA paratransit service requirements listed in Section 37.131 (service area, response time, fares, trip purpose, hours/days of service, and capacity constraints) have been met. If the transit authority has fully implemented these requirements, an annual update or progress report is no longer required. Further, the public hearing on the annual plan update is no longer required. All that is required of an FTA grantee is to complete the fiscal year 1997 Annual List of Certifications and Assurances, Category I, part G, which is an Assurance of Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability. However, if the ADA

paratransit service requirements will not be met by January 26, 1997, an applicant for funding must notify the appropriate FTA regional office in writing, submit a 1997 plan update to FTA by January 26, 1997, and submit a temporary time extension request to FTA to continue to remain eligible for federal funding. As of October 1, 1996, the FTA has not received any requests for a temporary time extension based on undue financial burden during the last three years.

D. Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG)

Beginning in fiscal year 1997, FTA and FHWA will offer the states the opportunity to participate in a pilot Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG) program. This concept is consistent with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials policy endorsing consolidation of FHWA and FTA planning funds and with comments received from our customers during ISTEA outreach meetings.

A consolidated grant will accomplish three important goals. First, it will result in one set of grant application and reporting procedures and one billing process, thereby streamlining the program. Second, the non-mode-specific nature of a consolidated grant will enhance the multimodal approach to transportation planning envisioned in ISTEA and the joint planning regulations. Finally, as the two agencies move toward greater streamlining, the cooperative effort required for unified delivery will reduce duplication of effort and increase FHWA and FTA staff time available for customer service.

In response to suggestions to streamline and consolidate the highway and transit planning programs, FTA and FHWA will initiate a pilot program to demonstrate this consolidated grant concept and invite the states' participation in the pilot. The CPG is intended to incorporate some of the most ''customer-friendly'' aspects of the FTA and FHWA separate processes. Under this pilot, the State's FHWA Metropolitan Planning funds and, at a State's request, the planning portion of FHWA's State Planning and Research funds and other Title 23, USC funds that may be used for metropolitan and statewide planning (i.e. Minimum Allocation, Funding Restoration, National Highway System (NHS), and/or STP), would be made available to FTA, similar to the process used for flexible STP funds. For information purposes, estimates of the FHWA Metropolitan Planning funds and the FHWA State Planning and Research funds, 75% of which is available for planning, are included in Table 9. The FHWA funds would be combined with FTA's counterpart planning funds and awarded electronically as a consolidated grant through FTA's Electronic Grant Making and Management (EGMM) System. States would submit a single claim for reimbursement to FTA. FHWA/FTA oversight and administrative responsibilities will be mutually agreed to by the affected field offices. Currently, all states are connected to the FTA Grants Management Information System which supports EGMM. EGMM software, training and support are available at no cost for any state wishing to utilize EGMM to apply for and receive consolidated planning grant funds.

Both the FTA and the FHWA view this pilot as a critical element in our efforts to ''redefine government'' and provide better customer service. We will receive expressions of interest through either the FTA Regional Office or FHWA Division Office.

E. Transit-Oriented Development

FTA is encouraging local governments and transit agencies to implement transit-oriented development around transit sites. This type of development includes mixed uses, carefully managed parking and good pedestrian access, and is within easy walking distance of the transit facilities.

Transit-Oriented Development on property owned by transit agencies promotes transit use and provides a source of income for transit operations. For example, some transit agencies lease air rights or ground space at transit stations for retail centers, day care facilities or news stands. To facilitate greater opportunities for joint development at transit sites, DOT has approved individual exceptions to the Federal government's Common Grant Rule for transit agencies in Washington, D.C.; Portland, Oregon; and Atlanta, Georgia. These three pilots may now involve the sell of unneeded property for transit-oriented development on that property, and use the income for transit-related capital and operational purposes.

F. FTA Home Page on the Internet

FTA in its efforts to provide better customer service and broaden the availability of FTA information has established an FTA Home Page on the Internet. This apportionment Notice as well as FTA program circulars (Section 5309 Capital Program: Grant Application Instructions—C9300.1, September 29, 1995; Section 18 Program Guidance—9040.1C (now Section 5311 Nonurbanized Area Formula Program), November 3, 1992; Section 16 Capital Assistance Program Guidance, 9070.1C, (now Section 5310 Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program), December 23, 1992; Grant Management Guidelines, C5010.1B, September 7, 1995; and Third Party Contracting Requirements, C4220.1D, April 15, 1996) are contained therein.

The FTA Home Page may be reached through the DOT Home Page at the following address: http://www.fta.dot.gov.

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

A. Total Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments

In addition to the appropriated fiscal year 1997 Urbanized Area Formula funds of $1,978,020,854, the apportionment also includes $8,031,253 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 one-half percent for project management oversight is reserved ($9,890,104), the amount appropriated for this program is $1,968,130,750. The funds to be reapportioned, described in the previous paragraph, have then been added. Thus, the total amount apportioned for this program is $1,976,162,003.

B. Data Used for Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments

Data from the 1995 National Transit Database (49 U.S.C. 5335) Report Year submitted in late 1995 and early 1996 have been used to calculate the fiscal year 1997 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 1997 Urbanized Area Formula apportionment reflect the amount the recipient would have received without the reductions in mileage.

D. Designation of New Urbanized Area

In fiscal year 1996, Flagstaff, Arizona, was designated an urbanized area by a special census review. This newly urbanized area is included for the first time in the Arizona Governor's apportionment for urbanized areas under 200,000 in population and is no longer eligible for inclusion in Section 5311 grants obligated in fiscal year 1997 and beyond.

E. Urbanized Area Formula Fiscal Year 1997 Apportionments to Governors

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

F. Urbanized Area Formula Operating Assistance Limitations

The fiscal year 1997 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 1997 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 1995, published by the Department of Labor (DOL), establishes that the calendar year 1995 CPI increase for all urban consumers is 2.5 percent. This increase was applied against the base operating assistance limitation calculated in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5336(d)(2). In addition, Flagstaff, Arizona, the new urbanized area designated by special census, has been given an operating assistance limitation of two-thirds of its apportionment, consistent with the provision of 49 U.S.C. 5336(d)(1).

These adjustments result in an overall national fiscal year 1997 authorized operating assistance limitation level of $1,140,989,706. However, the 1997 DOT Appropriations Act limits the nationwide availability for operating assistance to a maximum of $400,000,000. Further, it maintains the level of transit operating assistance to urbanized areas of less than 200,000 in population at seventy-five percent of the amount of operating assistance such areas received in fiscal year 1995. Accordingly, the operating assistance limitation published in this Notice takes into account both the 1997 DOT Appropriations Act and Federal transit laws. Therefore, the higher operating assistance limitation as authorized under Federal transit laws ($1,140,990,224) was reduced to the $400,000,000 required by the 1997 DOT Appropriations Act by taking a pro rata reduction across all categories of grantees. Further, the operating assistance limitation to urbanized areas less than 200,000 in population was adjusted to $92,949,803 or seventy-five percent of the amount of their fiscal year 1995 level of $123,933,070. The operating assistance limitation of $85,791 for Flagstaff, Arizona (a newly designated urbanized area) was then added, thereby increasing the fiscal year 1997 level for these areas to $93,035,594. The remaining $306,964,406 of the $400,000,000 was prorated to urbanized areas above 200,000 in population, as authorized by the 1997 DOT Appropriations Act.

Consistent with the 1997 Conference Report, the Secretary hereby directs each area of 1,000,000 or more in population to give priority consideration to the impact of reductions in operating assistance on smaller transit authorities operating within the area, and to consider the needs and resources of such transit authorities when the limitation is distributed among all transit authorities operating in the area.

G. Statewide Operating Assistance Limitations

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

H. Designated Transportation Management Areas

All urbanized areas over 200,000 in population have been designated as transportation management areas (TMAs), in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5305. These designations were formally made in a Federal Register Notice dated May 18, 1992 (57 FR 21160), signed by the Federal Highway Administrator and the Federal Transit Administrator. Additional areas may be designated as TMAs upon the request of the Governor and the MPO designated for such area or the affected local officials. As of October 1, 1996, two additional TMAs have been formally designated: Petersburg, Virginia, comprised solely of the Petersburg, Virginia, urbanized area; and Santa Barbara, Santa Maria, and Lompoc, California, which were combined and designated as one TMA.

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

As required by 49 U.S.C. 5307(a)(2), a recipient(s) must be designated to dispense the Urbanized Area Formula funds attributable to TMAs. Those urbanized areas that do not already have a designated recipient must name one and notify the appropriate FTA regional office of the designation. This would include those urbanized areas with less than 200,000 in population that may receive TMA designation independently, or those with less than 200,000 in population which are currently included within the boundaries of a larger designated TMA. In both cases, the Governor would only have discretion to allocate Governor's Apportionment funds attributable to areas which are outside of designated TMA boundaries. In order for the FTA and Governors to know which

urbanized areas under 200,000 in population are included within the boundaries of an existing TMA, and so that they can be identified in future Federal Register notices, each MPO whose TMA planning boundaries include these smaller urbanized areas is asked to identify such areas to the FTA. This notification should be made in writing to the Associate Administrator for Program Management, Federal Transit Administration, 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590, no later than July 1 of each fiscal year. To date, FTA has been notified of the following urbanized areas with less than 200,000 in population that are included within the planning boundaries of designated TMAs:

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

I. Urbanized Area Formula Funds Used for Highway Purposes

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

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

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

A. Nonurbanized Area Formula Program

The fiscal year 1997 Nonurbanized Area Formula apportionments to the states totaling $116,158,383 are displayed in Table 3. Of the $115,122,907 appropriated, one-half percent ($575,615) was reserved for project management oversight. In addition to the current appropriation, the funds available for apportionment included $1,611,091 consisting of deobligated funds from fiscal years prior to 1994.

The population figures used in calculating these apportionments are from the 1990 Census. The database for the State of Arizona has been adjusted to account for Flagstaff, Arizona, a newly designated urbanized area that is no longer eligible for Nonurbanized Area Formula grants.

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 1997 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 1997 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 1997 RTAP allocations to the States totaling $4,566,568 are also displayed on Table 3. This amount includes $4,500,000 in fiscal year 1997 appropriated funds, and $66,568 in prior year deobligated funds which have become available for reallocation for this program. The funds are allocated to the States to undertake research, training, technical assistance, and other support services to meet the needs of transit operators in nonurbanized areas. These funds are to be used in conjunction with the States' administration of the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program.

VII. Elderly and Persons With Disabilities Program (49 U.S.C. 5310)

A total of $56,059,007 is apportioned to the States for fiscal year 1997 for the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program. In addition to the fiscal year 1997 appropriation of $56,041,239 the fiscal year 1997 apportionment also includes $17,768 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.

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

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

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

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

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

A. Transfer Process

''Flexible'' DOT funds, such as Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, or others, which are designated for use in transit projects, are transferred from the FHWA to FTA after which FTA approves the project and awards a grant. Flexible funds designated for transit projects must result from the local and state planning and programming process, and must be included in an approved State Transportation Improvement Program

(STIP) before the funds can be transferred. In order to initiate the transfer process, the grantee must submit a completed application to the FTA Regional Office, and must notify the state highway/transportation agency that it has submitted an application which requires a transfer of funds. Once the state highway/transportation agency determines that the state has sufficient obligation authority, the State agency notifies FHWA that the funds are to be used for transit purposes and requests that the funds be obligated by FHWA as a transfer project to FTA. The flexible funds transferred to FTA will be placed in an urbanized area or state account for one of the three existing formula programs—Urbanized Area, Elderly and Persons with Disabilities, or Nonurbanized Area.

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

B. Matching Share for Flexible Funds

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

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

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

C. Other Funds Transferred to FTA

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

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

A. Fixed Guideway Modernization

Fixed Guideway Modernization funds are allocated by formula. Statutory percentages were established to allocate the first $497,700,000 to 11 fixed guideway areas. The next $70,000,000 is allocated one-half to these 11 urbanized areas and one-half to other urbanized areas with fixed guideways which are at least seven years old on the basis of the Urbanized Area Formula Program fixed guideway tier formula factors. The remaining funds are allocated to all of these urbanized areas as one universe. For fiscal year 1997, $760,000,000 was appropriated for fixed guideway modernization. After deducting the three-quarter percent for oversight ($5,700,000), $754,300,000 is available for apportionment to the specified urbanized areas for Fixed Guideway Modernization funding.

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

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

B. New Starts

The fiscal year 1997 appropriation for New Starts is 760,000,000. In addition, Congress reprogrammed $56,956,000 in unobligated New Starts funds originally appropriated in fiscal years 1992 and 1995, yielding an overall total of $816,956,000. This entire amount was allocated to projects specified in the 1997 DOT Appropriations Act. After applying the three-quarter percent reduction to the appropriated amount ($760,000,000) for project management oversight, $811,256,000 remains available for allocation. The amount of the project management oversight reduction ($5,700,000) is subtracted on a prorata basis from all 54 projects specified in the 1997 legislation. The final allocation for these projects is contained in Table 6 of this Federal Register Notice. Also provided in the table are prior year unobligated allocations for New Starts.

