

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****Federal Transit Administration****FTA Fiscal Year 1998 Apportionments, Allocations and Program Information**

**AGENCY:** Federal Transit Administration (FTA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice.

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

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

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

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

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

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The appropriate FTA Regional Administrator for grant-specific information and issues; Patricia Levine, Director, Office of Resource Management and State Programs, (202) 366-2053, for general information about the Urbanized Area Formula Program, the Nonurbanized Area Formula

Program, the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program, the Rural Transit Assistance Program, or the Capital Program; or Robert Stout, Director, Office of Planning Operations, (202) 366-6385, for general information concerning the Metropolitan Planning Program and the State Planning and Research Program.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. BACKGROUND
- II. OVERVIEW OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANT PROGRAMS
  - A. General
  - B. Funds Available for Obligation
  - C. Project Management Oversight
- III. EXPANDED DEFINITION OF CAPITAL
  - A. Preventive Maintenance
  - B. Operating Assistance for Urbanized Areas Less Than 200,000 In Population
- IV. DEPARTMENTAL INITIATIVES
  - A. FTA Home Page on the Internet
  - B. State Infrastructure Banks
- V. SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM
  - A. Total Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments
  - B. Data Used for Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments
  - C. Adjustments for Energy and Operating Efficiencies
  - D. Urbanized Area Formula Fiscal Year 1998 Apportionments to Governors
  - E. Urbanized Area Formula Operating Assistance Limitations
  - F. Statewide Operating Assistance Limitations
  - G. Designated Transportation Management Areas
  - H. Urbanized Area Formula Funds Used for Highway Purposes
- VI. SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM AND SECTION 5311(b) RURAL TRANSIT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (RTAP)
  - A. Nonurbanized Area Formula Program
  - B. Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP)
- VII. SECTION 5310 ELDERLY AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES PROGRAM
- VIII. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM "FLEXIBLE" FUNDS USED FOR TRANSIT PURPOSES (Title 23, U.S.C.)
  - A. Transfer Process
  - B. Matching Share for Flexible Funds
  - C. Other Funds Transferred to FTA
- IX. SECTION 5309 CAPITAL PROGRAM
  - A. Fixed Guideway Modernization
  - B. New Starts
  - C. Bus
- X. UNIT VALUES OF DATA FOR SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM, SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM, AND SECTION 5309 FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION PROGRAM
- XI. SECTION 5303 METROPOLITAN PLANNING PROGRAM AND SECTION 5313(b) STATE PLANNING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM

- A. Metropolitan Planning Program
- B. State Planning and Research Program
- C. Data Used for Metropolitan Planning Apportionments and State Planning and Research Apportionments
- D. FHWA Metropolitan Planning Program and State Planning and Research Program
- E. Local Match Waiver for Job Access Planning Activities
- F. Planning Emphasis Areas
- G. Federal Planning Certification Reviews
- H. Consolidated Planning Grant
- XII. PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS
- XIII. NOTICE OF PRE-AWARD AUTHORITY TO INCUR PROJECT COSTS
  - A. Background
  - B. Current Coverage
  - C. Conditions
  - D. Environmental, Planning and Other Requirements
- XIV. RAIL FIXED GUIDEWAY SYSTEMS: STATE SAFETY OVERSIGHT (49 CFR PART 659)
- XV. ELECTRONIC GRANT MAKING AND MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES
  - A. Background
  - B. Graphical User Interface
  - C. Fiscal Year 1998 Emphasis
- XVI. 1998 ANNUAL LIST OF CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES
- XVII. QUARTERLY APPROVAL OF GRANTS
- XVIII. GRANT APPLICATION PROCEDURES TABLES

- 1. FTA FY 1998 APPROPRIATIONS AND FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR GRANT PROGRAMS
- 2. FTA FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS
- 3. FTA FY 1998 SECTION 5311 NONURBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS, AND SECTION 5311(b) RURAL TRANSIT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (RTAP) ALLOCATIONS
- 4. FTA FY 1998 Section 5310 elderly and persons with disabilities apportionments
- 5. FTA FY 1998 section 5309 fixed guideway modernization apportionments
- 6. FTA FY 1998 section 5309 new start allocations
- 6A. FTA prior year unobligated section 5309 new start allocations
- 7. FTA FY 1998 section 5309 bus allocations
- 7A. FTA prior year unobligated section 5309 BUS allocations
- 8. FTA FY 1998 section 5303 metropolitan planning apportionments and section 5313(b) state planning and research apportionments
- 9. Unit values of data—FTA FY 1998 formula grant apportionments

