

**ESTIMATED IMPACTS OF THE 2010 CENSUS ON THE TEXAS
TRANSIT FUNDING FORMULA: SUMMARY REPORT ON FINDINGS**

by

Linda Cherrington
Research Scientist
Texas Transportation Institute

and

Suzie Edrington
Research Specialist
Texas Transportation Institute

Product 0-6199-P1

Project 0-6199

Project Title: Estimated Impact of the 2010 Census on the Texas Transit Funding Formula

Performed in cooperation with the
Texas Department of Transportation
Federal Transit Administration
and the
Federal Highway Administration

March 2010

Published: August 2010

TEXAS TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE
The Texas A&M University System
College Station, Texas 77843-3135

DISCLAIMER

This research was performed in cooperation with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official view or policies of the FTA, FHWA, or TxDOT. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was conducted in cooperation with TxDOT, FTA, and FHWA.

The authors would like to acknowledge the support and guidance of the TxDOT project director, Karen Dunlap, TxDOT Public Transportation Division (PTN); Eric Gleason, Director, TxDOT-PTN; and members of the Project Monitoring Committee: Kelly Kirkland, Linda Gonzalez, and Maureen McCoy of the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO). The authors appreciate the assistance of TxDOT Research and Technology Implementation (RTI) representatives Duncan Stewart and Sylvia Medina.

The authors would also like to thank Karl Eschbach, Director, and Michael Cline, Research Associate, Institute for Demographic and Socioeconomic Research (IDSER), University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) for the population projections by county in Texas, research information, and participation in research discussions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Acronyms	ix
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Report Purpose	1
Research Approach	1
Report Organization	2
Use of Terms	2
Chapter 2: Change in Population and Land Area by Transit District	3
Projected 2010 Population and Land Area by Transit District	3
Population for Limited Eligibility Transit Providers	9
New Urbanized Area Effect on Current Transit Districts	11
Scenarios To Reflect the Impacts of New Urbanized Areas	13
Summary	22
Chapter 3: Impact of Changes in 2010 Population on Funding Formula	23
Texas Transit Funding Formula	23
Results for Scenario A: New Small Urbanized Areas	27
Results for Scenario B: Mergers to Large Urbanized Areas	35
Results for Scenario C: Most Likely	39
Summary of Funding Analysis by Scenario	43
Chapter 4: Findings and Key Policy Implications	47
Research Findings	47
Policy Implications for Funding	48
References	55
Appendix A: Population and Land Area for Each County	59
Appendix B: Population for Each Urbanized Area	67
Appendix C: Needs Funding Methodology and Assumptions	69
Appendix D: Performance Funding Methodology and Assumptions	71
Appendix E: Scenario A Funding Results	77
Appendix F: Scenario B Funding Results	89
Appendix G: Scenario C Funding Results	99

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1. 2010 Percent Population Change by Rural Transit District.	5
Figure 2. 2010 Absolute Population Change by Rural Transit District.	6
Figure 3. Texas Urban Transit Districts.	8
Figure 4. Texas Transit Funding Formula.	24
Figure 5. Scenario A: Urban Transit District State Funding Impact if No New Funds.	30
Figure 6. Scenario A: Rural Transit District State Funding Impact if No New Funds.	34
Figure 7. Scenario A: Rural Transit District Federal Funding Impact if No New Funds.	34
Figure 8. Scenario B: Urban Transit District State Funding Impact if No New Funds.	38
Figure 9. Scenario C: Urban Transit District State Funding Impact if No New Funds.	42

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Example for Allocation of County Population to Transit Providers.	3
Table 2. Population and Land Area 2000 and 2010 for Existing Rural Transit Districts.	4
Table 3. Population 2000 and 2010 for Existing Urban Transit Districts.	7
Table 4. Rural Transit Districts Near Metropolitan Areas with Population Growth.	9
Table 5. Limited Eligibility Population as a Percent of Total Population.	10
Table 6. Projected 2010 Eligible Population for Limited Eligibility Providers.	11
Table 7. Scenario A: Population 2000 and 2010 for State Funded Urban Transit Districts.	15
Table 8. Scenario A: Population 2000 and 2010 for Rural Transit Districts.	16
Table 9. Scenario A: Land Area 2000 and 2010 for Rural Transit Districts (Sq Miles).	17
Table 10. Scenario B: Population 2000 and 2010 for State Funded Urban Transit Districts.	19
Table 11. Scenario C: Population 2000 and 2010 for State Funded Urban Transit Districts.	21
Table 12. Summary of Three Scenarios.	22
Table 13. Projected 2010 Limited Eligibility Provider Set-Aside Percent.	26
Table 14. Scenario A. Urban Transit State Funding Summary of Results.	28
Table 15. Rural Transit State Funding Summary of Results.	31
Table 16. Rural Transit <i>Federal</i> Funding Summary of Results.	32
Table 17. Scenario B. Urban Transit State Funding Summary of Results.	36
Table 18. Scenario C. Urban Transit State Funding Summary of Results.	40
Table 19. Urban Transit State Funding Differences from Current Funding.	44
Table 20. Rural Transit State and Federal Funding Differences from Current Funding.	45
Table 21. Population Increase 2000 to 2010 for Baseline and Each Scenario.	47
Table 22. Transit Funds per Capita for Baseline and Each Scenario.	49
Table 23. Required Funding for New Urbanized Areas.	49
Table 24. Additional Funding to Maintain Baseline per Capita.	50
Table 25. Total Funds Required Based on Projected 2010 Population.	50
Table 26. Funds Needed to Avoid Negative Impacts after All Reallocation.	51
Table 27. Percent Urban/Rural Population for State-Funded Transit Districts.	51