C. Bus

The fiscal year 1997 appropriation for Bus is $380,000,000 for the purchase of buses, bus-related equipment and paratransit vehicles, and for the construction of bus-related facilities. After deducting the three-quarter percent for oversight ($2,850,000), $377,150,000 remains available for projects. The Conference Report accompanying the 1997 DOT Appropriations Act earmarked all of the fiscal year 1997 Bus funds to specified states or localities for bus and bus-related projects. In three instances where funds were earmarked to States, the funds were further suballocated to local entities within these states. The Conference Report also includes the multi-year ISTEA earmarks.

Because the three-quarter percent for project management oversight was subtracted from the amount appropriated, each bus project identified in the Conference Report receives three-quarter percent less than the funding level contained in the report. No funds remain available for discretionary allocation by the Federal Transit Administrator. Table 7 displays the allocations of the fiscal year 1997 Bus funds by area and also shows prior year unobligated earmarks for the Bus Program.

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

For technical assistance purposes, the dollar unit values of data derived from the computations of the Urbanized Area Formula and Nonurbanized Area Formula Programs, and the Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula

apportionments are included in this Notice on Table 10. To determine how a particular apportionment amount was developed, areas may multiply their population, population density, and data from the National Transit Database by these unit values.

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

A. Metropolitan Planning Urbanized Area Program

The fiscal year 1997 Metropolitan Planning apportionments to States for MPOs to be used in urbanized areas total $40,172,643. This amount includes $39,500,000 in fiscal year 1997 apportioned funds, and $672,643 in prior year deobligated funds which have become available for reallocation for this program. A basic allocation of 80 percent of this amount $32,138,114 is distributed to the States based on the State's urbanized area population for subsequent State distribution to each urbanized area, or parts thereof, within each State. A supplemental allocation of the remaining 20 percent $8,034,529 is also provided to the States based on an FTA administrative formula to address planning needs in the larger, more complex urbanized areas. Table 8 contains the final State apportionments for the combined basic and supplemental allocations. Each State, in cooperation with the MPOs, must develop an allocation formula for the combined apportionment which distributes these funds to MPOs representing urbanized areas, or parts thereof, within the State. This formula, which must be approved by the FTA, must ensure to the maximum extent practicable that no MPO is allocated less than the amount it received by administrative formula under the Metropolitan Planning Program in fiscal year 1991 (minimum MPO allocation). Each State formula must include a provision for the minimum MPO allocation. Where the State and MPOs desire to use a new formula not previously approved by FTA, it must be submitted to the appropriate FTA Regional Office for prior approval.

B. State Planning and Research Program

The fiscal year 1997 apportionments for the State Planning and Research Program total $8,279,228. This amount includes $8,250,000 in fiscal year 1997 apportioned funds, and $29,228 in prior year deobligated funds which have become available for reallocation to this program. Final State apportionments for this program are also contained on Table 8. This is the sixth year of a consolidated program which is apportioned to the States for the purpose of such activities as planning, technical studies and assistance, demonstrations, management training and cooperative research. In addition, a State may authorize a portion of these funds to be used to supplement planning funds allocated by the State to its urbanized areas as the State deems appropriate.

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

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

D. FHWA Metropolitan Planning Program and State Planning and Research Program

For information purposes, the estimated State apportionments for the FHWA Metropolitan Planning Program and State Planning and Research Program are contained in Table 9.

E. Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs)

The PEAs are aids to the States and MPOs in the development of planning work programs. They are advisory and are intended to serve FTA, FHWA, and the rest of the Department as a means of helping to meet national transportation needs and implementing national transportation policy. The last PEAs were issued by the FTA and the FHWA on July 11, 1994. These remain in effect until changed, which is expected some time during early fiscal year 1997.

The PEAs currently under development will highlight program objectives identified jointly by FTA and FHWA including, but not limited to: ITS, multimodalism, innovative services, innovative financing, partnering, and the need for community sensitive transportation planning that considers social, environmental, economic, land-use and other quality of life factors early in the development process.

XII. Period of Availability of Funds

The funds apportioned under the Urbanized Area Formula Program, Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula, Metropolitan Planning and State Planning and Research Programs in this Notice will remain available to be obligated by FTA to recipients for three (3) fiscal years following fiscal year 1997. Any of these apportioned funds unobligated at the close of business on September 30, 2000, will revert to FTA for reapportionment under these respective programs. Funds apportioned to nonurbanized areas under the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program, including RTAP funds, will remain available for two (2) fiscal years following fiscal year 1997. Any such funds remaining unobligated at the close of business on September 30, 1999, 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, 1997. Any such funds remaining unobligated as of this date will revert to FTA for reapportionment among the States under the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program. The 1996 DOT Appropriations Act includes a provision requiring that fiscal year 1996 New Starts and Bus funds not obligated for their original purpose as of September 30, 1998, shall be made available for other discretionary projects within the respective categories of the Capital Program. Similar provisions in the 1994 and 1995 DOT Appropriations Acts required that fiscal year 1994 Bus and New Start funds that are not obligated by September 30, 1996, shall also be made available for other discretionary Bus or New Start projects, respectively, and fiscal year 1995 Bus and New Start funds unobligated by September 30, 1997, shall be made available for other discretionary Bus or New Start projects, respectively.

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

A. Background

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

B. Current Coverage

In fiscal year 1997, authority to incur costs for Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula, Metropolitan

Planning, Urbanized Area Formula, Elderly and Persons with Disabilities, Nonurbanized Area Formula, and State Planning and Research in advance of possible future Federal participation applies to fiscal year 1997 FTA funds apportioned in this Notice for the programs listed above. Carryover amounts for these programs are also included in this authority. This pre-award authority is also extended to projects intended to be funded with STP or CMAQ funds transferred to FTA in fiscal year 1997, provided that the projects are included in a Federally approved STIP. Pre-award authority applies to flexible funds prior to transfer to FTA if the conditions below are met. This pre-award authority also applies to Capital Bus funds identified in this Notice. The pre-award authority does not apply to Capital New Start funds.

C. Conditions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

D. Environmental and Other Requirements

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

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

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

XIV. Electronic Grant Making and Management Initiatives: Fiscal Year 1997 and Beyond

A. Background

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

B. On-Line Grantee Program

The On-Line Grantee Program enables grantee agencies to access the FTA Grants Management Information System (GMIS) data base via a toll free telephone connection. With this access grantee agencies can inquire about grant and fund status, file required financial and narrative grant status reports and make annual certifications and assurances through GMIS. Over 480 of FTA's approximately 700 grantees are currently ''on-line''.

C. Electronic Grant Making and Management (EGMM)

This initiative streamlines the entire FTA grant making and management process through a paperless electronic grant application, review, approval, acceptance and management process. During Fiscal Year 1996, 34 grantee agencies participated in the FTA EGMM program. These grantees utilized EGMM to electronically develop, submit, and manage their grants during the full life cycle of the grant via grantee computer station connections to the FTA GMIS computer using a modem and a toll free telephone connection. Any agency interested in participating in the EGMM program should contact the appropriate FTA Regional Office.

D. Electronic Signature of Certifications and Assurances

The FTA is required by U.S.C. 5307 as well as other laws and regulations to obtain specific certifications and assurances for its programs. Annually, since fiscal year 1995, FTA compiled the certifications and assurances applicable to the FTA programs into one document published in the Federal Register. Grantees are able to sign one document annually certifying to all the certifications and assurances applicable to FTA grants. During fiscal year 1997, we encourage all EGMM grantee participants and on-line grantee participants to provide this certification electronically, completely eliminating paper certification.

E. Future EGMM Activities

There are two initiatives in the development stages that FTA hopes will

result in more efficient and effective customer service.

(1) The FTA is working with the FHWA to develop single agency delivery of metropolitan and state planning funds utilizing the FTA EGMM grant delivery system. FTA and FHWA will pilot test the concept of a consolidated planning grant during fiscal year 1997.

(2) FTA has contracted for the development of graphic user interface software in order to make interface with the EGMM system more user friendly.

We appreciate and look forward to the continued support of our grantees agencies as we seek additional ways to improve delivery of the transit program.

XV. Quarterly Approval of Grants

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

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

In order to expedite the grant approval process within the quarterly approval structure, grants which are complete and have received the required Transit Employee Protective Certification 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.

Applications for the first quarter should be submitted to the FTA Regional Office within five business days of this Notice. The first-quarter grants will be released on or before December 30, 1996.

XVI. Grant Application Procedures

All applications for FTA funds should be submitted to the appropriate FTA Regional Office. Formula grant applications should be prepared in conformance with the following FTA Circulars: Urbanized Area Formula—C9030.1A, September 18, 1987; Nonurbanized Area Formula—C9040.1C, November 3, 1992; Elderly and Persons with Disabilities—C9070.1C, December 23, 1992; and Section 5309 Capital Program: Grant Application Instructions—C9300.1, September 29, 1995. Applications for STP ''flexible'' fund grants should be prepared in the same manner as the apportioned funds under the Urbanized Area Formula, Nonurbanized Area Formula, or Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Programs. Guidance on preparation of applications for Metropolitan Planning, and State Planning and Research funds may be obtained from each FTA Regional Office. Also available are revised editions of the Grant Management Guidelines, C5010.1B, September 7, 1995; and Third Party Contracting Requirements, C4220.1D, April 15, 1996. Copies of circulars are available from FTA Regional Offices. Circulars are also available on the FTA Home Page on the Internet.

Issued on: September 30, 1996.

Gordon J. Linton,

Administrator.

BILLING CODE 4910–57–P

TABLE 1

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 APPROPRIATIONS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZATIONS FOR GRANT PROGRAMS

SOURCES OF FUNDS	FY 1997 APPROPRIATIONS	*AUTHORIZED LEVELS*
SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM AND SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM	$2,093,143,761	$3,958,750,000
SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM	$1,978,020,854	*$3,741,018,750*
94.5% of Total Available for Urbanized Area Formula and Nonurbanized Area Formula Programs		
Less Oversight (1/2%)	(9,890,104)	
Reapportioned Funds Added	8,031,253	
Total Apportioned	$1,976,162,003	
Operating Assistance Limitation	$400,000,000	*$1,112,922,445*
SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM	$115,122,907	*$217,731,250*
5.5% of Total Available for Urbanized Area Formula and Nonurbanized Area Formula Programs		
Less Oversight (1/2%)	(575,615)	
Reapportioned Funds Added	1,611,091	
Total Apportioned	$116,158,383	
SECTION 5311(b) RTAP PROGRAM	$4,500,000	*$10,875,000*
Reapportioned Funds Added	66,568	
Total Apportioned	$4,566,568	
SECTION 5310 ELDERLY AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES PROGRAM	$56,041,239	*$97,150,000*
Reapportioned Funds Added	17,768	
Total Apportioned	$56,059,007	
SECTION 5309 CAPITAL PROGRAM	$1,900,000,000	*$2,900,000,000*
SECTION 5309(m)(1)(A) FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION	$760,000,000	*$1,160,000,000*
Less Oversight (3/4%)	(5,700,000)	
Total Apportioned	$754,300,000	
SECTION 5309(m)(1)(B) NEW STARTS	$760,000,000	*$1,160,000,000*
Less Oversight (3/4%)	(5,700,000)	
Reprogrammed Funds	56,956,000	
Total Allocated	$811,256,000	
SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) BUS	$380,000,000	*$580,000,000*
Less Oversight (3/4%)	(2,850,000)	
Total Allocated	$377,150,000	
SECTION 5303 METROPOLITAN PLANNING PROGRAM	$39,500,000	*$97,875,000*
Reapportioned Funds Added	672,643	
Total Apportioned	$40,172,643	
SECTION 5313(b) STATE PLANNING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM	$8,250,000	*$21,000,000*
Reapportioned Funds Added	29,228	
Total Apportioned	$8,279,228	
TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS (Above Grant Programs)	$4,101,435,000	*$7,085,650,000*

97FR-T1

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
OVER 1,000,000 IN POPULATION	$1,452,258,134	$239,805,353	*$2,749,230,539*	*$735,611,460*
200,000-1,000,000 IN POPULATION	333,567,556	67,159,053	*631,467,692*	*206,012,790*
50,000-200,000 IN POPULATION	190,336,313	93,035,594	*360,320,519*	*199,365,974*
NATIONAL TOTAL	$1,976,162,003	$400,000,000	*$3,741,018,750*	*$1,140,990,224*