## I. Background

Urbanized Area Formula Program funds are apportioned by statutory formula to urbanized areas and to the Governors to provide capital, operating and planning assistance in urbanized areas. Nonurbanized Area Formula Program funds are apportioned by statutory formula to the Governors for capital, operating and administrative assistance in nonurbanized areas. The

Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program funds are apportioned by statutory formula to the Governors to provide capital assistance to organizations providing transportation service for the elderly and persons with disabilities. Fixed Guideway Modernization funds are apportioned by statutory formula to specified urbanized areas for capital improvements in rail and other fixed guideways. Funds appropriated for the Metropolitan Planning Program are apportioned by a statutory formula to the Governors for allocation by them to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in urbanized areas or portions thereof. Appropriated funds for the State Planning and Research Program also are apportioned to states by a statutory formula. New Start funds identified for specific projects in the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act and Bus fund allocations in the accompanying Conference Report are also included in this Notice.

## II. Overview of Appropriations for Grant Programs

### A. General

In fiscal year 1998, the appropriation and obligation limitation for the Urbanized Area Formula Program and the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program is \$2,437,780,611. Of this amount, 94.50 percent (\$2,303,702,677) would be available to the Urbanized Area Formula Program, and 5.50 percent (\$134,077,934) would be available to the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program. The other program appropriations contained in this Notice are as follows: \$4,500,000 for the Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP); \$62,219,389 for the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program; \$39,500,000 for the Metropolitan Planning Program; \$8,250,000 for the State Planning and Research Program; and \$2,000,000,000 in obligation limitation for the Capital Program. Of the Capital Program amount, \$800,000,000 is for Fixed Guideway Modernization, \$800,000,000 is for New Starts, and \$400,000,000 is for Bus.

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

### B. Funds Available for Obligation

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

### C. Project Management Oversight

49 U.S.C. Section 5327 allows the Secretary of Transportation to use not more than one-half of one percent of the funds made available under the Capital Program; the Urbanized Area Formula Program, the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program; the National Capital Transportation Act, as amended; and an additional one-quarter of one percent of Capital Program funds to contract with any person to oversee the construction of any major project under these statutory programs and to conduct safety, procurement, management and financial reviews and audits.

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

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

### III. Expanded Definition of Capital

#### A. Preventive Maintenance

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

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

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

purchased service, then the grantee may apply for capital assistance under preventive maintenance for the actual maintenance costs of the purchased service.

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

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

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

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

### IV. Departmental Initiatives

#### A. FTA Home Page on the Internet

FTA provides extended customer service by making available transit information on the FTA Home Page web site, including this Apportionment Notice. Also posted on the web site are FTA program circulars: C9030.1B, Urbanized Area Formula Program: Grant

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

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

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

#### B. State Infrastructure Banks

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

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

### V. Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program

#### A. Total Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments

In addition to the appropriated fiscal year 1998 Urbanized Area Formula funds of \$2,303,702,677, the apportionment also includes \$7,162,381 in deobligated funds which have become available for reapportionment for the Urbanized Area Formula

Program as provided by 49 U.S.C. 5336(i).

Table 2 displays the amount apportioned for the Urbanized Area Formula Program. After the .32343056 of one percent for PMO is reserved (\$7,450,879), the amount appropriated for this program is \$2,296,251,798. The funds to be reapportioned, described in the previous paragraph, have then been added. Thus, the total amount apportioned for this program is \$2,303,414,179.

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

#### *B. Data Used for Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments*

Data from the 1996 NTD (49 U.S.C. 5335) Report Year submitted in late 1996 and early 1997 have been used to calculate the fiscal year 1998 Urbanized Area Formula apportionments for urbanized areas 200,000 in population and over. The population and population density figures used in calculating the Urbanized Area Formula are from the 1990 Census.