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AACOG	Alamo Area Council of Governments
ABI Abilene	
AMA Am	arillo
ARKT	Ark-Tex Council of Governments
ASBDC	Aspermont Small Business Development Center
BCAA	Bee Community Action Agency
BMT Beaum	ont
BRWN Brownsville	
BTD	Brazos Transit District
CACST	Community Act. Council of South Texas
CARTS	Capital Area Rural Transportation System
CCST	Community Council of Southwest Texas
CCSWT	Community Council of Southwest Texas
CLEB	Cleburne City of
CLEBURB	Cleburne Urbanized Area
COLCO	Collin County Committee on Aging
CONROE Conroe	
CONVA	Concho Valley Council of Governments
CS Community	Services, Inc.
CS-BRY College	Station-Bryan
CTRTD	Central Texas Rural Transit District
CVT	Colorado Valley Transit
DART	Dallas Area Rapid Transit
DCTA	Denton County Transportation Authority
DR	Del Rio, City of
EPC	El Paso, County of
ETCOG	East Texas Council of Governments
FBC	Fort Bend County
GALV Galveston	
GCC	Gulf Coast Center
GCRPC	Golden Crescent Regional Planning Commission
GEORGE Georgetown	
HCTD	Hill Country Transit District
HRL Harlingen	
HTCG	Heart of Texas Council of Governments
KART	Kaufman Area Rural Transportation
KCHS	Kleberg County Human Services
KIL Killeen	
LAR Laredo	
LEP	Limited Eligibility Provider
LJ-ANG Lake	Jackson-Angleton
LNG Longview	
LRGVDC	Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council
LUB Lubbock	

MCA McAllen	
MCKIN McKinney	
METRO	Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County (Houston)
MID-ODS Midland-Odessa	
MTED	Mesquite Transportation for the Elderly and Disabled
NB New	Braunfels
NETS	Northeast Transportation Services
PA Port	Arthur
PCS	Panhandle Community Services
PTN	TxDOT Public Transportation Division
PTS	Public Transit Services
REAL	Rural Economic Assist. League
RPMC	Rolling Plains Management Corp.
SANG San	Angelo
SCRPT	Senior Center Resources and Public Transit Inc.
SETRPC	South East Texas RPC
SHR Sherm	an
SM San	Marcos
SPAN	Services Program for Aging Needs
SPCAA	South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.
SPI	South Padre Island, Town of
TAPS	Texoma Area Paratransit System
The T	Fort Worth Transportation Authority
TMP Tem	ple
TTI	Texas Transportation Institute
TTS	The Transit System, Inc.
TWOO The	Woodlands
TXA Texarkana	
TXC Texas	City
TxDOT Texas	Department of Transportation
TYL Tyler	
VIA	San Antonio Via Metropolitan Transit
VIC Victoria	
WACO Waco	
WEBB	Webb Co. Community Action Agency
WF W	ichita Falls
WTO West	Texas Opportunities

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the research for Project 0-6199, *Estimated Impact of the 2010 Census on the Texas Transit Funding Formula*, is to project population growth for the 2010 Census in urbanized and non-urbanized areas in Texas and to identify the impacts on funding allocations using the Texas Transit Funding Formula. This research is a collaborative effort between the Institute for Demographic and Socioeconomic Research (IDSER) at the University of Texas at San Antonio and Texas Transportation Institute (TTI), part of The Texas A&M University System.

Researchers completed four major tasks prior to this report. The findings of the previous research are documented in technical memoranda that serve as the background and source of data for this report. Technical Memorandum #1, *Assessment of Policies Impacting Public Transportation Funding*, reviews legislative and administrative policies and practices for funding public transportation in Texas and discusses the policies that may be affected by the results of the decennial census in 2010. Technical Memorandum #2, *Impact of Census 2010 on Population Factors Affecting Apportionment of FTA Funds and on the Designation and Population of Urbanized Areas in Texas*, provides a summary of the projected changes in the number of urbanized areas for Texas as well as the projected population for each county and urbanized area for the 2010 Census. Technical Memorandum #3, *Assessment of the Impact of Demographic Trends on Public Transportation in Texas*, discusses changes in the populations for elderly and persons with disabilities by transit districts in Texas. Technical Memorandum #4: *Review of Impacts of Changes in Census Data Reporting* provides an overview of the American Community Survey and its relevance to transit funding.

REPORT PURPOSE

The purpose of this report, *Estimated Impact of the 2010 Census on the Texas Transit Funding Formula: Summary Report on Findings*, is to document the impact of the projections for the 2010 Census on federal and state funding for rural transit districts and the impact on state funding for eligible urban transit districts. [Appendices A](#) and [B](#) document the IDSER projections of 2010 population and land area for each county and urbanized area (from Technical Memorandum #2).

RESEARCH APPROACH

The research approach for this task relies on the population and land area projections by county and urbanized area by IDSER (see Technical Memorandum #2). Researchers identified the changes in population and land area by transit district for existing rural and urban transit districts. Based upon the allocation of population and land area by transit district, researchers identified how new urbanized areas will affect current transit districts. Researchers developed three population growth scenarios to reflect the possible impacts of new urbanized areas. Researchers applied each of the population growth scenarios to the current Texas transit funding formula to identify the impacts on funding by transit provider. Based up on the outcomes of the funding analysis, researchers documented findings and key policy implications for application of the Texas transit funding formula based on projected changes in population and land area.

REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report consists of four chapters. This introduction is the first chapter. [Chapter 2](#) documents the change in population and land area by transit district for existing rural and urban transit districts; identifies how new urbanized areas will affect current rural transit districts; and identifies the development of three population scenarios to reflect the possible impacts of new urbanized areas. [Chapter 3](#) applies each of the population scenarios to the current Texas transit funding formula to identify the impacts on funding by transit provider. [Chapter 4](#) provides discussion of the findings and key policy implications based on the information provided in the previous chapters. The Appendices to this report include information to support the research methodology.

USE OF TERMS

Public transportation is specifically defined in Texas statute to mean “mass transportation of passengers and their hand-carried packages or baggage on a regular and continuing basis by means of surface, fixed guideway, or underground transportation or transit, other than aircraft, taxicab, ambulance, or emergency vehicle” (*1*). The terms “public transportation” and “transit” are used interchangeably throughout this report. This report specifically focuses on rural and urban transit districts, as defined below.

The term transit district refers to the urban and rural transit providers that are funded by the state. Rural transit districts are defined in Texas statute to mean “a political subdivision of this state that provides and coordinates rural public transportation in its territory.” Rural public transportation serves non-urbanized areas that provide public transportation to communities with populations of less than 50,000. An urban transit district means a local governmental body or political subdivision of this state that operates a public transportation system in an urbanized area with a population of more than 50,000 but less than 200,000. The term also applies to any urban transportation provider that received public transportation money through TxDOT as of September 1, 1994 (prior to the 2000 Census) (*1*).