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
Amounts Apportioned and Authorized to Urbanized Areas Over 1,000,000 in Population:				
Atlanta, GA	$28,477,842	$2,816,782	*$53,910,632*	*$8,640,580*
Baltimore, MD	23,961,535	4,508,488	*45,360,931*	*13,829,948*
Boston, MA	54,141,795	8,464,663	*102,494,367*	*25,965,654*
Chicago, IL-Northwestern IN	131,887,681	23,451,339	*249,672,997*	*71,937,818*
Cincinnati, OH-KY	9,632,894	2,442,132	*18,235,770*	*7,491,326*
Cleveland, OH	16,578,429	4,468,291	*31,384,177*	*13,706,642*
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	25,467,278	4,006,917	*48,211,413*	*12,291,360*
Denver, CO	16,632,395	2,735,492	*31,486,338*	*8,391,219*
Detroit, MI	24,439,855	9,919,871	*46,266,426*	*30,429,558*
Ft Lauderdale-Hollywood-Pompano Bch, FL.	14,766,384	3,402,165	*27,953,841*	*10,436,263*
Houston, TX	30,163,976	4,210,427	*57,102,606*	*12,915,635*
Kansas City, MO-KS	6,785,583	2,069,272	*12,845,602*	*6,347,566*
Los Angeles, CA	130,749,338	26,458,161	*247,518,031*	*81,161,350*
Miami-Hialeah, FL	26,124,578	3,886,369	*49,455,730*	*11,921,576*
Milwaukee, WI	12,085,049	2,532,155	*22,877,878*	*7,767,476*
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN	17,489,509	3,376,246	*33,108,915*	*10,356,756*
New Orleans, LA	10,940,543	3,062,741	*20,711,245*	*9,395,067*
New York, NY-Northeastern NJ	424,978,676	61,275,249	*804,515,638*	*187,964,005*
Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News, VA	8,671,332	1,945,468	*16,415,463*	*5,967,792*
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	75,007,190	14,750,581	*141,994,079*	*45,247,934*
Phoenix, AZ	15,328,662	2,181,446	*29,018,274*	*6,691,663*
Pittsburgh, PA	21,030,760	4,403,029	*39,812,762*	*13,506,447*
Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA	15,378,663	2,040,154	*29,112,929*	*6,258,245*
Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	11,829,917	1,166,057	*22,394,893*	*3,576,921*
Sacramento, CA	8,986,639	1,612,646	*17,012,362*	*4,946,850*
San Antonio, TX	14,754,224	2,121,955	*27,930,822*	*6,509,173*
San Diego, CA	24,990,971	3,385,852	*47,309,729*	*10,386,223*
San Francisco-Oakland, CA	77,176,216	9,015,230	*146,100,203*	*27,654,539*
San Jose, CA	20,058,868	3,062,957	*37,972,897*	*9,395,728*
San Juan, PR	23,403,297	3,481,285	*44,304,148*	*10,678,964*
Seattle, WA	34,631,213	2,860,757	*65,559,412*	*8,775,474*
St. Louis, MO-IL	16,873,006	4,444,963	*31,941,830*	*13,635,083*
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	12,245,969	2,420,122	*23,182,511*	*7,423,810*
Washington, DC-MD-VA	66,587,867	7,826,091	*126,055,688*	*24,006,814*
TOTAL	$1,452,258,134	$239,805,353	*$2,749,230,539*	*$735,611,460*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
Amounts Apportioned and Authorized to Urbanized Areas 200,000 to 1,000,000 in Population :				
Akron, OH	**$4,059,741**	**$1,067,925**	*$7,685,385*	*$3,275,898*
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	**4,761,264**	**1,035,770**	*9,013,419*	*3,177,262*
Albuquerque, NM	**3,739,626**	**715,783**	*7,079,386*	*2,195,689*
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	**3,194,653**	**1,082,932**	*6,047,711*	*3,321,933*
Anchorage, AK	**1,556,095**	**353,415**	*2,945,800*	*1,084,113*
Ann Arbor, MI	**2,580,614**	**454,078**	*4,885,290*	*1,392,900*
Augusta, GA-SC	**1,323,808**	**361,721**	*2,506,064*	*1,109,591*
Austin, TX	**7,692,115**	**681,184**	*14,561,734*	*2,089,557*
Bakersfield, CA	**2,500,856**	**444,156**	*4,734,303*	*1,362,463*
Baton Rouge, LA	**2,037,036**	**593,526**	*3,856,258*	*1,820,663*
Birmingham, AL	**3,436,853**	**1,090,264**	*6,506,213*	*3,344,425*
Bridgeport-Milford, CT	**4,313,581**	**946,550**	*8,165,923*	*2,903,577*
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	**8,736,460**	**2,778,422**	*16,538,756*	*8,522,905*
Canton, OH	**1,312,653**	**522,973**	*2,484,947*	*1,604,239*
Charleston, SC	**2,091,766**	**495,832**	*3,959,866*	*1,520,981*
Charlotte, NC	**4,242,082**	**597,735**	*8,030,572*	*1,833,572*
Chattanooga, TN-GA	**1,723,265**	**450,609**	*3,262,266*	*1,382,260*
Colorado Springs, CO	**2,682,047**	**447,324**	*5,077,311*	*1,372,181*
Columbia, SC	**1,984,293**	**506,192**	*3,756,412*	*1,552,762*
Columbus, GA-AL	**1,270,244**	**379,273**	*2,404,665*	*1,163,434*
Columbus, OH	**7,728,615**	**2,015,134**	*14,630,832*	*6,181,496*
Corpus Christi, TX	**2,604,032**	**398,027**	*4,929,622*	*1,220,961*
Davenport-Rock Island-Moline, IA-IL	**1,997,317**	**517,895**	*3,781,067*	*1,588,660*
Dayton, OH	**8,324,401**	**1,340,914**	*15,758,697*	*4,113,301*
Daytona Beach, FL	**1,794,688**	**359,635**	*3,397,476*	*1,103,192*
Des Moines, IA	**1,834,582**	**504,401**	*3,472,996*	*1,547,268*
Durham, NC	**2,185,218**	**370,685**	*4,136,777*	*1,137,089*
El Paso, TX-NM	**6,085,157**	**824,995**	*11,519,645*	*2,530,701*
Fayetteville, NC	**1,053,726**	**341,127**	*1,994,781*	*1,046,419*
Flint, MI	**2,730,993**	**701,642**	*5,169,968*	*2,152,313*
Fort Myers-Cape Coral, FL	**1,547,883**	**261,974**	*2,930,256*	*803,615*
Fort Wayne, IN	**1,358,261**	**500,307**	*2,571,288*	*1,534,710*
Fresno, CA	**3,724,661**	**673,282**	*7,051,054*	*2,065,317*
Grand Rapids, MI	**2,856,660**	**711,632**	*5,407,867*	*2,182,957*
Greenville, SC	**1,314,526**	**343,967**	*2,488,493*	*1,055,132*
Harrisburg, PA	**1,569,322**	**519,480**	*2,970,841*	*1,593,523*
Hartford-Middletown, CT	**6,254,556**	**1,054,201**	*11,840,332*	*3,233,801*
Honolulu, HI	**15,442,112**	**1,305,605**	*29,233,045*	*4,004,990*
Indianapolis, IN	**6,189,778**	**1,754,251**	*11,717,700*	*5,381,226*
Jackson, MS	**1,369,139**	**414,700**	*2,591,880*	*1,272,107*
Jacksonville, FL	**5,663,862**	**929,479**	*10,722,103*	*2,851,210*
Knoxville, TN	**1,688,818**	**413,405**	*3,197,055*	*1,268,134*
Lansing-East Lansing, MI	**2,308,274**	**533,655**	*4,369,733*	*1,637,005*
Las Vegas, NV	**7,253,908**	**633,483**	*13,732,175*	*1,943,230*
Lawrence-Haverhill, MA-NH	**2,386,518**	**392,150**	*4,517,853*	*1,202,935*
Lexington-Fayette, KY	**1,385,420**	**594,869**	*2,622,702*	*1,824,783*
Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR	**1,958,848**	**475,665**	*3,708,243*	*1,459,120*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
Amounts Apportioned and Authorized to Urbanized Areas 200,000 to 1,000,000 in Population (continued):				
Lorain-Elyria, OH	$900,086	$358,820	*$1,703,928*	*$1,100,692*
Louisville, KY-IN	7,160,476	1,791,628	*13,555,303*	*5,495,881*
Madison, WI	3,379,278	457,666	*6,397,219*	*1,403,907*
McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX	960,878	380,225	*1,819,012*	*1,166,353*
Melbourne-Palm Bay, FL	1,742,237	323,270	*3,298,180*	*991,643*
Memphis, TN-AR-MS	6,397,414	1,660,461	*12,110,771*	*5,093,522*
Mobile, AL	1,467,031	462,711	*2,777,198*	*1,419,381*
Modesto, CA	2,069,508	455,399	*3,917,730*	*1,396,952*
Montgomery, AL	1,083,840	470,828	*2,051,788*	*1,444,283*
Nashville, TN	3,368,111	769,856	*6,376,080*	*2,361,560*
New Haven-Meriden, CT	6,714,903	1,063,644	*12,711,802*	*3,262,764*
Ogden, UT	2,154,784	321,477	*4,079,163*	*986,142*
Oklahoma City, OK	3,509,969	1,065,517	*6,644,627*	*3,268,511*
Omaha, NE-IA	4,049,887	1,092,759	*7,666,732*	*3,352,078*
Orlando, FL	9,611,472	804,076	*18,195,217*	*2,466,533*
Oxnard-Ventura, CA	4,501,099	623,592	*8,520,908*	*1,912,892*
Pensacola, FL	1,350,328	348,493	*2,556,270*	*1,069,016*
Peoria, IL	1,329,266	485,558	*2,516,396*	*1,489,467*
Providence-Pawtucket, RI-MA	11,115,901	2,182,805	*21,043,209*	*6,695,832*
Provo-Orem, UT	1,937,793	374,224	*3,668,384*	*1,147,944*
Raleigh, NC	2,093,495	335,808	*3,963,139*	*1,030,104*
Reno, NV	2,657,820	387,125	*5,031,446*	*1,187,519*
Richmond, VA	4,238,572	889,458	*8,023,925*	*2,728,444*
Rochester, NY	5,048,775	1,425,823	*9,557,699*	*4,373,764*
Rockford, IL	1,374,700	446,830	*2,602,409*	*1,370,666*
Salt Lake City, UT	9,295,760	1,127,716	*17,597,551*	*3,459,310*
Sarasota-Bradenton, FL	2,758,095	582,139	*5,221,275*	*1,785,732*
Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA	2,217,042	800,013	*4,197,022*	*2,454,070*
Shreveport, LA	1,921,434	484,850	*3,637,413*	*1,487,294*
South Bend-Mishawaka, IN-MI	1,630,178	529,654	*3,086,045*	*1,624,733*
Spokane, WA	4,214,409	513,954	*7,978,182*	*1,576,573*
Springfield, MA-CT	4,352,194	933,765	*8,239,020*	*2,864,356*
Stockton, CA	2,331,172	616,566	*4,413,078*	*1,891,339*
Syracuse, NY	3,676,358	875,413	*6,959,614*	*2,685,362*
Tacoma, WA	7,853,575	715,557	*14,867,389*	*2,194,997*
Toledo, OH-MI	3,884,026	1,033,816	*7,352,746*	*3,171,268*
Trenton, NJ-PA	3,619,207	912,780	*6,851,423*	*2,799,985*
Tucson, AZ	5,844,721	764,772	*11,064,483*	*2,345,964*
Tulsa, OK	3,199,661	724,097	*6,057,191*	*2,221,194*
West Palm Bch-Boca Raton-Delray Bch, FL	9,222,658	762,122	*17,459,162*	*2,337,838*
Wichita, KS	2,262,247	626,429	*4,282,599*	*1,921,594*
Wilmington, DE-NJ-MD-PA	4,403,353	926,484	*8,335,866*	*2,842,023*
Worcester, MA-CT	3,064,276	534,786	*5,800,897*	*1,640,475*
Youngstown-Warren, OH	1,749,240	823,863	*3,311,439*	*2,527,228*
TOTAL	$333,567,556	$67,159,053	*$631,467,692*	*$206,012,790*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
Amounts Apportioned and Authorized to State Governors for Urbanized Areas 50,000 to 200,000 in Population:				
ALABAMA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$3,564,706**	**$1,970,561**	*$6,748,248*	*$4,221,424*
Anniston, AL	**343,841**	**231,980**	*650,915*	*496,959*
Auburn-Opelika, AL	**275,863**	**129,622**	*522,229*	*277,681*
Decatur, AL	**314,845**	**152,422**	*596,024*	*326,525*
Dothan, AL	**264,445**	**133,304**	*500,614*	*285,569*
Florence, AL	**368,413**	**235,002**	*697,433*	*503,431*
Gadsden, AL	**325,615**	**233,057**	*616,413*	*499,266*
Huntsville	**1,033,647**	**504,984**	*1,956,769*	*1,081,800*
Tuscaloosa, AL	**638,037**	**350,190**	*1,207,851*	*750,193*
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:	**$933,084**	**$292,757**	*$1,766,394*	*$688,089*
Flagstaff, AZ	**367,077**	**85,791**	*694,903*	*244,718*
Yuma, AZ-CA (AZ)	**566,007**	**206,966**	*1,071,491*	*443,371*
ARKANSAS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$1,361,973**	**$798,674**	*$2,578,316*	*$1,710,956*
Fayetteville-Springdale, AR	**375,881**	**168,344**	*711,570*	*360,634*
Fort Smith, AR-OK (AR)	**511,676**	**275,251**	*968,641*	*589,656*
Pine Bluff, AR	**345,780**	**269,436**	*654,587*	*577,198*
Texarkana, TX-AR (AR)	**128,636**	**85,643**	*243,518*	*183,467*
CALIFORNIA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$20,862,343**	**$6,801,253**	*$39,493,935*	*$14,569,951*
Antioch-Pittsburg, CA	**1,179,816**	**345,636**	*2,233,477*	*740,438*
Chico, CA	**515,132**	**185,098**	*975,182*	*396,526*
Davis, CA	**625,337**	**213,010**	*1,183,809*	*456,320*
Fairfield, CA	**759,495**	**255,671**	*1,437,779*	*547,710*
Hemet-San Jacinto, CA	**633,643**	**195,698**	*1,199,533*	*419,232*
Hesperia-Apple Valley-Victorville, CA	**808,344**	**265,938**	*1,530,254*	*569,705*
Indio-Coachella, CA	**383,147**	**126,070**	*725,325*	*270,072*