#### *C. Adjustments for Energy and Operating Efficiencies*

49 U.S.C. 5336(b)(2)(E) provides that, if a recipient of Urbanized Area Formula Program funds demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that energy or operating efficiencies would be achieved by actions that reduce revenue vehicle miles but provide the same frequency of revenue service to the same number of riders, the recipient's apportionment under 49 U.S.C. 5336(b)(2)(A)(i) shall not be reduced as a result of such actions. One recipient has submitted data acceptable to FTA in accordance with this provision. Accordingly, the revenue vehicle miles used in the Urbanized Area Formula database to calculate the fiscal year 1998 Urbanized Area Formula apportionment reflect the amount the recipient would have received without the reductions in mileage.

#### *D. Urbanized Area Formula Fiscal Year 1998 Apportionments to Governors*

The total Urbanized Area Formula apportionment to the Governor for use in areas under 200,000 in population for

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

#### *E. Urbanized Area Formula Operating Assistance Limitations*

The fiscal year 1998 limitations on the amount of Urbanized Area Formula funds that may be used for operating assistance are shown on Table 2 with the fiscal year 1998 apportionment.

The operating assistance limitations for all urbanized areas have been adjusted by 49 U.S.C. 5336(d)(2) to reflect the increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all urban consumers during the most recent calendar years. *The CPI Detailed Report*, December 1996, published by the Department of Labor (DOL), establishes that the calendar year 1996 CPI increase for all urban consumers is 3.3 percent. This increase was applied against the base operating assistance limitation calculated in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5336(d)(2).

These adjustments result in an overall national fiscal year 1998 authorized operating assistance limitation level of \$1,178,642,366. However, the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act limits the nationwide availability for operating assistance to a maximum of \$150,000,000. Further, it maintains the level of transit operating assistance to urbanized areas of less than 200,000 in population at 75 percent of the amount of operating assistance such areas received in fiscal year 1995. Accordingly, the operating assistance limitation published in this Notice takes into account both the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act and Federal transit laws. Therefore, the higher operating assistance limitation as authorized under Federal transit laws (\$1,178,642,366) was reduced to the \$150,000,000 required by the 1998 DOT Appropriations Act by taking a pro rata reduction across all categories of grantees. Further, the operating assistance limitation to urbanized areas less than 200,000 in population was adjusted to \$92,949,803 or 75 percent of the amount of their fiscal year 1995 level of \$123,933,070.

The operating assistance limitation of \$85,791 for Flagstaff, Arizona (a newly

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

Consistent with the 1998 Conference Report, the Secretary hereby directs each area of 1,000,000 or more in population to give priority consideration to the impact of reductions in operating assistance on smaller transit authorities operating within the area, and to consider the needs and resources of such transit authorities when the limitation is distributed among all transit authorities operating in the area.

#### *F. Statewide Operating Assistance Limitations*

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

#### *G. Designated Transportation Management Areas*

All urbanized areas over 200,000 in population have been designated as transportation management areas (TMAs), in accordance with 49 U.S.C. Section 5305. These designations were formally made in a **Federal Register** notice dated May 18, 1992 (57 FR 21160), signed by the Federal Highway Administrator and the Federal Transit Administrator. Additional areas may be designated as TMAs upon the request of the Governor and the MPO designated for such area or the affected local officials. As of October 1, 1997, two additional TMAs have been formally designated: Petersburg, Virginia, comprised solely of the Petersburg,

Virginia, urbanized area; and Santa Barbara, Santa Maria, and Lompoc, California, which were combined and designated as one TMA.

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

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

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

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

#### *H. Urbanized Area Formula Funds Used for Highway Purposes*

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

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

#### **VI. Section 5311 Nonurbanized Area Formula Program and Section 5311(b) Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP)**

##### *A. Nonurbanized Area Formula Program*

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

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

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

The Nonurbanized Formula Program provides capital, operating and administrative assistance for areas less

than 50,000 in population. Each state must spend no less than 15 percent of its fiscal year 1998 Nonurbanized Area Formula apportionment for the development and support of intercity bus transportation, unless the Governor certifies to the Secretary that the intercity bus service needs of the state are being adequately met. Fiscal year 1998 Nonurbanized Area Formula grant applications must reflect this level of programming for intercity bus or include a certification from the Governor.