CHAPTER 2: CHANGE IN POPULATION AND LAND AREA BY TRANSIT DISTRICT

The purpose of this chapter is to document the projected 2010 change in population and land area by transit district for rural transit districts and urban transit districts that are eligible for state funding. The chapter also identifies how new urbanized areas in 2010 will affect current transit districts and develops three scenarios to reflect the possible impacts of new urbanized areas on the allocation of transit funding.

PROJECTED 2010 POPULATION AND LAND AREA BY TRANSIT DISTRICT

As documented in Technical Memorandum #2, IDSER projected 2010 population for each county in Texas. Researchers summarized the Census 2000 and 2010 projections by county as [Appendix A](#) and by urbanized area as [Appendix B](#). Researchers used county and urbanized area data from the 2000 Census and the 2010 projections by IDSER to assign county population and land area to each Texas transit district. [Table 1](#) provides an example of the assignment process for Wichita County for the 2010 Census projection. Wichita County is projected to have a population of 127,695 in 2010. Researchers assigned the Wichita Falls urbanized area 2010 population (as provided by IDSER) to the Wichita Falls Transit System (state funded urban transit district) and the remaining non-urbanized area population to Rolling Plains Management Corporation (rural transit district). Researchers used this same process to assign land area projections for each county.

Table 1. Example for Allocation of County Population to Transit Providers.

County	Transit Provider	Projected 2010 County Population	Urbanized			Non-Urbanized
			Large Urbanized Area	State Funded Urban Transit District	State Funded Limited Eligibility Population	State Funded Rural Transit District
Wichita	Wichita Falls Transit System (Urban)	127,695		96,194		
	Rolling Plains Management Corporation - Sharp Lines (Rural)					31,501

Researchers conducted the county by county assignment of population until a picture of the impact of population changes on *existing* transit districts was complete. [Table 2](#) provides the results of the population and land area change by *existing* rural transit district. [Figure 1](#) illustrates the projected percent change in population by existing rural transit district, and [Figure 2](#) illustrates the projected absolute change in population by existing rural transit district. [Table 2](#) shows that many rural transit districts have a loss in land area. Urbanized areas are projected to expand in geographic size and therefore reduce the surrounding rural area. For example, the El Paso County rural transit district is expected to decrease in land area by 28 square miles as a result of the growth in the El Paso urbanized area. Despite the loss of the urbanized land area, the majority of rural areas continue to experience net population growth.

Table 2. Population and Land Area 2000 and 2010 for Existing Rural Transit Districts.
Sorted by Percent Population Change

Rural Transit Districts	Population				Land Area (Sq. Miles)			
	2000	2010	Change	Percent	2000	2010	Change	Percent
Rural Totals	5,762,803	6,766,971	1,004,168	17%	251,954	251,583	(371) 0.	1%
El Paso, County of	31,157	59,174	28,017	90%	809	781	(28)	-3.5%
Collin County COA	56,516	100,216	43,700	77%	689	650	(39)	-5.7%
Webb Co. CAA	17,531	30,388	12,857	73%	3,314	3,313	(2)	-0.1%
Kaufman Area RT	82,737	132,068	49,331	60%	896	886	(10)	-1.1%
SPAN	62,453	99,474	37,021	59%	748	711	(37)	-5.0%
CARTS	427,869	633,043	205,174	48%	7,192	7,137	(55)	-0.8%
Fort Bend County	37,891	50,701	12,810	34%	747	705	(43)	-5.7%
Transit System Inc., The	47,909	63,252	15,343	32%	609	609	-	0.0%
Alamo Area COG	392,995	501,680	108,685	28%	10,130	10,121	(9)	-0.1%
Cleburne City of	103,238	130,161	26,923	26%	710	707	(3)	-0.4%
Community Services, Inc.	135,414	170,698	35,284	26%	1,924	1,921	(3)	-0.2%
Public Transit Services	117,544	141,657	24,113	21%	2,765	2,763	(2)	-0.1%
Community Act. CST	84,180	100,195	16,015	19%	5,149	5,149	-	0.0%
LRGV DC	122,660	144,271	21,611	18%	2,641	2,614	(27)	-1.0%
Snr Ctr Res. & Public Tr.	76,596	89,977	13,381	17%	841	841	-	0.0%
Brazos Transit District	798,164	928,675	130,511	16%	16,910	16,865	(45)	-0.3%
Colorado Valley Transit	117,124	135,438	18,314	16%	3,220	3,220	(0)	0.0%
Hill Country Transit Dist.	155,387	179,046	23,659	15%	8,321	8,313	(7)	-0.1%
Texoma Area Para. Syst.	200,664	226,167	25,503	13%	5,601	5,599	(2)	0.0%
Del Rio, City of	44,856	50,067	5,211	12%	3,170	3,170	-	0.0%
Gulf Coast Center	102,725	114,403	11,678	11%	1,570	1,545	(25)	-1.6%
CC of Southwest Texas	109,525	120,725	11,200	10%	11,138	11,138	-	0.0%
East Texas COG	565,616	624,278	58,662	10%	9,613	9,607	(6)	-0.1%
Bee Community AA	75,844	82,047	6,203	8%	4,051	4,051	-	0.0%
South Padre Island	2,422	2,627	205	8%	2	2	-	0.0%
Heart of Texas COG	168,338	180,734	12,396	7%	5,478	5,473	(5)	-0.1%
Golden Crescent RPC	160,333	169,456	9,123	6%	7,088	7,087	(1)	0.0%
Central Texas Rural TD	184,925	195,080	10,155	5%	10,693	10,690	(3)	0.0%
Panhandle Comm. Serv.	223,550	235,286	11,736	5%	25,749	25,744	(4)	0.0%
REAL	96,923	102,017	5,094	5%	2,491	2,491	(0)	0.0%
Ark-Tex COG	221,701	230,739	9,038	4%	5,761	5,761	(1)	0.0%
Concho Valley COG	56,505	58,541	2,036	4%	15,309	15,309	(1)	0.0%
Kleberg County HS	31,963	32,460	497	2%	2,328	2,328	-	0.0%
South Plains CAA	201,705	206,432	4,727	2%	15,342	15,337	(5)	0.0%
West Texas Opportunities	190,752	195,180	4,428	2%	44,056	44,053	(3)	0.0%
Rolling Plains MC.	86,084	85,719	(365)	0%	6,553	6,553	(0)	0.0%
Aspermont SBDC	39,877	39,478	(399)	0%	6,317	6,317	-	0.0%
South East Texas RPC	131,130	125,421	(5,709)	-4%	2,027	2,023	(3)	-0.2%




Figure 1. 2010 Percent Population Change by Rural Transit District.