Lancaster-Palmdale, CA	**1,359,656**	**162,437**	*2,573,928*	*347,980*
Lodi, CA	**532,299**	**175,169**	*1,007,680*	*375,256*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
CALIFORNIA (Continued):				
Lompoc, CA	**326,914**	**107,558**	*618,871*	*230,415*
Merced, CA	**581,189**	**188,067**	*1,100,233*	*402,886*
Napa, CA	**607,279**	**266,728**	*1,149,624*	*571,396*
Palm Springs, CA	**756,568**	**180,689**	*1,432,238*	*387,080*
Redding, CA	**437,460**	**149,645**	*828,144*	*320,576*
Salinas, CA	**1,151,186**	**423,192**	*2,179,280*	*906,580*
San Luis Obispo, CA	**545,161**	**179,409**	*1,032,030*	*384,338*
Santa Barbara, CA	**1,780,940**	**700,123**	*3,371,449*	*1,499,836*
Santa Cruz, CA	**920,903**	**376,707**	*1,743,337*	*806,999*
Santa Maria, CA	**837,847**	**227,014**	*1,586,105*	*486,319*
Santa Rosa, CA	**1,624,493**	**449,066**	*3,075,283*	*962,010*
Seaside-Monterey, CA	**1,091,625**	**521,884**	*2,066,527*	*1,118,004*
Simi Valley, CA	**1,033,302**	**306,429**	*1,956,115*	*656,445*
Vacaville, CA	**627,290**	**206,423**	*1,187,506*	*442,209*
Visalia	**716,502**	**225,542**	*1,356,391*	*483,166*
Watsonville, CA	**394,734**	**129,889**	*747,259*	*278,253*
Yuba City, CA	**629,839**	**236,597**	*1,192,331*	*506,849*
Yuma, AZ-CA (CA)	**2,242**	**1,564**	*4,245*	*3,351*
COLORADO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$3,844,091**	**$1,839,230**	*$7,277,145*	*$3,940,083*
Boulder, CO	**855,368**	**412,508**	*1,619,274*	*883,694*
Fort Collins, C0	**712,440**	**294,588**	*1,348,701*	*631,080*
Grand Junction, CO	**405,635**	**189,506**	*767,897*	*405,969*
Greeley, CO	**569,821**	**283,630**	*1,078,713*	*607,605*
Longmont, CO	**519,272**	**170,885**	*983,019*	*366,077*
Pueblo, CO	**781,555**	**488,113**	*1,479,541*	*1,045,659*
CONNECTICUT:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$12,953,976**	**$4,543,229**	*$24,522,821*	*$9,732,709*
Bristol, CT	**605,888**	**297,793**	*1,146,989*	*637,945*
Danbury, CT-NY (CT)	**2,196,021**	**492,302**	*4,157,228*	*1,054,632*
New Britain, CT	**1,134,519**	**626,111**	*2,147,727*	*1,341,282*
New London-Norwich, CT	**912,955**	**533,937**	*1,728,291*	*1,143,824*
Norwalk, CT	**2,322,457**	**676,464**	*4,396,581*	*1,449,151*
Stamford, CT-NY (CT)	**2,931,943**	**1,016,038**	*5,550,382*	*2,176,602*
Waterbury, CT	**2,850,193**	**900,584**	*5,395,623*	*1,929,273*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
DELAWARE:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$290,008**	**$95,414**	*$549,007*	*$204,401*
Dover, DE	**290,008**	**95,414**	*549,007*	*204,401*
FLORIDA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$8,838,818**	**$3,152,975**	*$16,732,526*	*$6,754,444*
Deltona, FL	**293,887**	**96,684**	*556,350*	*207,121*
Fort Pierce, F	**704,001**	**205,216**	*1,332,725*	*439,623*
Fort Walton Beach, FL	**682,437**	**258,405**	*1,291,902*	*553,566*
Gainesville, FL	**874,586**	**351,847**	*1,655,655*	*753,742*
Kissimmee, FL	**407,355**	**134,039**	*771,153*	*287,145*
Lakeland, FL	**894,093**	**345,542**	*1,692,584*	*740,235*
Naples, FL	**588,435**	**146,868**	*1,113,950*	*314,628*
Ocala, FL	**395,279**	**147,105**	*748,292*	*315,135*
Panama City, FL	**593,205**	**234,999**	*1,122,981*	*503,426*
Punta Gorda, FL	**387,921**	**127,629**	*734,362*	*273,413*
Spring Hill, FL	**296,545**	**97,565**	*561,381*	*209,008*
Stuart, FL	**517,420**	**170,246**	*979,514*	*364,708*
Tallahassee, FL	**996,984**	**393,861**	*1,887,364*	*843,747*
Titusville, FL.	**285,395**	**93,895**	*540,273*	*201,146*
Vero Beach, FL	**361,442**	**118,916**	*684,236*	*254,746*
Winter Haven, FL.	**559,833**	**230,158**	*1,059,804*	*493,054*
GEORGIA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$3,869,856**	**$2,169,758**	*$7,325,925*	*$4,648,153*
Albany, GA.	**479,330**	**316,131**	*907,408*	*677,230*
Athens, GA.	**459,567**	**197,454**	*869,995*	*422,995*
Brunswick, GA	**264,466**	**87,007**	*500,653*	*186,390*
Macon, GA.	**859,125**	**542,798**	*1,626,387*	*1,162,807*
Rome, GA.	**269,608**	**149,674**	*510,388*	*320,639*
Savannah, GA	**1,124,074**	**689,903**	*2,127,955*	*1,477,940*
Warner Robins, GA	**413,686**	**186,791**	*783,139*	*400,153*
HAWAII:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$1,028,506**	**$475,852**	*$1,947,037*	*$1,019,392*
Kailua, HI	**1,028,506**	**475,852**	*1,947,037*	*1,019,392*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
IDAHO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$2,035,598**	**$809,759**	*$3,853,535*	*1,734,702*
Boise City, ID	**1,245,611**	**469,898**	*2,358,032*	*1,006,635*
Idaho Falls, ID	**446,527**	**146,933**	*845,309*	*314,767*
Pocatello, ID	**343,460**	**192,928**	*650,194*	*413,299*
ILLINOIS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$9,324,061**	**$5,371,412**	*$17,651,130*	*11,506,880*
Alton, IL	**503,900**	**372,784**	*953,920*	*798,596*
Aurora, IL	**1,411,277**	**723,464**	*2,671,651*	*1,549,835*
Beloit, WI-IL (IL)	**64,402**	**25,498**	*121,919*	*54,622*
Bloomington-Normal, IL	**811,785**	**382,645**	*1,536,768*	*819,719*
Champaign-Urbana, IL	**1,145,586**	**616,763**	*2,168,678*	*1,321,258*
Crystal Lake, IL	**459,966**	**151,340**	*870,749*	*324,208*
Decatur, IL	**644,855**	**446,782**	*1,220,757*	*957,116*
Dubuque, IA-IL (IL)	**15,021**	**8,765**	*28,436*	*18,777*
Elgin, IL	**1,018,027**	**636,793**	*1,927,198*	*1,364,167*
Joliet, IL	**1,177,134**	**953,579**	*2,228,401*	*2,042,801*
Kankakee, IL.	**461,991**	**262,596**	*874,583*	*562,545*
Round Lake Beach-McHenry, IL-WI (IL)	**670,393**	**209,575**	*1,269,103*	*448,962*
Springfield, IL.	**939,724**	**580,828**	*1,778,967*	*1,244,275*
INDIANA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$5,438,198**	**$3,063,742**	*$10,294,905*	*$6,563,286*
Anderson, IN	**439,561**	**303,284**	*832,121*	*649,710*
Bloomington, IN	**655,933**	**287,968**	*1,241,729*	*616,897*
Elkhart-GosheN, IN	**657,411**	**288,505**	*1,244,528*	*618,047*
Evansville, IN-KY (IN)	**1,217,849**	**712,185**	*2,305,478*	*1,525,675*
Kokomo, IN	**442,654**	**265,091**	*837,976*	*567,891*
Lafayette-West Lafayette, IN	**880,021**	**439,016**	*1,665,944*	*940,481*
Muncie, IN	**646,927**	**435,588**	*1,224,679*	*933,136*
Terre Haute, IN	**497,842**	**332,105**	*942,450*	*711,449*
IOWA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$2,960,493**	**$1,777,815**	*$5,604,427*	*$3,808,516*
Cedar Rapids, IA	**920,022**	**542,576**	*1,741,668*	*1,162,331*
Dubuque, IA-IL (IA)	**447,809**	**302,695**	*847,736*	*648,447*
Iowa City, IA	**530,093**	**207,305**	*1,003,505*	*444,099*
Sioux City, IA-NE-SD (IA)	**489,595**	**311,588**	*926,837*	*667,498*
Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA	**572,974**	**413,651**	*1,084,681*	*886,141*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
KANSAS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$1,437,410**	**$759,970**	*$2,721,124*	*$1,628,042*
Lawrence, KS	**544,317**	**217,653**	*1,030,433*	*466,267*
St. Joseph, MO-KS (KS)	**4,493**	**3,866**	*8,506*	*8,283*
Topeka, KS	**888,600**	**538,451**	*1,682,185*	*1,153,493*
KENTUCKY:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$1,132,915**	**$635,567**	*$2,144,690*	*$1,361,539*
Clarksville, TN-KY (KY)	**138,239**	**73,054**	*261,697*	*156,501*
Evansville, IN-KY (KY)	**169,754**	**45,056**	*321,356*	*96,520*
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH ((KY)	**338,518**	**218,446**	*640,839*	*467,964*
Owensboro, KY	**486,404**	**299,011**	*920,798*	*640,555*
LOUISIANA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$3,355,232**	**$1,868,922**	*$6,351,700*	*$4,003,690*
Alexandria, LA	**489,624**	**326,140**	*926,894*	*698,673*
Houma, LA	**344,401**	**192,233**	*651,976*	*411,811*
Lafayette, LA	**847,168**	**428,989**	*1,603,751*	*919,000*
Lake Charles, LA	**680,516**	**413,989**	*1,288,266*	*886,866*
Monroe, LA	**647,066**	**393,577**	*1,224,944*	*843,138*
Slidell, LA	**346,457**	**113,994**	*655,869*	*244,202*
MAINE:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$1,460,258**	**$808,464**	*$2,764,375*	*$1,731,928*
Bangor, ME	**300,059**	**152,758**	*568,033*	*327,246*
Lewiston-Auburn, ME	**348,663**	**215,633**	*660,045*	*461,938*
Portland, ME	**745,522**	**409,648**	*1,411,328*	*877,566*
Portsmouth-Dover-Rochester, NH-ME (ME)	**66,014**	**30,425**	*124,969*	*65,178*
MARYLAND:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$1,623,878**	**$751,514**	*$3,074,118*	*$1,609,927*
Annapolis, MD	**528,899**	**228,635**	*1,001,245*	*489,792*
Cumberland, MD-WV (MD)	**281,298**	**180,307**	*532,517*	*386,263*
Frederick, MD	**381,627**	**125,567**	*722,447*	*268,995*
Hagerstown, MD-PA-WV (MD)	**432,054**	**217,005**	*817,909*	*464,878*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
MASSACHUSETTS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$6,431,297**	**$4,010,979**	*$12,174,914*	*$8,592,499*
Brockton, MA	**1,174,807**	**966,707**	*2,223,995*	*2,070,923*
Fall River, MA-RI (MA)	**1,145,818**	**628,972**	*2,169,118*	*1,347,412*
Fitchburg-Leominster, MA	**464,336**	**265,581**	*879,023*	*568,940*
Hyannis, MA	**331,586**	**109,085**	*627,716*	*233,687*
Lowell, MA-NH (MA)	**1,454,227**	**997,173**	*2,752,957*	*2,136,189*
New Bedford, MA	**1,260,158**	**695,995**	*2,385,571*	*1,490,992*
Pittsfield, MA	**300,162**	**211,988**	*568,229*	*454,130*
Taunton, MA	**300,203**	**135,478**	*568,305*	*290,227*
MICHIGAN:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$5,488,211**	**$3,283,763**	*$10,389,586*	*$7,034,625*
Battle Creek, MI	**458,369**	**313,820**	*867,726*	*672,278*
Bay City, MI	**512,072**	**343,896**	*969,390*	*736,709*
Benton Harbor, MI	**370,395**	**211,224**	*701,185*	*452,494*
Holland, MI	**415,701**	**136,779**	*786,952*	*293,015*
Jackson, MI	**511,790**	**327,621**	*968,857*	*701,844*
Kalamazoo, MI	**1,105,188**	**614,106**	*2,092,202*	*1,315,565*
Muskegon, MI	**674,119**	**414,697**	*1,276,157*	*888,384*
Port Huron, MI	**443,651**	**218,257**	*839,864*	*467,559*
Saginaw, MI	**996,926**	**703,363**	*1,887,253*	*1,506,776*
MINNESOTA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$1,955,838**	**$1,090,931**	*$3,702,543*	*$2,337,042*
Duluth, MN-WI (MN)	**475,940**	**358,439**	*900,990*	*767,864*
Fargo-Moorhead, ND-MN (MN)	**275,192**	**152,304**	*520,958*	*326,273*
Grand Forks, ND-MN (MN)	**60,313**	**37,533**	*114,176*	*80,406*
La Crosse, WI-MN (MN)	**29,545**	**12,455**	*55,931*	*26,681*
Rochester, MN	**536,812**	**287,183**	*1,016,224*	*615,217*
St. Cloud, MN	**578,036**	**243,017**	*1,094,264*	*520,601*
MISSISSIPPI:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$1,679,127**	**$906,680**	*$3,178,708*	*$1,942,330*
Biloxi-Gulfport, MS	**1,039,596**	**552,169**	*1,968,030*	*1,182,881*
Hattiesburg, MS	**324,011**	**166,061**	*613,377*	*355,743*
Pascagoula, MS	**315,520**	**188,450**	*597,301*	*403,706*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