##### *B. Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP)*

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

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

The funds are allocated to the states to undertake research, training, technical assistance, and other support services to meet the needs of transit operators in nonurbanized areas. These funds are to be used in conjunction with the states' administration of the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program.

#### **VII. Section 5310 Elderly and Persons With Disabilities Program**

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

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

The formula for apportioning these funds uses 1990 Census population data for persons aged 65 and over and for persons with disabilities.

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

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

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

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

##### **A. Transfer Process**

"Flexible" DOT funds, such as Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, or others, which are designated for use in transit projects, are transferred from the FHWA to FTA after which FTA approves the project

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

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

##### **B. Matching Share for Flexible Funds**

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

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

Secondly, commuter carpooling and vanpooling projects and transit safety projects using flexible funds administered by FTA may retain the

same 100 percent Federal share that would be allowed for ride-sharing or safety projects administered by the FHWA. The third instance includes the 100 percent Federal safety projects; however, these are subject to a nationwide 10 percent program limitation.

##### **C. Other Funds Transferred to FTA**

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

#### **IX. Section 5309 Capital Program**

##### **A. Fixed Guideway Modernization**

Fixed Guideway Modernization funds are allocated by formula. Statutory percentages were established to allocate the first \$497,700,000 to 11 fixed guideway areas. The next \$70,000,000 is allocated one-half to these 11 urbanized areas and one-half to other urbanized areas with fixed guideways which are at least seven years old on the basis of the Urbanized Area Formula Program fixed guideway tier formula factors. The remaining funds are allocated to all of these urbanized areas as one universe. For fiscal year 1998, there is a \$800,000,000 obligation limitation for fixed guideway modernization. After deducting the .32343056 of one percent for oversight (\$2,587,445), \$797,412,555 would be available for apportionment to the specified urbanized areas for Fixed Guideway Modernization funding. Table 5 displays these apportionments.

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

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

All urbanized areas with fixed guideway systems that are at least seven years old are eligible to receive Fixed Guideway Modernization funds. A

request for the start-up service dates for fixed guideways has been incorporated into the NTD reporting system to ensure that all eligible fixed guideway data is included in the calculation of these apportionments. A threshold level of more than one mile of fixed guideway is required to receive Fixed Guideway Modernization funds. Therefore, urbanized areas reporting one mile or less of fixed guideway mileage under the NTD are not included. Urbanized areas should be aware that the formula allocating Fixed Guideway Modernization funds may be changed under a new authorization act.

#### *B. New Starts*

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

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

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

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

#### *C. Bus*

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

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

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

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

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

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

Because the .32343056 of one percent for PMO was subtracted from the amount appropriated, each bus project identified in the Conference Report receives .32343056 of one percent less than the funding level contained in the report. No funds remain available for discretionary allocation by the Federal Transit Administrator. Table 7 displays the allocations of the fiscal year 1998 Bus funds by state and area.

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

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

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

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

##### *A. Metropolitan Planning Program*

The fiscal year 1998 Metropolitan Planning apportionment to states for MPOs to be used in urbanized areas totals \$39,625,587. This amount includes \$39,500,000 in fiscal year 1998 appropriated funds, and \$125,587 in prior year deobligated funds which have become available for reallocation for this program. A basic allocation of 80 percent of this amount (\$31,700,470) is distributed to the states based on a statutory formula for subsequent state distribution to each urbanized area, or parts thereof, within each state. A supplemental allocation of the remaining 20 percent (\$7,925,117) is also provided to the States based on an FTA administrative formula to address planning needs in the larger, more complex urbanized areas. Table 8 contains the final state apportionments for the combined basic and supplemental allocations. Each state, in cooperation with the MPOs, must develop an allocation formula for the combined apportionment which distributes these funds to MPOs representing urbanized areas, or parts thereof, within the state. This formula, which must be approved by the FTA, must ensure to the maximum extent practicable, that no MPO is allocated less than the amount it received by administrative formula under the Metropolitan Planning Program in fiscal year 1991 (minimum MPO allocation). Each state formula must include a provision for the minimum MPO allocation. Where the state and MPOs



desire to use a new formula not previously approved by FTA, the state or MPO must submit the new formula to the appropriate FTA Regional Office for prior approval.