Figure 2. 2010 Absolute Population Change by Rural Transit District.

Table 3 provides the change in population and land area for each *existing* urban transit district that is eligible to receive state funding. The transit districts with a population over 200,000 are identified by a note because of the significance for funding allocation (see discussion in Chapter 3). The population projections are not precise. A population change of ± 2.5 percent for any urbanized area is assumed to reflect *no change in population* (0%). Figure 3 is a map of metropolitan transit authorities and state funded urban transit districts in Texas.

Table 3. Population 2000 and 2010 for Existing Urban Transit Districts.


Population by State Funded Urban Transit District Sorted by Percent Population Change					
	2000	Projected 2010 Change		Percent	Notes
Urban Totals 3,	356,007 4,	094,827 73	8,820	22%	
McKinney	54,525	145,824	91,299	167%	
The Woodlands	89,445	180,880	91,435	102%	
McAllen	523,144	739,217	216,073	41%	>200,000
Brownsville	165,776	214,428	48,652	29%	>200,000
Laredo	175,586	227,202	51,616	29%	>200,000
Tyler	101,494	125,471	23,977	24%	
Temple	71,937	86,175	14,238	20%	
Harlingen	110,770	132,033	21,263	19%	
Killeen	167,976	200,475	32,499	19%	>200,000
College Station-Bryan	132,500	151,722	19,222	15%	
Texas City	96,417	110,875	14,458	15%	
Amarillo	179,312	201,289	21,977	12%	>200,000
Midland – Odessa	210,616	235,546	24,930	12%	>200,000
Lubbock	202,225	223,853	21,628	11%	>200,000
Sherman	56,168	62,140	5,972	11%	
Texarkana	48,767	53,987	5,220	11%	
Waco	153,198	170,155	16,957	11%	
Lake Jackson-Angleton	73,416	78,789	5,373	7%	
Longview	78,070	83,225	5,155	7%	
Victoria	61,529	65,378	3,849	6%	
Abilene	107,041	112,253	5,212	5%	
Beaumont	139,304	140,223	919	0%	
Port Arthur	114,656	114,274	(382)	0%	
San Angelo	87,969	87,710	(259)	0%	
Galveston (a)	54,770	54,240	(530)	0%	
Wichita Falls	99,396	97,463	(1,933)	0%	

(a) Estimate based on trends before Hurricane Ike

CITIES AND COUNTIES SERVED BY PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS



Geographic Coverage of Public Transportation



- ★ Cities served by metropolitan transit authorities
- Cities served by urban transit systems
- Counties served by rural or specialized (elderly & persons with disabilities) transit systems
- Counties not served

Figure 3. Texas Urban Transit Districts.

The data show significant population growth in the rural transit districts surrounding major metropolitan areas and along the Texas border with Mexico. Rural areas surrounding many of the metropolitan areas are growing at a rate faster than the metropolitan area. Table 4 shows the rural transit districts that are growing faster than the immediate surrounding metropolitan area.

Table 4. Rural Transit Districts Near Metropolitan Areas with Population Growth.

Urbanized Area (UZA) and Rural Transit District	Census 2000	Projected 2010 Change		Percent
<u>Dallas - Ft Worth – Arlington UZA</u>	<u>4,145,659</u>	<u>5,115,000</u>	<u>969,341</u>	23 %
Collin County Committee on Aging	56,516	100,216	43,700	77%
Kaufman Area Rural Transit	82,737	132,068	49,331	60%
Cleburne, City of	103,238	130,161	26,923	26%
Community Services Incorporated	135,414	170,698	35,284	26%
<u>Laredo UZA</u>	<u>175,586</u>	<u>227,000</u>	<u>51,414</u>	29 %
Webb Community Action Assoc.	17,531	30,388	12,857	73%
<u>El Paso UZA</u>	<u>648,465</u>	<u>714,000</u>	<u>65,535</u>	10 %
El Paso County	31,157	59,174	28,017	90%
<u>Houston UZA</u>	<u>3,822,509</u>	<u>4,831,000</u>	<u>1,008,491</u>	26 %
Fort Bend County	37,891	50,701	12,810	34%
<u>Austin UZA</u>	<u>901,920</u>	<u>1,183,000</u>	<u>281,080</u>	31 %
Capital Area Rural Transp. Sys.	427,869	633,043	205,174	48%
<u>San Antonio UZA</u>	<u>1,327,554</u>	<u>1,567,000</u>	<u>239,446</u>	18 %
Alamo Area COG	392,995	501,680	108,685	28%

POPULATION FOR LIMITED ELIGIBILITY TRANSIT PROVIDERS

There are four transit providers in Texas located in the Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington urbanized area that are designated as “limited eligibility providers”—Arlington, Northeast Transportation Services (NETS), Grand Prairie, and Mesquite. These transit providers restrict transit eligibility to seniors and persons with disabilities. Limited eligibility providers are grandfathered to be funded by the state in Texas Transportation Code, Chapter 456 under § 456.006 (b) entitled “Limitations Use of Funds.” This statute calls out limits and conditions on “designated recipients not included in a transit authority but located in an urbanized area that includes one or more transit authorities and that received state transit funding during the biennium ending August 31, 1997” [Arlington, NETS, Grand Prairie, Mesquite].

The Texas transit funding formula allocates urban transit funds to limited eligibility transit providers by setting aside a portion of urban funds. The set aside amount is based on the populations of seniors and persons with disabilities in these four service areas, as compared to

the total urban population in the urban areas eligible for state funds for transit. Population of seniors is defined as population age 65 and older as reported by the U.S. Census. A person with a disability is an individual ages 5 to 64 with a U.S. Census defined disability (2).