MISSOURI:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$2,313,860**	**$1,205,239**	*$4,380,305*	*$2,581,917*
Columbia, MO	**456,815**	**222,473**	*864,784*	*476,592*
Joplin, MO	**320,811**	**158,607**	*607,318*	*339,775*
Springfield, MO	**1,077,678**	**512,465**	*2,040,123*	*1,097,825*
St. Joseph, MO-KS (MO)	**458,556**	**311,694**	*868,080*	*667,725*
MONTANA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$1,540,339**	**$865,821**	*$2,915,974*	*$1,854,801*
Billings, MT	**594,047**	**332,854**	*1,124,574*	*713,056*
Great Falls, MT	**553,960**	**324,442**	*1,048,687*	*695,033*
Missoula, MT	**392,332**	**208,525**	*742,713*	*446,711*
NEBRASKA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$1,712,384**	**$783,608**	*$3,241,669*	*$1,678,680*
Lincoln, NE	**1,638,309**	**747,115**	*3,101,439*	*1,600,503*
Sioux City, IA-NE-SD (NE)	**74,075**	**36,493**	*140,230*	*78,177*
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:	**$2,079,451**	**$930,889**	*$3,936,554*	*$1,994,193*
Lowell, MA-NH (NH)	**4,256**	**1,136**	*8,057*	*2,434*
Manchester, NH	**871,739**	**425,529**	*1,650,265*	*911,588*
Nashua, NH	**697,101**	**270,768**	*1,319,664*	*580,051*
Portsmouth-Dover-Rochester, NH-ME (NH)	**506,355**	**233,456**	*958,568*	*500,120*
NEW JERSEY:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$1,575,569**	**$1,162,152**	*$2,982,666*	*$2,489,615*
Atlantic City, NJ	**1,135,623**	**913,408**	*2,149,817*	*1,956,744*
Vineland-Millville, NJ	**439,946**	**248,744**	*832,849*	*532,871*
NEW MEXICO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$857,983**	**$346,371**	*$1,624,224*	*$742,011*
Las Cruces, NM	**476,613**	**185,079**	*902,263*	*396,484*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
NEW MEXICO (Continued):				
Santa Fe, NM	**381,370**	**$161,292**	*721,961*	*345,526*
NEW YORK:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$4,760,359**	**$2,887,397**	*$9,011,707*	*$6,185,513*
Binghamton, NY	**1,194,868**	**753,963**	*2,261,973*	*1,615,174*
Danbury, CT-NY (NY)	**16,195**	**4,225**	*30,659*	*9,051*
Elmira, NY	**490,651**	**328,474**	*928,838*	*703,671*
Glens Falls, NY	**337,413**	**163,510**	*638,747*	*350,280*
Ithaca, NY	**340,544**	**112,051**	*644,674*	*240,041*
Newburgh, NY	**442,206**	**203,473**	*837,129*	*435,889*
Poughkeepsie, NY	**928,913**	**630,599**	*1,758,500*	*1,350,899*
Stamford, CT-NY (NY)	**110**	**109**	*208*	*233*
Utica-Rome, NY	**1,009,459**	**690,993**	*1,910,979*	*1,480,275*
NORTH CAROLINA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$7,727,991**	**$3,807,386**	*$14,629,652*	*$8,156,353*
Asheville, NC	**596,503**	**313,739**	*1,129,223*	*672,106*
Burlington, NC	**432,712**	**238,562**	*819,155*	*511,059*
Gastonia, NC	**633,594**	**363,032**	*1,199,439*	*777,704*
Goldsboro, NC	**329,040**	**162,993**	*622,898*	*349,171*
Greensboro, NC	**1,362,734**	**686,529**	*2,579,756*	*1,470,716*
Greenville, NC	**378,854**	**124,657**	*717,199*	*267,045*
Hickory, NC	**361,323**	**173,702**	*684,011*	*372,112*
High Point, NC	**609,324**	**357,277**	*1,153,496*	*765,375*
Jacksonville, NC	**588,279**	**205,012**	*1,113,655*	*439,187*
Kannapolis, NC	**424,687**	**207,368**	*803,963*	*444,232*
Rocky Mount, NC	**339,486**	**111,702**	*642,671*	*239,293*
Wilmington, NC	**555,275**	**259,914**	*1,051,176*	*556,799*
Winston-Salem, NC	**1,116,180**	**602,897**	*2,113,010*	*1,291,554*
NORTH DAKOTA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$1,501,536**	**$694,941**	*$2,842,518*	*$1,488,734*
Bismarck, ND	**432,980**	**217,303**	*819,662*	*465,516*
Fargo-Moorhead, ND-MN (ND)	**626,200**	**285,401**	*1,185,442*	*611,399*
Grand Forks, ND-MN (ND)	**442,356**	**192,237**	*837,414*	*411,819*
OHIO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$4,128,528**	**$2,454,959**	*$7,815,605*	*$5,259,124*
Hamilton, OH	**853,330**	**413,830**	*1,615,417*	*886,526*
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH (OH)	**217,304**	**123,238**	*411,371*	*264,005*
Lima, OH	**466,372**	**296,760**	*882,877*	*635,732*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
OHIO (Continued):				
Mansfield, OH	**450,264**	**$297,105**	*852,383*	*636,471*
Middletown, OH	**586,711**	**286,086**	*1,110,686*	*612,866*
Newark, OH	**357,476**	**171,899**	*676,728*	*368,249*
Parkersburg, WV-OH (OH)	**52,934**	**31,162**	*100,208*	*66,758*
Sharon, PA-OH (OH)	**34,906**	**20,995**	*66,080*	*44,977*
Springfield, OH	**678,666**	**453,628**	*1,284,764*	*971,781*
Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV-PA (OH)	**244,159**	**194,158**	*462,211*	*415,934*
Wheeling, WV-OH (OH)	**186,406**	**166,098**	*352,880*	*355,824*
OKLAHOMA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$642,583**	**$386,416**	*$1,216,456*	*$827,798*
Fort Smith, AR-OK (OK)	**11,273**	**6,655**	*21,340*	*14,256*
Lawton, OK	**631,310**	**379,761**	*1,195,116*	*813,541*
OREGON:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$3,351,054**	**$1,425,107**	*$6,343,789*	*$3,052,929*
Eugene-Springfield, OR	**1,577,414**	**725,646**	*2,986,160*	*1,554,510*
Longview, WA-OR (OR)	**10,491**	**5,369**	*19,859*	*11,502*
Medford, OR	**487,494**	**194,556**	*922,862*	*416,787*
Salem, OR	**1,275,655**	**499,536**	*2,414,908*	*1,070,129*
PENNSYLVANIA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$8,760,250**	**$5,129,718**	*$16,583,791*	*$10,989,113*
Altoona, PA	**598,447**	**408,051**	*1,132,903*	*874,145*
Erie, PA	**1,539,491**	**929,251**	*2,914,369*	*1,990,684*
Hagerstown, MD-PA-WV (PA)	**5,274**	**3,855**	*9,984*	*8,259*
Johnstown, PA	**551,862**	**437,207**	*1,044,714*	*936,604*
Lancaster, PA	**1,391,900**	**607,678**	*2,634,967*	*1,301,795*
Monessen, PA	**378,791**	**211,581**	*717,079*	*453,259*
Pottstown, PA	**359,452**	**118,272**	*680,469*	*253,368*
Reading, PA	**1,624,799**	**1,108,504**	*3,075,864*	*2,374,684*
Sharon, PA-OH (PA)	**251,650**	**184,335**	*476,392*	*394,891*
State College, PA	**523,744**	**250,976**	*991,486*	*537,653*
Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV-PA (PA)	**1,829**	**681**	*3,463*	*1,460*
Williamsport, PA	**439,038**	**277,812**	*831,131*	*595,142*
York, PA	**1,093,973**	**591,515**	*2,070,970*	*1,267,169*
PUERTO RICO:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$8,092,619**	**$3,312,130**	*$15,319,911*	*$7,095,395*
Aguadilla, PR	**707,995**	**245,837**	*1,340,287*	*526,644*
Arecibo, PR	**661,533**	**284,696**	*1,252,330*	*609,889*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
PUERTO RICO (Continued):				
Caguas, PR	**1,732,461**	**$615,765**	*3,279,675*	*1,319,119*
Cayey, PR	**512,224**	**168,563**	*969,678*	*361,103*
Humacao, PR	**443,320**	**145,877**	*839,237*	*312,504*
Mayaguez, PR	**952,473**	**453,778**	*1,803,101*	*972,104*
Ponce, PR	**2,119,540**	**1,056,142**	*4,012,435*	*2,262,514*
Vega Baja-Manati, PR	**963,073**	**341,472**	*1,823,168*	*731,517*
RHODE ISLAND:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$515,118**	**$246,288**	*$975,155*	*$527,609*
Fall River, MA-RI (RI)	**118,087**	**54,179**	*223,547*	*116,065*
Newport, RI	**397,031**	**192,109**	*751,608*	*411,544*
SOUTH CAROLINA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$2,181,467**	**$1,013,149**	*$4,129,679*	*$2,170,414*
Anderson, SC	**293,390**	**158,795**	*555,409*	*340,178*
Florence, SC	**301,774**	**166,525**	*571,281*	*356,736*
Myrtle Beach, SC	**316,467**	**104,116**	*599,095*	*223,043*
Rock Hill, SC	**336,020**	**149,201**	*636,111*	*319,625*
Spartanburg, SC	**585,757**	**319,995**	*1,108,881*	*685,507*
Sumter, SC	**348,059**	**114,517**	*658,902*	*245,324*
SOUTH DAKOTA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$1,083,163**	**$523,345**	*$2,050,506*	*$1,121,134*
Rapid City, SD	**344,971**	**177,805**	*653,055*	*380,901*
Sioux City, IA-NE-SD (SD)	**9,672**	**4,219**	*18,310*	*9,038*
Sioux Falls, SD	**728,520**	**341,321**	*1,379,141*	*731,195*
TENNESSEE:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$1,676,389**	**$887,865**	*$3,173,527*	*$1,902,024*
Bristol, TN-Bristol, VA (TN)	**156,692**	**90,241**	*296,630*	*193,317*
Clarksville, TN-KY (TN)	**382,042**	**167,264**	*723,232*	*358,320*
Jackson, TN	**289,169**	**148,661**	*547,419*	*318,468*
Johnson City, TN	**440,788**	**228,788**	*834,444*	*490,121*
Kingsport, TN-VA (TN)	**407,698**	**252,911**	*771,802*	*541,797*
TEXAS:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$15,521,819**	**$7,687,065**	*$29,383,932*	*$16,467,577*
Abilene, TX	**550,689**	**322,174**	*1,042,495*	*690,176*
Amarillo, TX	**1,021,405**	**544,163**	*1,933,594*	*1,165,730*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
TEXAS (Continued):				
Beaumont, TX	**702,504**	**$436,937**	*1,329,892*	*936,026*
Brownsville, TX	**1,021,066**	**343,413**	*1,932,952*	*735,675*
Bryan-College Station, TX	**683,950**	**248,808**	*1,294,766*	*533,007*
Denton, TX	**369,451**	**121,550**	*699,397*	*260,390*
Galveston, TX	**391,903**	**263,556**	*741,901*	*564,601*
Harlingen, TX	**501,826**	**213,740**	*949,994*	*457,884*
Killeen, TX	**959,855**	**322,616**	*1,817,076*	*691,123*
Laredo, TX	**1,212,263**	**440,079**	*2,294,902*	*942,756*
Lewisville, TX	**426,499**	**140,316**	*807,394*	*300,591*
Longview, TX	**419,622**	**205,890**	*794,374*	*441,067*
Lubbock, TX	**1,195,059**	**634,745**	*2,262,334*	*1,359,780*
Midland, TX	**523,615**	**258,553**	*991,242*	*553,883*
Odessa, TX	**580,880**	**408,081**	*1,099,647*	*874,210*
Port Arthur, TX	**633,651**	**418,221**	*1,199,548*	*895,932*
San Angelo, TX	**544,495**	**269,195**	*1,030,769*	*576,682*
Sherman-Denison, TX	**272,555**	**197,337**	*515,966*	*422,744*
Temple, TX	**309,425**	**147,551**	*585,765*	*316,090*
Texarkana, TX-AR (TX)	**249,682**	**142,859**	*472,665*	*306,038*
Texas City, TX	**663,701**	**308,822**	*1,256,435*	*661,573*
Tyler, TX	**518,996**	**272,311**	*982,496*	*583,357*
Victoria, TX	**359,779**	**202,360**	*681,088*	*433,504*
Waco, TX	**783,791**	**436,203**	*1,483,773*	*934,453*
Wichita Falls, TX	**625,157**	**387,585**	*1,183,467*	*830,302*
UTAH:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$310,232**	**$102,073**	*$587,292*	*$218,665*
Logan, UT	**310,232**	**102,073**	*587,292*	*218,665*
VERMONT:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$544,366**	**$244,385**	*$1,030,525*	*$523,533*
Burlington, VT	**544,366**	**244,385**	*1,030,525*	*523,533*
VIRGINIA:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$3,613,475**	**$2,010,460**	*$6,840,569*	*$4,306,898*
Bristol, TN-Bristol, VA (VA)	**111,554**	**54,597**	*211,179*	*116,960*
Charlottesville, VA	**519,581**	**258,207**	*983,604*	*553,142*
Danville, VA	**295,060**	**182,428**	*558,569*	*390,805*
Fredericksburg, VA	**346,408**	**113,974**	*655,775*	*244,161*
Kingsport, TN-VA (VA)	**21,061**	**15,609**	*39,870*	*33,438*
Lynchburg, VA	**494,304**	**290,441**	*935,753*	*622,196*
Petersburg, VA	**626,641**	**414,079**	*1,186,277*	*887,059*
Roanoke, VA	**1,198,866**	**681,125**	*2,269,542*	*1,459,137*