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

#### *B. State Planning and Research Program*

The fiscal year 1998 apportionment for the State Planning and Research Program totals \$8,472,086. This amount includes \$8,250,000 in fiscal year 1998 appropriated funds, and \$222,086 in prior year deobligated funds which have become available for reallocation to this program. Final state apportionments, based on a statutory formula for this program, are also contained on Table 8. These funds may be used for a variety of purposes such as planning, technical studies and assistance, demonstrations, management training and cooperative research. In addition, a state may authorize a portion of these funds to be used to supplement planning funds allocated by the State to its urbanized areas as the state deems appropriate.

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

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

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

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

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

#### *E. Local Match Waiver for Job Access Planning Activities*

Federal, state, and local welfare reform initiatives may require the development of new and innovative public and other transportation services to ensure that former welfare recipients

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

#### *F. Planning Emphasis Areas*

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

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

agencies and other stakeholders to participate in the transportation planning process.

#### *1. System Management and Operation*

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

#### *2. Financial Planning*

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

#### *3. Environmental and Community Impact*

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



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

#### 4. Transportation and Equity

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

#### G. Federal Planning Certification Reviews

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

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

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

#### H. Consolidated Planning Grant

In fiscal year 1997, FTA and FHWA began offering states the option of participating in a pilot Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG) program. Thirteen

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

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

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

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

#### XII. Period of Availability of Funds

The funds apportioned under the Urbanized Area Formula Program, the Fixed Guideway Modernization Program, the Metropolitan Planning Program and the State Planning and Research Program in this notice will remain available to be obligated by FTA to recipients for three fiscal years following fiscal year 1998. Any of these apportioned funds unobligated at the close of business on September 30, 2001, will revert to FTA for reapportionment under these respective programs.

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

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

##### A. Background

Since fiscal year 1994, FTA has provided grantees pre-award authority to cover planning and capital costs prior to grant award. Previous to this grantees had authority to incur costs for operating assistance prior to grant award. This automatic pre-award spending authority permitted a grantee to incur costs on an eligible transit capital or planning project without prejudice to possible future Federal

participation in the cost of the project or projects. In order to ensure eligibility for future FTA funds, grantees are encouraged to consult with the appropriate regional office prior to exercising pre-award authority.

#### *B. Current Coverage*

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

#### *C. Conditions*

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

- (1) This pre-award authority is not a legal or moral commitment that the project(s) will be approved for FTA assistance or that the FTA will obligate Federal funds. Furthermore, it is not a legal or moral commitment that all items undertaken by the applicant will be eligible for inclusion in the project(s).
- (2) All FTA statutory, procedural, and contractual requirements must be met.
- (3) No action will be taken by the grantee which prejudices the legal and administrative findings which the Federal Transit Administrator must make in order to approve a project.
- (4) Local funds expended by the grantee pursuant to and after the date of this authority will be eligible for credit toward local match or reimbursement if the FTA later makes a grant for the project(s) or project amendment(s).
- (5) The Federal amount of any future FTA assistance to the grantee for the project will be determined on the basis

of the overall scope of activities and the prevailing statutory provisions with respect to the Federal-local match ratio at the time the funds are obligated.

(6) For funds to which this authority applies, the authority expires with the lapsing of fiscal year 1998 funds.

#### *D. Environmental, Planning and Other Federal Requirements*

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

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

Before an applicant may incur costs either for activities expected to be funded by New Start funds, or for activities requiring funding beyond fiscal year 1998, it must first obtain a

written LONP from the FTA. To obtain an LONP, a grantee must submit a written request accompanied by adequate information and justification to the appropriate FTA regional office.

#### **XIV. Rail Fixed Guideway Systems: State Safety Oversight (49 CFR Part 659)**

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

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

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

## **XV. Electronic Grant Making and Management Initiatives**

### *A. Background*

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

### *B. Graphical User Interface*

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

### *C. Fiscal Year 1998 Emphasis*

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

## **XVI. 1998 Annual List of Certifications and Assurances**

The Fiscal Year 1998 Annual List of Certifications and Assurances for Federal Transit Administration Grants

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

## **XVII. Quarterly Approval of Grants**

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

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

In order to expedite the grant approval process within the quarterly approval structure, grants which are complete and have received the required Transit Employee Protective Certification from the Department of Labor (DOL) will be approved before the end of the quarter. There are only two factors which would delay FTA

approval of the project beyond the end of a quarter. First is a failure by DOL to issue a Transit Employee Protective Certification where such certification is a prerequisite to a grant approval, and second is the failure of FHWA to actually transfer flexible funds.