TxDOT currently sets aside 6.58 percent of urban funds for limited eligibility providers based on the Census 2000 eligible population calculation. There are two issues that suggest this percent estimate is not correct. Researchers discovered that when the Texas transit funding formula was first applied for limited eligibility providers (in 2006) the eligible population for persons with disabilities was based on a Census 2000 report that tallies *disabilities* rather than *persons with disabilities*. This creates an inflated number to represent the eligible population served by limited eligibility providers.

Another issue is the U.S. Census has determined that disabilities were likely over-reported in Census 2000 due to possible misinterpretation of written instructions in the mail survey. As a result, the Census changed the order in which questions about disabilities were asked and added additional instructions. The American Community Survey (ACS) for 2006–2008 now captures this change for larger populations (65,000 and over). The ACS made additional changes in the data collection instrument to document persons with disabilities in 2008. Preliminary indications are that the number of persons with disabilities as of ACS 2010 data may be a lower than Census 2000. [Chapter 4](#) discusses the impact of this possibility.

ACS data for age is not yet reported at a level of detail to make it possible to estimate 2010 percent of persons age 65 or older for each of the cities served by NETS. These data will be available with ACS 5-year data for 2005–2010 when published.

For purposes of this report, researchers revised the source of the data to estimate the eligible population for limited eligibility providers. This research assumes the ACS 2006 through 2008 populations for *persons with disabilities* ages 5 to 64, and Census 2000 data for persons age 65 and older.

For projected 2010 population scenarios developed in this report, researchers used the revised source data to first calculate the percent of eligible population to total population for each of the limited eligibility providers (see [Table 5](#)).

Table 5. Limited Eligibility Population as a Percent of Total Population.

Provider	Original Calculation	Revised Calculation		
		Persons Age 65 and older (Census 2000)	Persons with Disabilities Age 5-64 (ACS 2006-2008)	Revised Eligible Population
Arlington	25.9%	7.17% 12	.09%	19.3%
Grand Prairie	29.8%	7.11% 14	.09%	21.2%
Mesquite	27.5%	7.95% 12	.13%	20.1%
NETS	24.8%	9.66% 10	.28%	19.9%

Using IDSER projected 2010 populations for the cities served by the four limited eligibility transit providers, researchers applied the revised eligible population percent to project the 2010 eligible population as shown in [Table 6](#).

Table 6. Projected 2010 Eligible Population for Limited Eligibility Providers.

Limited Eligibility Providers	2000 Total Population	2000 Eligible Population	Projected 2010 Total Population	Projected Percent Eligible Population	Projected 2010 Eligible Population
Arlington 3	35,164	86,396	387,086	19.3	74,561
Grand Prairie	126,889	37,995	154,157	21.2	32,673
Mesquite 1	23,800	34,209	136,565	20.1	27,424
NETS 3	13,030	77,713	341,014	19.9	68,002
Total Limited Eligibility Providers	898,883	236,313	1,018,822	19.9	202,660

NEW URBANIZED AREA EFFECT ON CURRENT TRANSIT DISTRICTS

After the initial assignment of population and land area to existing transit districts, researchers reviewed the implications of changes in population in high growth areas for transit providers. Researchers conducted an initial screening for areas near urbanized thresholds of 50,000 (small urbanized areas), 200,000 (large urbanized areas), and 1 million (very large urbanized areas). New urbanized areas may have a significant impact on the application of the state transit funding formula. The impacts are different depending on if areas of high population growth become new small urbanized areas or if the areas become part of the existing metropolitan areas:

- **new small urbanized areas over 50,000 in population:**
 - more eligible state funded urban transit districts,
 - decreased population for the rural transit districts;
- **rapidly urbanizing rural areas merge into large urbanized areas:**
 - eligible state funded urban transit districts merge into a large urbanized areas that are not eligible for state funding, and
 - decreased population and land area for the rural transit districts.

IDSER identified areas that are most likely to reach the 50,000 population threshold and become a new urbanized area or merge into a nearby large urbanized area. These areas include:

- Cleburne,
- Conroe,
- Georgetown,
- New Braunfels, and
- San Marcos-Kyle.

IDSER also identified three existing small urbanized areas that may merge in total or in part into a nearby large urbanized area. These areas include:

- McKinney,
- The Woodlands, and
- Texas City-La Marque.

Cleburne

The Cleburne area is expected to grow from Census 2000 population of 36,863 to 52,000 in 2010. IDSER projects the Cleburne population will exceed the 50,000 threshold and become a new small urbanized area. There is a possibility that all or parts of the Cleburne urban area could merge with Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington (DFWA) via a jump connection to Burleson.

Conroe

The Conroe area is expected to grow from Census 2000 population of 41,402 to 58,000 in 2010. IDSER projects most likely Conroe will become a new small urbanized area. Concentrations of population outside of the main Conroe area close to The Woodlands were considered part of the Conroe Urban Cluster in 2000 via a jump connection along Interstate Highway 45 (I-45). These areas are separated by a flood plain that restricts the connections between the areas by a jump or hop connection. If the current hop or jump connection criteria continue, then Conroe and The Woodlands areas will remain separate with Conroe meeting the 50,000 population threshold.

Georgetown

The Georgetown area is expected to grow from Census 2000 population of 32,763 to 59,000 in 2010. The distance between Georgetown and Austin is over 2.5 miles and the gap is projected to remain assuming the urban area criteria remain the same as 2000. IDSER projects that most likely these two areas will remain separate and Georgetown will become a new small urbanized area.

New Braunfels

The New Braunfels area population is expected to grow from Census 2000 population of 39,709 to 62,000 in 2010. The potential for merger with San Antonio is unlikely due to the distance between the two urban areas. IDSER projects that most likely New Braunfels will remain separate from San Antonio and become a new small urbanized area.

San Marcos

The San Marcos-Kyle population is expected to grow from Census 2000 of 47,333 to 79,000 in 2010. The distance between the Census 2000 designated urban areas of San Marcos-Kyle and Austin is over five miles. The possibility of San Marcos-Kyle being connected to Austin could only occur through a series of contiguous blocks of 500 or more persons per square miles. IDSER projects that most likely San Marcos-Kyle will remain separate from Austin and become a new small urbanized area.

McKinney

The McKinney area population is expected to grow from the Census 2000 population of 54,525 to 147,000 in 2010. McKinney could link to DFWA if the development to the west and south of McKinney consists of more than a hop, jump, or point-to-point connection. Otherwise if the two areas connect as a result of a hop, jump, or point-to-point connection, then these areas would remain separate. IDSER makes the projection that McKinney will most likely merge with DFWA.