TABLE 2

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5307 APPORTIONMENT	*OPER. ASSIST. LIMITATION*
WASHINGTON:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$3,414,794**	**$1,441,915**	*$6,464,458*	*$3,088,935*
Bellingham, WA	**402,330**	**178,042**	*761,640*	*381,410*
Bremerton, WA	**779,388**	**218,876**	*1,475,439*	*468,886*
Longview, WA-OR (WA)	**340,435**	**172,874**	*644,470*	*370,337*
Olympia, WA	**606,370**	**220,296**	*1,147,903*	*471,927*
Richland-Kennewick-Pasco, WA	**632,578**	**328,900**	*1,197,517*	*704,585*
Yakima, WA	**653,693**	**322,927**	*1,237,489*	*691,790*
WEST VIRGINIA				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$2,624,443**	**$1,811,406**	*$4,968,262*	*$3,880,476*
Charleston, WV	**1,055,770**	**668,361**	*1,998,650*	*1,431,794*
Cumberland, MD-WV (WV)	**12,627**	**10,483**	*23,904*	*22,457*
Hagerstown, MD-PA-WV (WV)	**3,189**	**2,443**	*6,037*	*5,233*
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH (WV)	**592,751**	**434,965**	*1,122,120*	*931,802*
Parkersburg, WV-OH (WV)	**381,215**	**275,348**	*721,667*	*589,863*
Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV-PA (WV)	**164,015**	**128,467**	*310,493*	*275,207*
Wheeling, WV-OH (WV)	**414,876**	**291,339**	*785,391*	*624,120*
WISCONSIN:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$7,184,516**	**$3,935,089**	*$13,600,811*	*$8,429,924*
Appleton-Neenah, WI	**1,315,612**	**655,709**	*2,490,549*	*1,404,689*
Beloit, WI-IL (WI)	**282,004**	**155,628**	*533,854*	*333,394*
Duluth, MN-WI (WI)	**123,525**	**94,707**	*233,842*	*202,886*
Eau Claire, WI	**515,308**	**237,885**	*975,516*	*509,608*
Green Bay, WI	**999,216**	**506,229**	*1,891,588*	*1,084,466*
Janesville, WI	**379,237**	**194,329**	*717,924*	*416,299*
Kenosha, WI	**690,518**	**483,440**	*1,307,200*	*1,035,646*
La Crosse, WI-MN (WI)	**548,190**	**276,146**	*1,037,763*	*591,573*
Oshkosh, WI	**478,416**	**282,563**	*905,677*	*605,318*
Racine, WI	**1,066,505**	**621,866**	*2,018,971*	*1,332,189*
Round Lake Beach-McHenry, IL-WI (WI)	**400**	**99**	*757*	*211*
Sheboygan, WI	**450,755**	**238,772**	*853,312*	*511,509*
Wausau, WI	**334,830**	**187,716**	*633,858*	*402,134*
WYOMING:				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	**$752,148**	**$461,199**	*$1,423,873*	*$988,001*
Casper, WY	**345,029**	**247,399**	*653,166*	*529,989*
Cheyenne, WY	**407,119**	**213,800**	*770,707*	*458,012*
TOTAL	**$190,336,313**	**$93,035,594**	*$360,320,519*	*$199,365,974*

TABLE 3

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS, SECTION 5311(b) RURAL TRANSIT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (RTAP) ALOCATIONS, AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5311 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 RTAP ALLOCATION	ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS SECTION 5311 APPORTIONMENT	ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS RTAP ALLOCATION
Alabama	$2,774,654	$97,214	$5,200,907	$247,902
Alaska	413,761	57,041	775,567	79,511
America Samoa	58,974	11,004	110,542	14,206
Arizona	1,214,671	70,669	2,276,820	136,636
Arkansas	2,218,221	87,746	4,157,909	208,215
California	5,413,954	142,125	10,148,100	436,150
Colorado	1,155,663	69,665	2,166,214	132,428
Connecticut	1,048,295	67,838	1,964,960	124,770
Delaware	261,524	54,450	490,210	68,653
Florida	3,480,328	109,222	6,523,647	298,235
Georgia	4,056,840	119,032	7,604,279	339,354
Guam	167,885	12,857	314,689	21,974
Hawaii	455,318	57,748	853,464	82,476
Idaho	918,591	65,631	1,721,839	115,519
Illinois	3,721,924	113,333	6,976,501	315,466
Indiana	3,595,294	111,178	6,739,142	306,434
Iowa	2,312,529	89,350	4,334,683	214,941
Kansas	1,839,543	81,302	3,448,103	181,205
Kentucky	3,036,684	101,673	5,692,065	266,592
Louisiana	2,511,558	92,737	4,707,750	229,137
Maine	1,211,925	70,622	2,271,673	136,441
Maryland	1,513,030	75,746	2,836,074	157,917
Massachusetts	1,621,508	77,592	3,039,410	165,654
Michigan	4,391,321	124,723	8,231,242	363,211
Minnesota	2,526,951	92,999	4,736,604	230,235
Mississippi	2,465,977	91,961	4,622,311	225,886
Missouri	2,943,248	100,083	5,516,924	259,927
Montana	744,131	62,662	1,394,825	103,075
Nebraska	1,122,800	69,106	2,104,615	130,084
Nevada	366,577	56,238	687,125	76,146
New Hampshire	970,600	66,516	1,819,326	119,228
New Jersey	1,387,753	73,614	2,601,251	148,982
New Mexico	1,090,984	68,564	2,044,977	127,814
New York	4,885,056	133,125	9,156,716	398,427
North Carolina	5,189,372	138,303	9,727,137	420,132
North Dakota	550,318	59,364	1,031,536	89,251
Northern Marianas	54,652	10,930	102,441	13,898
Ohio	5,283,142	139,899	9,902,902	426,820
Oklahoma	2,258,489	88,431	4,233,388	211,087
Oregon	1,793,260	80,514	3,361,348	177,904
Pennsylvania	5,893,400	150,283	11,046,790	470,347
Puerto Rico	1,761,133	79,968	3,301,129	175,613
Rhode Island	225,604	53,839	422,880	66,091
South Carolina	2,597,307	94,196	4,868,481	235,253
South Dakota	670,795	61,414	1,257,362	97,844
Tennessee	3,352,826	107,052	6,284,652	289,140
Texas	7,078,748	170,452	13,268,653	554,894
Utah	508,500	58,653	953,149	86,269
Vermont	599,749	60,205	1,124,190	92,777
Virgin Islands	128,366	12,184	240,614	19,156
Virginia	2,972,605	100,582	5,571,953	262,021
Washington	2,082,867	85,442	3,904,198	198,561
West Virginia	1,771,037	80,136	3,319,693	176,319
Wisconsin	3,060,145	102,072	5,736,040	268,265
Wyoming	427,996	57,283	802,250	80,527
TOTAL	$116,158,383	$4,566,568	$217,731,250	$10,875,000

TABLE 4

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5310 ELDERLY AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

STATE	FY 1997 SECTION 5310 APPORTIONMENT	ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS SECTION 5310
Alabama	$971,766	$1,678,841
Alaska	174,769	216,328
America Samoa	51,960	53,596
Arizona	859,847	1,473,466
Arkansas	686,774	1,155,872
California	5,150,324	9,346,615
Colorado	672,737	1,130,114
Connecticut	767,109	1,303,290
Delaware	250,635	355,544
District of Columbia	248,968	352,484
Florida	3,483,837	6,288,567
Georgia	1,252,413	2,193,837
Guam	131,518	136,960
Hawaii	311,791	467,767
Idaho	318,472	480,027
Illinois	2,261,194	4,044,979
Indiana	1,198,676	2,095,228
Iowa	736,367	1,246,877
Kansas	621,512	1,036,115
Kentucky	932,381	1,606,568
Louisiana	935,313	1,611,949
Maine	391,717	614,434
Maryland	939,615	1,619,842
Massachusetts	1,341,983	2,358,200
Michigan	1,938,351	3,452,554
Minnesota	952,498	1,643,483
Mississippi	667,950	1,121,329
Missouri	1,215,224	2,125,594
Montana	294,326	435,718
Nebraska	445,831	713,734
Nevada	338,305	516,422
New Hampshire	321,031	484,722
New Jersey	1,605,944	2,842,577
New Mexico	395,217	620,856
New York	3,687,196	6,661,736
North Carolina	1,420,791	2,502,815
North Dakota	254,393	362,441
Northern Marianas	51,790	53,284
Ohio	2,358,691	4,223,890
Oklahoma	808,155	1,378,611
Oregon	753,156	1,277,686
Pennsylvania	2,822,811	5,075,564
Puerto Rico	715,800	1,209,136
Rhode Island	351,504	540,641
South Carolina	782,036	1,330,681
South Dakota	272,647	395,937
Tennessee	1,142,743	1,992,589
Texas	2,914,514	5,243,842
Utah	370,061	574,695
Vermont	229,874	317,448
Virgin Islands	133,276	140,186
Virginia	1,187,751	2,075,181
Washington	1,067,908	1,855,265
West Virginia	578,418	957,036
Wisconsin	1,089,737	1,895,321
Wyoming	199,400	261,526
TOTAL	$56,059,007	$97,150,000

TABLE 5

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(A) FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION APPORTIONMENTS AND ISTEA AUTHORIZED LEVELS