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

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

## **XVIII. Grant Application Procedures**

All applications for FTA funds should be submitted to the appropriate FTA Regional Office. Formula grant applications should be prepared in conformance with the following FTA Circulars: Urbanized Area Formula Program: Grant Application Instructions—C9040.1B, October 10, 1996; Nonurbanized Area Formula Program Guidance and Grant Application Instructions—C9040.1D, May 8, 1997; Section 5310 Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program Guidance and Application Instructions—C9070.1D, October 22, 1997; Section 5309 Capital Program: Grant Application Instructions—C9300.1, September 29, 1995; and Program Guidance and Application Instructions for Metropolitan Planning Program Grants—C8100.1B, October 25, 1996. Applications for STP "flexible" fund grants should be prepared in the same manner as the apportioned funds under the Urbanized Area Formula, Nonurbanized Area Formula, or Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Programs. Guidance on preparation of applications for State Planning and Research funds

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

Issued on: December 2, 1997.

**Gordon J. Linton,**  
*Administrator.*

BILLING CODE 4910-57-U

**TABLE 1**  
**FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION**

**FY 1998 APPROPRIATIONS AND FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR GRANT PROGRAMS**

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

97FR-TIC/D586

TABLE 2

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

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

  

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

TABLE 2

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

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



TABLE 2  
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

**FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS**

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

TABLE 2

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT	AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION
<i>Amounts Apportioned to State Governors for Urbanized Areas 50,000 to 200,000 in Population:</i>				
<b>ALABAMA:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	<u>\$4,155,019</u>	<u>\$1,970,561</u>	<u>\$2,605,188</u>	<u>\$1,970,561</u>
Anniston, AL	400,780	231,980	251,288	231,980
Auburn-Opelika, AL	321,546	129,622	201,609	129,622
Decatur, AL	366,983	152,422	230,097	152,422
Dothan, AL	308,237	133,304	193,264	133,304
Florence, AL	429,422	235,002	269,247	235,002
Gadsden, AL	379,537	233,057	237,969	233,057
Huntsville	1,204,818	504,984	755,418	504,984
Tuscaloosa, AL	743,696	350,190	466,296	350,190
<b>ALASKA:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>ARIZONA:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	<u>\$1,087,601</u>	<u>\$292,757</u>	<u>\$681,923</u>	<u>\$292,757</u>
Flagstaff, AZ	427,864	85,791	268,270	85,791
Yuma, AZ-CA (AZ)	659,737	206,966	413,653	206,966
<b>ARKANSAS:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	<u>\$1,587,516</u>	<u>\$798,674</u>	<u>\$995,368</u>	<u>\$798,674</u>
Fayetteville-Springdale, AR	438,127	168,344	274,704	168,344
Fort Smith, AR-OK (AR)	596,410	275,251	373,947	275,251
Pine Bluff, AR	403,041	269,436	252,706	269,436
Texarkana, TX-AR (AR)	149,938	85,643	94,011	85,643
<b>CALIFORNIA:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	<u>\$24,317,143</u>	<u>\$6,801,253</u>	<u>\$15,246,787</u>	<u>\$6,801,253</u>
Antioch-Pittsburg, CA	1,375,193	345,636	862,243	345,636
Chico, CA	600,437	185,098	376,473	185,098
Davis, CA	728,893	213,010	457,014	213,010
Fairfield, CA	885,267	255,671	555,060	255,671
Hemet-San Jacinto, CA	738,574	195,698	463,084	195,698
Hesperia-Apple Valley-Victorville, CA	942,206	265,938	590,761	265,938
Indio-Coachella, CA	446,596	126,070	280,014	126,070
Lancaster-Palmdale, CA	1,584,815	162,437	993,675	162,437
Lodi, CA	620,447	175,169	389,019	175,169