The Woodlands

The Woodlands area population is expected to grow from Census 2000 population of 89,445 to 183,000 in 2010. In Census 2000, The Woodlands and Houston were considered two urbanized areas because the urbanized areas were separated by the flood plain along Spring Creek and the only connection between the two was through a point-to-point connection. In 2010, The U.S. Census Bureau may use ancillary information including employment and land use data to connect these two areas rather than limiting the separation by the flood plain between the two areas. If these data are used, then The Woodlands and Houston could merge. IDSER projects that most likely The Woodlands will not merge with Houston in 2010.

Texas City

The Texas City-La Marque area population is expected to grow from Census 2000 population of 96,417 to 111,000 in 2010. In Census 2000 Texas City-La Marque was split from Houston by a point-to-point connection and consisted of two population cores (cities of Dickinson and Santa Fe) connected via a point-to-point connection within the Texas City-La Marque urbanized area. Residential development between the area of Houston and Texas City-La Marque has occurred since 2000. IDSER projects that most likely the Dickinson portion of Texas City-La Marque will merge with Houston.

SCENARIOS TO REFLECT THE IMPACTS OF NEW URBANIZED AREAS

Based on documentation provided by IDSER, researchers identified two scenarios that are significant to transit funding:

- Scenario A. New Small Urbanized Areas and
- Scenario B. Mergers to Large Urbanized Areas.

Both of the scenarios are defined to reflect a distinction in the probable impact on the Texas transit funding formula. Scenario A assumes the rapidly urbanizing rural areas become small urbanized areas, eligible for state urban funds. Scenario B assumes the rapidly urbanizing rural areas will become part of large urbanized areas, no longer eligible for state transit funding. In the case of scenarios, population and land area that were rural after Census 2000 will be urbanized in 2010. The impact on rural population and land area is the same for both scenarios.

Scenario A

For Scenario A, researchers estimated the maximum number of possible state funded urban transit districts based on projected new urbanized areas in 2010 as provided by IDSER. Scenario A includes the following possible new urban transit districts:

- Cleburne (affects Cleburne Rural Transit District),
- Conroe (affects Brazos Rural Transit District),
- Georgetown (affects Capital Area Rural Transportation System),
- New Braunfels (affects Alamo Area Council of Governments), and
- San Marcos-Kyle (affects Capital Area Rural Transportation System).

[Table 7](#) documents 2000 and 2010 population for urbanized transit districts, including five new small urbanized areas. The population projections are not precise. A population change of ± 2.5 percent for any urbanized transit district is assumed to reflect *no change in population* (0 percent).

[Table 8](#) documents 2000 and 2010 population for rural transit districts after the new urbanized areas are recognized. [Table 9](#) provides the same information as [Table 8](#) but for the land area (rather than population) for rural transit districts. Many rural transit districts have a decrease in land area as portions of the rural areas become urbanized. However, most rural transit districts that have a decrease in land area in [Table 9](#) still show an increase in population in [Table 8](#). This is because the population increase in the remaining rural area is greater than the population in the areas that are reclassified as urbanized in Scenario A. There is a net increase in population in the (smaller) rural area.

Table 7. Scenario A: Population 2000 and 2010 for State Funded Urban Transit Districts.

State Funded Urban System	2000	Projected		Percent	Notes
		2010	Change		
Current Urban Transit Districts:					
Abilene 10	7,041	112,253	5,212	5	
Amarillo 1	79,312	201,289	21,977	12	>200,000
Beaumont 1	39,304	140,223	919	0	
Brownsville 1	65,776	214,428	48,652	29	>200,000
College Station-Bryan	132,500	151,722	19,222	15	
Galveston (a) 5	4,770	54,240	(530)	0	
Harlingen 1	10,770	132,033	21,263	19	
Killeen 1	67,976	200,475	32,499	19	>200,000
Laredo 1	75,586	227,202	51,616	29	>200,000
Lake Jackson-Angleton	73,416	78,789	5,373	7	
Longview 7	8,070	83,225	5,155	7	
Lubbock 2	02,225	223,853	21,628	11	>200,000
McAllen 5	23,144	739,217	216,073	41	>200,000
McKinney 5	4,525	145,824	91,299	167	
Midland-Odessa 2	10,616	235,546	24,930	12	>200,000
Port Arthur	114,656	114,274	(382)	0	
San Angelo	87,969	87,710	(259)	0	
Sherman 5	6,168	62,140	5,972	11	
Temple 7	1,937	86,175	14,238	20	
The Woodlands	89,445	180,880	91,435	102	
Texarkana 4	8,767	53,987	5,220	11	
Texas City	96,417	110,875	14,458	15	
Tyler 1	01,494	125,471	23,977	24	
Victoria 6	1,529	65,378	3,849	6	
Waco 1	53,198	170,155	16,957	11	
Wichita Falls	99,396	97,463	(1,933)	0	
State Funded Urban Totals	3,356,007	4,094,827	738,820	22	
Possible New Urban Transit Districts:					
Cleburne -		51,866	51,866	100	
Conroe -		58,417	58,417	100	
Georgetown -		58,851	58,851	100	
New Braunfels	-	62,419	62,419	100	
San Marcos-Kyle	-	79,748	79,748	100	
Revised State Funded Urban Totals	3,356,007	4,406,128	1,050,121	31	
Limited Eligibility Providers					
Arlington 8	6,396	74,561			
Grand Prairie	37,995	32,673			
Mesquite 3	4,209	27,424			
NETS 7	7,713	68,002			
Total Limited Eligibility	236,313	202,660	(33,653)	(14)	>200,000
Total Urban and Limited Eligibility	3,592,320	4,608,788	1,016,468	28	

(a) Estimate based on trends before Hurricane Ike

Table 8. Scenario A: Population 2000 and 2010 for Rural Transit Districts.