AREA	FY 1997 SECTION 5309 (m) (1) (A) APPORTIONMENT	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS SECTION 5309 (m) (1) (A) APPORTIONMENT*
AZ Phoenix	$669,108	*$1,534,418*
CA Los Angeles	10,427,516	*23,397,749*
CA Sacramento	981,632	*2,117,974*
CA San Diego	2,985,221	*6,531,165*
CA San Francisco	49,442,360	*76,538,710*
CA San Jose	4,263,280	*9,634,699*
CO Denver	782,421	*1,703,851*
CT Hartford	516,507	*1,187,072*
CT Southwestern Connecticut	31,846,888	*38,982,908*
DE Wilmington	330,779	*746,492*
DC Washington	18,344,482	*38,375,997*
FL Ft. Lauderdale	1,203,048	*2,715,185*
FL Jacksonville	37,887	*80,850*
FL Miami	3,427,932	*7,276,285*
FL Tampa	36,083	*80,900*
FL West Palm Beach	912,251	*2,043,692*
GA Atlanta	7,605,052	*15,500,314*
HI Honolulu	267,233	*628,253*
IL Chicago/Northwestern Indiana	103,902,385	*148,843,673*
LA New Orleans	2,125,226	*2,812,778*
MD Baltimore	2,896,727	*6,137,848*
MD Baltimore Commuter Rail	12,702,015	*20,150,699*
MA Boston	52,020,352	*74,847,273*
MA Lawrence-Haverhill	507,213	*1,142,620*
MI Detroit	137,537	*286,859*
MN Minneapolis	1,927,271	*4,274,095*
MO St. Louis	1,336,010	*2,854,488*
NJ Northeastern New Jersey	65,844,001	*92,369,040*
NJ Trenton	582,696	*1,193,976*
NY Buffalo	424,416	*900,914*
NY New York	260,926,381	*410,791,529*
OH Cleveland	10,658,076	*12,657,004*
OH Dayton	1,660,765	*3,783,464*
PA Philadelphia/Southern New Jersey	74,243,371	*100,872,448*
PA Pittsburgh	15,068,506	*17,515,214*
PR San Juan	699,069	*1,482,447*
OR Portland	1,164,940	*2,463,566*
RI Providence	950,200	*2,100,981*
TN Chattanooga	29,299	*66,948*
TX Dallas	313,785	*705,390*
TX Houston	2,404,861	*5,365,064*
VA Norfolk	457,758	*1,063,350*
WA Seattle	6,575,245	*14,725,664*
WA Tacoma	409,083	*955,573*
WI Madison	253,132	*560,576*
TOTAL	$754,300,000	$1,160,000,000

TABLE 6

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FTA FISCAL YEAR 1997 SECTION 5309 NEW START ALLOCATIONS

	PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION	FY 1997 ALLOCATION	PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED ALLOCATION	TOTAL AVAILABLE
AK	Hollis- Ketchikan Ferry Project	6,345,416	0	6,345,416
AR	Little Rock- Junction Bridge Project	1,986,046	0	1,986,046
CA	Los Angeles- Metrorail- MOS-3	69,511,602	5	69,511,607
CA	Los Angeles - San Diego (LOSSAN)	1,489,534	8,397,834	9,887,368
CA	Orange County Transitway	2,979,069	0	2,979,069
CA	Sacramento- LRT Extension	5,958,137	1,975,961	7,934,098
CA	San Diego Mid-Coast Extension	1,489,534	948,000	2,437,534
CA	San Francisco- BART Extension to SFO/Tasman LRT	27,308,129	11,115,059	38,423,188
CO	Denver- Southwest Corridor LRT	1,489,534	0	1,489,534
CT	Hartford- Griffin Light Rail Project	993,023	0	993,023
FL	Fort Lauderdale- Tri-County Commuter Rail	8,937,206	0	8,937,206
FL	Jacksonville- Automated Skyway Express Extension	14,895,343	9,603,788	24,499,131
FL	Miami- North 27th Avenue Project	993,023	0	993,023
FL	Miami- Metro Dade East-West Corridor Project	1,489,534	0	1,489,534
FL	Orlando- Lynx LRT Project	1,986,046	0	1,986,046
FL	Tampa Bay Regional Rail Project	1,986,046	0	1,986,046
GA	Atlanta- North Springs Project	63,960,604	0	63,960,604
GA	Atlanta- DeKalb County Light Rail Project	656,388	0	656,388
IL	Chicago- Transit Improvements	22,343,015	0	22,343,015
IN	Northern Indiana Commuter Rail Project	496,511	0	496,511
LA	New Orleans- Canal Street Corridor Project	7,944,183	12,674,702	20,618,885
LA	New Orleans- Desire Streetcar Project	1,986,046	0	1,986,046
MA	Boston- South Boston Piers (MOS-2) Transitway	29,790,686	2	29,790,688
MD	Baltimore- Central Corridor LRT Extensions	10,188,415	0	10,188,415
MD	MARC- Commuter Rail Improvements Project	32,959,422	2	32,959,424
MN	Twin Cities Central Corridor	0	4,962,500	4,962,500
MO	Kansas City- Southtown Corridor Project	2,979,069	0	2,979,069
MO	St. Louis- Metrolink St. Clair Project	31,776,732	7,930,961	39,707,693
MO	St. Louis- Metrolink Project	13,405,809	0	13,405,809
MS	Jackson- Intermodal Corridor	5,461,626	0	5,461,626
NC	Research Triangle Park- Regional Transit Plan	1,986,046	0	1,986,046
NJ	Urban Core (Secaucus)	104,793,704	0	104,793,704
NJ	Urban Core (Hudson-Bergen)	9,930,229	0	9,930,229
NJ	Burlington-Gloucester Line	0	1,488,750	1,488,750
NJ	West Trenton- Commuter Rail	496,511	0	496,511
NY	New York- Queens Connection	34,775,661	1	34,775,662
NY	New York- Staten Island-Midtown Ferry	372,383	0	372,383
NY	New York- Whitehall Ferry Terminal	3,723,836	4,951,201	8,675,037
OH	Cleveland- Euclid Avenue Corridor/Berea Extension	0	0	0
OH	Canton-Akron-Cleveland [Northeast Ohio] Commuter Rail	3,475,580	4,198,917	7,674,497
OH	Cincinnati- Northeast/Northern Kentucky Rail	2,979,069	0	2,979,069
OK	Oklahoma City- MAPS Corridor Transit System	1,986,046	0	1,986,046
OR	Portland- Westside LRT	137,037,157	0	137,037,157
OR	Portland- South/North LRT	5,958,137	0	5,958,137
PA	Pittsburgh- Busway	9,930,229	3	9,930,232
PR	San Juan- Tren Urbano	4,716,859	0	4,716,859
TN	Memphis- Regional Rail Plan	3,017,796	0	3,017,796
TX	Dallas- North Central LRT Ext.	10,923,252	2,740,391	13,663,643
TX	Dallas- Ft. Worth RAILTRAN	15,143,599	8,905,383	24,048,982
TX	Houston- Regional Bus Plan	40,306,799	1	40,306,800
UT	Salt Lake City- South LRT Project	34,755,801	0	34,755,801
VA	Virginia Railway Express- Commuter Rail Project	2,979,069	0	2,979,069
VT	Burlington-Charlotte Commuter Rail	993,023	1,862,090	2,855,113
WI	Milwaukee- East-West Corridor	0	3,000,000	3,000,000
WA	Seattle-Renton-Tacoma Light Rail Project	2,979,069	1,332,375	4,311,444
WV	Morgantown- Personal Rapid Transit System	4,210,417	0	4,210,417
	TOTAL (All Allocations Above).....	811,256,000	86,087,926	889,012,464

FRN97.WK4

TABLE 7

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	PURPOSE	SUB-ALLOCATION	FY 1997 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) ALLOCATION
AZ Phoenix	Sun Tran maintenace facility		$992,500
AR Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		2,679,750
AR Little Rock	Central Arkansas transit buses and bus loading station		992,500
CA Eureka	Intermodal transportation center		992,500
CA Fairfield City	Buses		1,389,500
CA Folsom	Buses		496,250
CA Foothill	Transit bus maintenance facility		4,714,375
CA Lake Tahoe	South Shore Transportation, coordinated transit system		1,256,505
CA Long Beach	Buses and bus facilities		992,500
CA Los Angeles County (MTA)	ATTB prototype buses		3,149,202
CA Los Angeles County	Neighborhood initiative (LANI)		1,488,750
CA Mendocino County	Buses		595,500
CA North Orange County	Buses		198,500
CA Norwalk	Buses and bus facilities		992,500
CA Riverside County	Buses and bus facilities		992,500
CA San Francisco	Buses		4,242,938
CA San Joaquin	RTD downtown transit center (livable communities)		2,729,375
CA San Ysidro Border	Border intermodal center		992,500
CA Santa Barbara (MTD)	Buses and bus facilities		1,985,000
CA Santa Cruz (MTD)	Bus facility		1,985,000
CA Sonoma County	Park-and-ride facilities		992,500
CA Thousand Oaks	Multimodal center		595,500
CA Yolo County	Buses		1,985,000
CO Fort Collins and Greeley	Buses		992,500
CT Bridgeport	Buses and bus facilities		992,500
DE Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		6,947,500
FL Metropolitan Dade County	Buses and bus facilities		4,962,500
FL Miami Beach	Electric battery buses		992,500
FL Orlando	LYNX Buses		4,466,250
FL Palm Beach County	Buses and bus facilities		992,500
FL Tampa (Hillsborough area RTD)	HARTline buses		2,779,000
FL Volusia County (Votran)	Buses		1,488,750
FL Ybor	Buses and bus facilities		992,500
GA Chatham	Bus facility		1,052,050
GA MARTA	Buses		1,985,000
IA Cedar Rapids	Park and ride lots		1,183,060
IA Cedar Rapids	Hybrid electric bus consortium		886,302
IA Des Moines			1,183,060
IA Fort Dodge	Park and ride facility		688,160
IA Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		3,693,668
IA Iowa City			849,342
IA Ottumwa			60,940
IA Sioux City	Includes intermodal center		2,143,800
IA Waterloo	Intermodal bus facility		660,012

TABLE 7

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	PURPOSE	SUB-ALLOCATION	FY 1997 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) ALLOCATION
IA Iowa Department of Transportation	State regions 6,13,14,15 & 16		$1,261,368
	Region 6	$10,024	
	Region 13	384,693	
	Region 14	292,589	
	Region 15	326,334	
	Region 16	247,728	
IL Statewide*	Buses and bus facilities		10,917,500
Champaign-Urbana	Replacement buses	833,700	
Chicago (CTA)	New bus communications system	4,962,500	
Madison County	Replacement buses	952,800	
Pace	Buses	1,756,725	
Rock Island	Replacement buses	952,800	
Rural Paratransit	Buses	476,400	
Springfield	Replacement buses	952,800	
IN Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		3,721,875
IN Indianapolis (metro)	New buses		992,500
IN South Bend	Intermodal facility		5,458,750
KS Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		992,500
KS Johnson City	Bus maintenance center		2,183,500
KY Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		3,970,000
KY Owensboro	Vans		99,250
LA Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		16,376,250
Alexandria	Buses	978,605	
Baton Rouge	Buses	1,313,077	
DOTD	Vans	956,770	
Jefferson Parish	Buses	1,969,120	
Lafayette	Intermodal facility	746,360	
Lake Charles	Buses	307,675	
Monroe	Buses	292,788	
New Orleans	Buses and bus facilities	8,952,350	
Shreveport	Bus facility	859,505	
MD Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		4,962,500
MA Boston	South Station intermodal center		992,500
MA Hyannis/Cape Cod	Intermodal transportation center		3,225,625
MA Lowell	Gallagher transportation terminal		992,500
MA Springfield	Union Station intermodal facility		744,375
MA Worcester	Union Station		2,977,500
MI Statewide	Buses and bus facilities (includes ISTEA earmark)		14,391,250
Dearborn	Intermodal facility	992,500	
Detroit (SMART)	Buses and facilities	1,985,000	
Detroit	Intermodal facility	1,985,000	
Flint	Bus facilities	1,985,000	

TABLE 7

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	PURPOSE	SUB-ALLOCATION	FY 1997 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) ALLOCATION
MI Statewide (cont'd)			
For distribution by the State of MI	Buses and bus facilities	$2,610,275	
Grand Rapids (GRATA)	Bus facilities	1,985,000	
Kalamazoo	Buses and bus facilities	992,500	
Kalkaska	Bus facilities	635,200	
Lansing	Bus facility	1,220,775	
MN Minneapolis/St. Paul (MCTO)	Buses and bus facilities		$5,955,000
MS Jackson	Buses		992,500
MS Jackson	Downtown multimodal transit center		3,473,750
MO Kansas City (KCATA)	Buses		2,630,125
MO Kansas City	Union Station intermodal		6,451,250
MO Kansas City	Replacement trolleys (Kansas City Trolley Corporation)		317,600
MO Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		9,180,625
MO St. Louis	Buses and bus facilities		1,736,875
NV Clark County	Bus facilities		3,275,250
NV Reno (RTC)	Buses		1,721,988
NJ New Jersey Transit	Clean Air Act bus fleet improvements		2,977,500
NM Albuquerque	URICA bus project		1,985,000
NY Brooklyn, Bronx, Manhattan	Alternative bus fuels fueling facilities		5,955,000
NY Broome County	Buses		992,500
NY Buffalo	Crossroads intermodal station		992,500
NY Chemung County	Intermodal center		1,488,750
NY Elmira	Buses and bus facilities		992,500
NY Long Island	Bus alternatives fuels fueling facilities		1,885,750
NY New Rochelle	Intermodal facility		1,240,625
NY New York City	Natural gas buses		9,925,000
NY Rochester-Genesse RTA	Buses		1,736,875
NY Syracuse	Buses		1,985,000
NY Utica	Buses support vehicles		1,191,000
NY Westchester County	Bus facilities		496,250
NC Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		3,970,000
ND Bismarck-Mandan (Bis-Man Transit)	Intermodal center		1,488,750
OH Statewide	Buses		27,293,750
OH Cleveland	Triskett bus garage and facilities (Including CITME)		1,488,750
OR Eugene	Lane Transit District buses and station		2,530,875
OR Central City	Streetcar		4,962,500
OR Hood River	Buses		173,688
OR Salem	Downtown transit center		1,836,125
OR Portland, South	Buses and south bus mall extension		8,932,500
OR Wilsonville	Transit vehicles		248,125
PA Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		1,429,200
PA Altoona (ISTEA earmark)	Bus testing		2,977,500
PA Armstrong County MID-County	Buses and bus facilities		260,035
PA Berks Area Reading Transit	Intermodal facility		397,000