TABLE 2

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

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

TABLE 2

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

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

TABLE 2

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

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

TABLE 2

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

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

TABLE 2  
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

**FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS**

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



**TABLE 2**  
**FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION**

**FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS**

URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT	AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION
<b>MISSOURI:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	<u>\$2,697,035</u>	<u>\$1,205,239</u>	<u>\$1,691,032</u>	<u>\$1,205,239</u>
Columbia, MO	532,464	222,473	333,853	222,473
Joplin, MO	373,937	158,607	234,457	158,607
Springfield, MO	1,256,141	512,465	787,597	512,465
St. Joseph, MO-KS (MO)	534,493	311,694	335,125	311,694
<b>MONTANA:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	<u>\$1,795,419</u>	<u>\$865,821</u>	<u>\$1,125,723</u>	<u>\$865,821</u>
Billings, MT	692,421	332,854	434,146	332,854
Great Falls, MT	645,696	324,442	404,850	324,442
Missoula, MT	457,302	208,525	286,727	208,525
<b>NEBRASKA:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	<u>\$1,995,955</u>	<u>\$783,608</u>	<u>\$1,251,458</u>	<u>\$783,608</u>
Lincoln, NE	1,909,613	747,115	1,197,322	747,115
Sioux City, IA-NE-SD (NE)	86,342	36,493	54,136	36,493
<b>NEVADA:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	<u>\$2,423,808</u>	<u>\$930,889</u>	<u>\$1,519,722</u>	<u>\$930,889</u>
Lowell, MA-NH (NH)	4,961	1,136	3,111	1,136
Manchester, NH	1,016,099	425,529	637,091	425,529
Nashua, NH	812,541	270,768	509,461	270,768
Portsmouth-Dover-Rochester, NH-ME (NH)	590,207	233,456	370,059	233,456
<b>NEW JERSEY:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	<u>\$1,836,483</u>	<u>\$1,162,152</u>	<u>\$1,151,470</u>	<u>\$1,162,152</u>
Atlantic City, NJ	1,323,682	913,408	829,945	913,408
Vineland-Millville, NJ	512,801	248,744	321,525	248,744
<b>NEW MEXICO:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	<u>\$1,000,064</u>	<u>\$346,371</u>	<u>\$627,038</u>	<u>\$346,371</u>
Las Cruces, NM	555,540	185,079	348,322	185,079

TABLE 2  
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

**FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS**

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

**TABLE 2**  
**FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION**

**FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS**

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

TABLE 2  
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS				
URBANIZED AREA/STATE	FY 1998 APPORTIONMENT	FY 1998 OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION	FY 1998 AVAILABLE APPORTIONMENT	AVAILABLE OPERATING ASSISTANCE LIMITATION
<b>PUERTO RICO (Continued):</b>				
Caguas, PR	2,019,356	615,765	1,266,131	615,765
Cayey, PR	597,049	168,563	374,348	168,563
Humacao, PR	516,734	145,877	323,991	145,877
Mayaguez, PR	1,110,203	453,778	696,094	453,778
Ponce, PR	2,470,532	1,056,142	1,549,016	1,056,142
Vega Baja-Manati, PR	1,122,558	341,472	703,841	341,472
<b>RHODE ISLAND:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	\$600,421	\$246,288	\$376,462	\$246,288
Fall River, MA-RI (RI)	137,642	54,179	86,301	54,179
Newport, RI	462,779	192,109	290,161	192,109
<b>SOUTH CAROLINA:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	\$2,542,719	\$1,013,149	\$1,594,279	\$1,013,149
Anderson, SC	341,975	158,795	214,418	158,795
Florence, SC	351,748	166,525	220,545	166,525
Myrtle Beach, SC	368,874	104,116	231,283	104,116
Rock Hill, SC	391,665	149,201	245,573	149,201
Spartanburg, SC	682,759	319,995	428,088	319,995
Sumter, SC	405,698	114,517	254,372	114,517
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	\$1,262,534	\$523,345	\$791,607	\$523,345
Rapid City, SD	402,098	177,805	252,115	177,805
Sioux City, IA-NE-SD (SD)	11,274	4,219	7,069	4,219
Sioux Falls, SD	849,162	341,321	532,423	341,321
<b>TENNESSEE:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	\$1,953,999	\$887,865	\$1,225,152	\$887,865
Bristol, TN-Bristol, VA (TN)	182,640	90,241	114,515	90,241
Clarksville, TN-KY (TN)	445,308	167,264	279,207	167,264
Jackson, TN	337,056	148,661	211,333	148,661
Johnson City, TN	513,782	228,788	322,140	228,788
Kingsport, TN-VA (TN)	475,213	252,911	297,957	252,911
<b>TEXAS:</b>				
State apportionment and limitation for areas 50,000 to 200,000 in population:	\$18,092,227	\$7,687,065	\$11,343,782	\$7,687,065
Abilene, TX	641,883	322,174	402,459	322,174
Amarillo, TX	1,190,549	544,163	746,472	544,163