Current Rural Transit District	2000	Projected 2010	Change	Percent	Impacted by New UZA
Alamo Area COG	392,995	439,261	46,266	12%	New Braunfels
Ark-Tex COG	221,701	230,739	9,038	4%	
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	39,877	39,478	(399)	0%	Conroe
Bee Community Action Agency	75,844	82,047	6,203	8%	
Brazos Transit District	798,164	870,258	72,094	9%	San Marcos-Kyle and Georgetown
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	427,869	494,444	66,575	16%	
Central Texas Rural Transit District	184,925	195,080	10,155	5%	City of Cleburne
Cleburne City of	103,238	78,295	(24,943)	-24%	
Collin County Committee on Aging	56,516	100,216	43,700	77%	
Colorado Valley Transit	117,124	135,438	18,314	16%	
Community Act. Council of South Texas	84,180	100,195	16,015	19%	
Community Council of Southwest Texas	109,525	120,725	11,200	10%	
Community Services, Inc.	135,414	170,698	35,284	26%	
Concho Valley COG	56,505	58,541	2,036	4%	
Del Rio, City of	44,856	50,067	5,211	12%	
East Texas COG	565,616	624,278	58,662	10%	
El Paso, County of	31,157	59,174	28,017	90%	
Fort Bend County	37,891	50,701	12,810	34%	
Golden Crescent RPC	160,333	169,456	9,123	6%	
Gulf Coast Center	102,725	114,403	11,678	11%	
Heart of Texas COG	168,338	180,734	12,396	7%	
Hill Country Transit District	155,387	179,046	23,659	15%	
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	82,737	132,068	49,331	60%	
Kleberg County Human Services	31,963	32,460	497	2%	
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	122,660	144,271	21,611	18%	
Panhandle Community Services	223,550	235,286	11,736	5%	
Public Transit Services	117,544	141,657	24,113	21%	
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	86,084	85,719	(365)	0%	
Rural Economic Assist. League	96,923	102,017	5,094	5%	
Services Program for Aging Needs	62,453	99,474	37,021	59%	
Snr. Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	76,596	89,977	13,381	17%	
South East Texas RPC	131,130	125,421	(5,709)	-4%	
South Padre Island, Town of	2,422	2,627	205	8%	
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	201,705	206,432	4,727	2%	
Texoma Area Paratransit System	200,664	226,167	25,503	13%	
Transit System Inc., The	47,909	63,252	15,343	32%	
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	17,531	30,388	12,857	73%	
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	190,752	195,180	4,428	2%	
Rural Totals	5,762,803	6,455,670	692,867	12%	

Table 9. Scenario A: Land Area 2000 and 2010 for Rural Transit Districts (Sq Miles).

Current Rural Transit District	2000	Projected 2010	Change	Percent	Impacted by New/Merged or Expanded UZA
Alamo Area COG	10,130	10,090	(40)	-0.4%	SA, New Braunfels
Ark-Tex COG	5,761	5,761	(1)	0.0%	Texarkana
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	6,317	6,317	-	0.0%	
Bee Community Action Agency	4,051	4,051	-	0.0%	
Brazos Transit District	16,910	16,835	(75)	-0.4%	CS-B, TWO, Conroe
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	7,192	7,082	(110)	-1.5%	Austin, Georgetown San Marcos-Kyle
Central Texas Rural Transit District	10,693	10,690	(3)	0.0%	Abilene
Cleburne City of	710	677	(33)	-4.6%	Cleburne
Collin County Committee on Aging	689	650	(39)	-5.7%	McKinney
Colorado Valley Transit	3,220	3,220	(0)	0.0%	
Community Act. Council of South Texas	5,149	5,149	-	0.0%	
Community Council of Southwest Texas	11,138	11,138	-	0.0%	
Community Services, Inc.	1,924	1,921	(3)	-0.2%	DFWA
Concho Valley COG	15,309	15,309	(1)	0.0%	San Angelo
Del Rio, City of	3,170	3,170	-	0.0%	
East Texas COG	9,613	9,607	(6)	-0.1%	Tyler, Longview
El Paso, County of	809	781	(28)	-3.5%	El Paso
Fort Bend County	747	705	(43)	-5.7%	Houston
Golden Crescent RPC	7,088	7,087	(1)	0.0%	Victoria
Gulf Coast Center	1,570	1,545	(25)	-1.6%	Texas City, LJ-A
Heart of Texas COG	5,478	5,473	(5)	-0.1%	Waco
Hill Country Transit District	8,321	8,313	(7)	-0.1%	Killeen, Temple
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	896	886	(10)	-1.1%	DFWA
Kleberg County Human Services	2,328	2,328	-	0.0%	
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	2,641	2,614	(27)	-1.0%	McAllen, Hgn Brownsville
Panhandle Community Services	25,749	25,744	(4)	0.0%	Amarillo
Public Transit Services	2,765	2,763	(2)	-0.1%	DFWA
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	6,553	6,553	(0)	0.0%	
Rural Economic Assist. League	2,491	2,491	(0)	0.0%	
Services Program for Aging Needs	748	711	(37)	-5.0%	Denton-Lewisville
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	841	841	-	0.0%	
South East Texas RPC	2,027	2,023	(3)	-0.2%	Beaumont
South Padre Island, Town of	2	2	-	0.0%	
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	15,342	15,337	(5)	0.0%	Lubbock
Texoma Area Paratransit System	5,601	5,599	(2)	0.0%	Sherman-Denison
Transit System Inc., The	609	609	-	0.0%	
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	3,314	3,313	(2)	-0.1%	Laredo
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	44,056	44,053	(3)	0.0%	Midland-Odessa
Rural Totals	251,954	251,437	(516)	-0.2%	

With the addition of five new urban transit districts in Scenario A, the total number of state funded urban transit districts increases from 30 current to 35. Four additional state funded urban transit districts are estimated to increase in population to more than 200,000, increasing the number of large urban areas eligible for state funding, as shown in [Table 7](#).

In Scenario A, the number of *rural* transit districts remains at 38. The addition of the five new state funded urban transit districts in Scenario A does not affect the total number of rural transit districts but does reduce the population in the rural transit districts affected. As shown in [Table 8](#), three of four rural transit districts that lose some population due to the new small urbanized areas (Alamo Area Council of Governments, Capital Area Rural Transportation System, and Brazos Transit District) are projected to experience population growth despite the loss of an urbanized area. A portion of Cleburne County will remain as a rural area even after the creation of a new Cleburne urbanized area; the overall population and land area for rural Cleburne County is significantly smaller due to the new urban transit district. [Table 9](#) documents land area loss for several rural transit districts (in addition to the four rural transit districts affected by the new urbanized areas). This loss of land area is due to the fact that IDSER projects that urbanized areas will grow (land area and population) into the rural transit district boundaries. For example, the urbanized area for the City of El Paso is expected to increase by 28 square miles into the El Paso County rural transit district.