TABLE 7

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) BUS ALLOCATIONS

STATE/AREA	PURPOSE	SUB-ALLOCATION	FY 1997 SECTION 5309(m)(1)(C) ALLOCATION
PA Erie	Intermodal complex		$1,985,000
PA Indiana County	Buses		674,900
PA Johnstown (Cambria County)	Buses and bus facilities		1,021,282
PA Lehigh/North Hampton Transportation	Buses		397,000
PA Mid Mon Valley Transit	Buses		79,400
PA Philadelphia	North Philadelphia intermodal center		992,500
PA Philadelphia	Alternative fueled vehicles		3,970,000
PA SEPTA			7,940,000
PA Scranton	Buses and bus facilities		992,500
PA Somerset County	Vans		119,100
PA Williamsport	Buses and bus facilities		1,985,000
SC Spartanburg	Intermodal facility		1,488,750
TN Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		2,481,250
TX Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		2,183,500
TX Brazos Valley	Woodlands town center project		1,339,875
TX Corpus Christi	Buses and bus facilities		992,500
TX El Paso	Buses and bus facilities		2,481,250
TX Galveston	Trolley maintenance		496,250
TX Liberty, Montgomery, Polk Counties	Service expansion		2,977,500
UT Salt Lake City	2002 Winter Olympics buses and facilities		5,558,000
UT Salt Lake City	2002 Winter Olympics intermodal centers		5,458,750
UT Logan	Buses and bus facilities		2,382,000
VT Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		1,240,625
VT Burlington	Multimodal center		1,488,750
VT Rutland	Intermodal center		694,750
VT Urban & Rural	Buses and bus facilities		2,729,375
VA Reston	Internal bus system, buses		496,250
VA Richmond	Downtown intermodal station		9,925,000
VA Virginia Beach	Intermodal facility		992,500
WA Bremerton	Buses and bus facilities		1,985,000
WA Chelan-Douglas	Multimodal center-Amtrak platform		992,500
WA Everett	Intermodal center		2,977,500
WA Port Angeles	Buses and bus facilities		992,500
WA Seattle Metro/King County	Multimodal		3,970,000
WA Tacoma	Tacoma Dome		4,466,250
WA Thurston County	Intercity transit buses		992,500
WV Charleston	Renovate maintenance facility		3,156,150
WI Statewide	Buses and bus facilities		11,810,750
WY Freemont County	Shoshone and Arapahoe Nation's buses and facility		992,500
TOTAL			$377,150,000

* Of the total amount allocated to the State of Illinois, $29,775 is not included in the sub-allocations.

TABLE 7A

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

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

	STATE/AREA	PRIOR YEAR SECTION 5309 (m)(1)(C) UNOBLIGATED ALLOCATION
FY 1996		
	AR Statewide	$3,964,000
	CA Coachella Valley	496,250
	CA Long Beach	1,488,750
	CA San Diego	4,674,500
	CA San Francisco	3,233,065
	CA Sonoma County	1,240,625
	CT Norwich	1,488,750
	GA Atlanta	3,721,875
	HI Honolulu	3,970,000
	IL Statewide	1,759,702
	IN State	608,069
	IN Gary/Hammond	258,050
	IN South Bend	2,484,678
	IA Waterloo	664,975
	IA Cedar Rapids	1,191,000
	KY Lexington	992,500
	LA New Orleans	2,977,500
	LA St. Bernard Parish	1,488,750
	MD MTA	12,902,500
	MN Minneapolis	7,443,750
	MO Kansas City	6,451,250
	MO Statewide	6,947,500
	NY Albany	4,962,500
	NY Buffalo	496,250
	NY Garden State Parkway	1,141,375
	NY Long Island	1,488,750
	NY Rensselaer	7,433,750
	NY Rochelle	744,375
	NY Syracuse	1,985,000
	NY Westchester County	2,233,125
	NC State	4,962,500
	OH State	2,200,000
	PA Altoona	992,500
	PA Philadelphia	992,500
	PA Erie	3,970,000
	TN Nashville	297,750
	TX El Paso	5,161,000
	VA Richmond	4,962,500
	VT Statewide	2,977,500

TABLE 7A

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

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

	STATE/AREA	PRIOR YEAR SECTION 5309 (m)(1)(C) UNOBLIGATED ALLOCATION
FY 1996 (cont'd)		
	VT Marble Valley	$612,500
	WA Everett	3,473,750
	WA King County/Seattle	8,188,125
	WI Statewide	5,129,240
FY 1995		
	CT Norwich	$2,000,000
	FL Orlando	828,400
	IL Statewide	2,724,000
	IA Cedar Rapids	2,550,000
	LA New Orleans	2,000,000
	MI Detroit	4,000,000
	MO Kansas City	3,760,000
	NJ Camden	150,000
	NM Albuquerque	3,750,000
	NY Bronx	1,000,000
	OR Albany	86,000
	TX El Paso	2,810,613
	TX El Paso	1,500,000
	VA Northern Virginia Dulles	950,000
FY 1994		
	NJ Camden	$800,000
	IN South Bend	3,428
	TOTAL	$163,765,470

TABLE 8

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 SECTION 5303 METROPOLITAN PLANNING PROGRAM AND SECTION 5313(b) STATE PLANNING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM

STATE	FY 1997 METROPOLITAN PLANNING PROGRAM APPORTIONMENT	FY 1997 STATE PLANNING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM APPORTIONMENT	*ISTEA FY 1997 AUTHORIZED LEVELS*	
			SECTION 5303 APPORTIONMENT	*SECTION 5313(b) APPORTIONMENT*
Alabama	$350,159	$90,647	*$857,286*	*$229,922*
Alaska	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
Arizona	631,094	130,849	*1,559,149*	*331,894*
Arkansas	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
California	6,781,265	1,254,602	*16,686,764*	*3,182,251*
Colorado	521,298	117,144	*1,273,462*	*297,133*
Connecticut	462,884	120,981	*1,144,171*	*306,864*
Delaware	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
District/Col	215,632	41,396	*527,817*	*105,000*
Florida	2,156,865	501,405	*5,337,057*	*1,271,797*
Georgia	767,987	160,638	*1,889,333*	*407,454*
Hawaii	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
Idaho	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
Illinois	2,343,651	417,706	*5,719,120*	*1,059,498*
Indiana	569,612	132,656	*1,388,423*	*336,477*
Iowa	179,331	46,440	*439,206*	*117,794*
Kansas	206,476	50,182	*507,734*	*127,285*
Kentucky	249,175	62,905	*608,169*	*159,556*
Louisiana	438,000	109,764	*1,050,948*	*278,413*
Maine	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
Maryland	932,101	176,442	*2,272,317*	*447,540*
Massachusetts	1,134,990	233,044	*2,771,517*	*591,109*
Michigan	1,470,219	286,354	*3,570,467*	*726,327*
Minnesota	594,005	116,805	*1,449,807*	*296,272*
Mississippi	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
Missouri	695,407	137,093	*1,602,949*	*347,731*
Montana	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
Nebraska	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
Nevada	173,586	44,885	*424,502*	*113,851*
New Hampshire	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
New Jersey	1,984,402	326,607	*4,852,183*	*828,428*
New Mexico	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
New York	4,032,593	695,432	*9,853,166*	*1,763,942*
North Carolina	473,443	123,797	*1,170,807*	*314,008*
North Dakota	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
Ohio	1,383,816	327,958	*3,372,951*	*831,856*
Oklahoma	256,730	66,722	*631,022*	*169,239*
Oregon	290,417	69,960	*708,810*	*177,451*
Pennsylvania	1,909,473	355,080	*4,374,628*	*900,650*
Rhode Island	165,658	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
South Carolina	268,740	70,289	*664,753*	*178,285*
South Dakota	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
Tennessee	421,256	109,271	*1,033,425*	*277,162*
Texas	2,708,092	560,258	*6,650,538*	*1,421,077*
Utah	248,024	65,008	*614,812*	*164,891*
Vermont	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
Virginia	885,950	188,674	*2,187,535*	*478,565*
Washington	710,222	158,375	*1,743,544*	*401,714*
West Virginia	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
Wisconsin	557,792	121,425	*1,220,712*	*307,992*
Wyoming	160,691	41,396	*391,502*	*105,000*
Puerto Rico	431,242	104,702	*1,060,882*	*265,572*
	$40,172,643	$8,279,228	*$97,875,500*	*$21,000,000*

TABLE 9

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

FY 1997 METROPOLITAN PLANNING PROGRAM
AND FY 1997 STATE PLANNING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM

STATE	ESTIMATED FY 1997 METROPOLITAN PLANNING PROGRAM APPORTIONMENT	ESTIMATED FY 1997 STATE PLANNING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM APPORTIONMENT
Alabama	$1,728,566	$5,094,000
Alaska	789,394	4,145,000
Arizona	2,495,191	3,778,000
Arkansas	789,394	3,269,000
California	23,924,292	25,461,000
Colorado	2,233,856	4,013,000
Connecticut	2,307,018	5,345,000
Delaware	789,394	1,371,000
Distr. of Col.	789,394	1,551,000
Florida	9,561,423	11,602,000
Georgia	3,063,258	7,589,000
Hawaii	789,394	2,404,000
Idaho	789,394	2,146,000
Illinois	7,965,348	10,647,000
Indiana	2,529,649	5,664,000
Iowa	885,581	4,026,000
Kansas	956,933	3,660,000
Kentucky	1,199,548	4,331,000
Louisiana	2,093,123	5,011,000
Maine	789,394	1,667,000
Maryland	3,364,623	4,620,000
Massachusetts	4,443,983	12,710,000
Michigan	5,460,559	7,546,000
Minnesota	2,227,388	5,012,000
Mississippi	789,394	3,708,000
Missouri	2,614,258	6,997,000
Montana	789,394	2,987,000
Nebraska	789,394	2,764,000
Nevada	855,933	2,019,000
New Hampshire	789,394	1,621,000
New Jersey	6,228,157	7,646,000
New Mexico	789,394	3,362,000
New York	13,261,391	15,642,000
N. Carolina	2,360,725	7,388,000
N. Dakota	789,394	1,969,000
Ohio	6,253,930	11,536,000
Oklahoma	1,272,345	3,910,000
Oregon	1,334,082	3,179,000
Pennsylvania	6,771,121	12,192,000
Rhode Island	789,394	1,502,000
S. Carolina	1,340,358	3,787,000
S. Dakota	789,394	2,169,000
Tennessee	2,083,719	6,478,000
Texas	10,683,717	18,953,000
Utah	1,239,659	2,468,000
Vermont	789,394	1,471,000
Virginia	3,597,869	5,885,000
Washington	3,020,103	6,389,000
West Virginia	789,394	3,169,000
Wisconsin	2,315,495	5,585,000
Wyoming	789,394	2,169,000
Puerto Rico	1,996,582	1,721,000
Total	$157,878,875	$291,328,000

TABLE 10

Federal Transit Administration - Unit Values of Data
Fiscal Year 1997 Formula Grant Apportionments

Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program - Bus Tier

Urbanized Areas Over 1,000,000:

Population	$2.09112649
Population x Density	$0.00053634
Bus Revenue Vehicle Mile	$0.29661622

Urbanized Areas Under 1,000,000:

Population	$1.88979937
Population x Density	$0.00083226
Bus Revenue Vehicle Mile	$0.38184824

Bus Incentive (PM denotes Passenger Mile):

Bus PM x Bus PM = / Operating Cost	$0.00353153

Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program - Fixed Guideway Tier

Fixed Guideway Revenue Vehicle Mile	$0.40702226
Fixed Guideway Route Mile	$23,377
- Commuter Rail Floor $4,277,721	

Fixed Guideway Incentive:

Fixed Guideway PM x Fixed Guideway PM = / Operating Cost	$0.00038296
- Commuter Rail Incentive Floor $196,415	

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

Population	$3.41199253
Population x Density	$0.00170497

Section 5311 Nonurbanized Area Formula Program

Areas Under 50,000

Population	$1.26085061

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

	Tier 3	Tier 4
Legislatively Specified Areas:		**All Areas:**
Revenue Vehicle Mile	$0.03043440	$0.13683130
Route Mile	$2,212.43	$7,832.52
Other Areas:		
Revenue Vehicle Mile	$0.16377360	
Route Mile	$4,772.78	

[FR Doc. 96–25248 Filed 10–4–96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–57–C