TABLE 2

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

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

TABLE 2

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5307 URBANIZED AREA FORMULA APPORTIONMENTS

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

TABLE 3

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

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

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



TABLE 4

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5310 ELDERLY AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES APPORTIONMENTS

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

TABLE 5

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5309 FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION APPORTIONMENTS

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

Page 1 of 2 pages.

TABLE 6

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5309 NEW START ALLOCATIONS

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

Page 2 of 2 pages.

TABLE 6

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5309 NEW START ALLOCATIONS

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

TABLE 6A

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED SECTION 5309 NEW START ALLOCATIONS

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

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

TABLE 7

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

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

TABLE 7

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

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



TABLE 7

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

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

TABLE 7

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

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

TABLE 7

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

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

Page 6 of 6 pages.

TABLE 7

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## FY 1998 SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

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

Page 1 of 4 pages.

Table 7A

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

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

Page 2 of 4 pages.

Table 7A

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

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

Page 3 of 4 pages.

Table 7A

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

## PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS

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

Page 4 of 4 pages.

Table 7A

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

**PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED SECTION 5309 BUS ALLOCATIONS**

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



TABLE 8

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

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

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

TABLE 9

Federal Transit Administration - Unit Values of Data Fiscal Year 1998 Formula Grant Apportionments			FY 1998 APPORTIONMENTS	FY 1998 FUNDS AVAILABLE
<b>Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program - Bus Tier</b>				
Urbanized Areas Over 1,000,000:				
Population .....			\$2.43741676	\$1.52825411
Population x Density .....			\$0.00062516	\$0.00039197
Bus Revenue Vehicle Mile .....			\$0.34472062	\$0.21613895
Urbanized Areas Under 1,000,000:				
Population .....			\$2.20274993	\$1.38111858
Population x Density .....			\$0.00097008	\$0.00060824
Bus Revenue Vehicle Mile .....			\$0.42276377	\$0.26507181
Bus Incentive (PM denotes Passenger Mile):				
Bus PM x Bus PM = Operating Cost .....			\$0.00412867	\$0.00258867
<b>Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program - Fixed Guideway Tier</b>				
Fixed Guideway Revenue Vehicle Mile .....			\$0.46535454	\$0.29177611
Fixed Guideway Route Mile .....			\$26,427	\$16,569
- Commuter Rail Floor .....	\$4,986,111	\$3,126,279		
Fixed Guideway Incentive:				
Fixed Guideway PM x Fixed Guideway PM = Operating Cost .....			\$0.00039964	\$0.00025057
- Commuter Rail Incentive Floor .....	\$228,941	\$143,545		
<b>Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program - Areas Under 200,000</b>				
Population .....			\$3.97701806	\$2.49358020
Population x Density .....			\$0.00198731	\$0.00124604
<b>Section 5311 Nonurbanized Area Formula Program</b>				
Areas Under 50,000				
Population .....			\$1.46340428	\$0.92061934
<b>Section 5309(m)(1)(A) Capital Program - Fixed Guideway Modernization</b>				
	<u>Tier 3</u>	<u>Tier 4</u>		
Legislatively Specified Areas:		All Areas:		
Revenue Vehicle Mile	\$0.02988368		\$0.13418473	
Route Mile	\$2,093.71		\$7,584.44	
Other Areas:				
Revenue Vehicle Mile	\$0.15951697			
Route Mile	\$4,438.10			