Scenario B

For Scenario B, researchers assumed the maximum number of possible mergers of transit districts into large urbanized areas based on the information provided by IDSER. Scenario B includes the following potential mergers that impact state funded urban and rural transit districts:

- **Merged areas that are currently state funded urban transit districts:**
 - The Woodlands with Houston,
 - McKinney with DFWA,
 - Partial Texas City (Dickinson) with Houston;

- **Merged areas that are currently a part of rural transit districts:**
 - Cleburne with DFWA,
 - Conroe with The Woodlands and Houston,
 - Georgetown with Austin,
 - New Braunfels with San Antonio, and
 - San Marcos with Austin.

[Table 10](#) provides the outcome of Scenario B projected population for state funded urban transit districts. The change in rural transit districts is the same across all scenarios (see [Table 8](#) and [Table 9](#) for rural transit districts).

Table 10. Scenario B: Population 2000 and 2010 for State Funded Urban Transit Districts.

State Funded Urban System	2000	Projected 2010 Change		Percent	Impacted by Merger to Large UZA
Abilene 10	7,041	112,253	5,212	5	
Amarillo 1	79,312	201,289	21,977	12	
Beaumont 1	39,304	140,223	919	1	
Brownsville 1	65,776	214,428	48,652	29	
College Station-Bryan	132,500	151,722	19,222	15	
Galveston (a)	54,770	4,240	(530)	-1	
Harlingen 1	10,770	132,033	21,263	19	
Killeen 1	67,976	200,475	32,499	19	
Laredo 1	75,586	227,202	51,616	29	
Lake Jackson-Angleton	73,416	78,789	5,373	7	
Longview 7	8,070	83,225	5,155	7	
Lubbock 2	02,225	223,853	21,628	11	
McAllen 5	23,144	739,217	216,073	41	
McKinney 5	4,525	-	(54,525)	-100	DFWA
Midland - Odessa	210,616	235,546	24,930	12	
Port Arthur	114,656	114,274	(382)	0	
San Angelo	87,969	87,710	(259)	0	
Sherman 5	6,168	62,140	5,972	11	
Temple 7	1,937	86,175	14,238	20	
The Woodlands	89,445	-	(89,445)	-100	Houston
Texarkana 4	8,767	53,987	5,220	11	
Texas City	96,417	79,122	(17,295)	-18	Dickinson to Houston
Tyler 1	01,494	125,471	23,977	24	
Victoria 6	1,529	65,378	3,849	6	
Waco 1	53,198	170,155	16,957	11	
Wichita Falls	99,396	97,463	(1,933)	-2	
State Funded Urban Totals	3,356,007	3,736,370	380,363	11	
New Urbanized Areas:					
Cleburne		n/a	0		DFWA
Conroe	n/	a	0		Houston
Georgetown	n/	a	0		Austin
New Braunfels	n/	a	0		San Antonio
San Marcos-Kyle		n/a	0		Austin
Limited Eligibility Providers					
Arlington 8	6,396	74,561			
Grand Prairie	37,995	32,673			
Mesquite 3	4,209	27,424			
NETS 7	7,713	68,002			
Total Limited Eligibility	236,313	202,660	(33,653)	(14)	
Total Urban and Limited Eligibility 3	,592,320	3,939,030	346,710	10	

(a) Estimate based on trends before Hurricane Ike

In Scenario B, researchers analyze the impact of the merger of areas located in current small urbanized areas into large urbanized areas as a result of Census 2010. Three current state funded urban transit districts are assumed to merge into large urbanized areas (McKinney, The Woodlands, and part of Texas City). These mergers have the impact of reducing the total number of state urban transit districts from the existing 30 to 28 (only a portion of Texas City is merged). For the five newly urbanized areas that are currently a part of rural transit districts, these mergers have the impact of decreasing population and land area for existing rural transit districts, with no change in the number of rural transit districts. The same changes occur for rural transit districts in Scenarios A and B. The same population and land area move to state funded urban transit districts in Scenario A or move to large urbanized areas in Scenario B.

Scenario C

Actual population changes may include both new small urbanized areas and mergers into larger urbanized areas. IDSER projected the most likely changes in urbanized areas for 2010, including the most likely new urbanized areas and most likely mergers to large urbanized areas. Scenario C represents the most likely change in population and land area for state funded transit districts as follows:

- **Most likely new state funded urban transit districts:**
 - Cleburne,
 - Conroe,
 - Georgetown,
 - New Braunfels,
 - San Marcos-Kyle;

- **Most likely mergers with large urbanized areas:**
 - McKinney with DFWA and
 - Partial Texas City (Dickinson) with Houston.

The impacts on rural population and land area are the same for Scenario C as Scenarios A and B. [Table 11](#) provides the outcome of Scenario C projected population for state funded urban transit districts. Rural transit district change is the same across all scenarios (see [Table 8](#) and [Table 9](#) for Rural Transit Districts).

Table 11. Scenario C: Population 2000 and 2010 for State Funded Urban Transit Districts.

State Funded Urban System	Projected		Change	Percent	Merged to Large UZA
	2000	2010			
Current Urban Transit Districts:					
Abilene 10	7,041	112,253	5,212	5	
Amarillo 1	79,312	201,289	21,977	12	
Beaumont 1	39,304	140,223	919	1	
Brownsville 1	65,776	214,428	48,652	29	
College Station-Bryan	132,500	151,722	19,222	15	
Galveston (a) 5	4,770	54,240	(530)	-1	
Harlingen 1	10,770	132,033	21,263	19	
Killeen 1	67,976	200,475	32,499	19	
Laredo 1	75,586	227,202	51,616	29	
Lake Jackson-Angleton	73,416	78,789	5,373	7	
Longview 7	8,070	83,225	5,155	7	
Lubbock 2	02,225	223,853	21,628	11	
McAllen 5	23,144	739,217	216,073	41	
McKinney 5	4,525		(54,525)	-100	Merge to DFWA
Midland-Odessa 2	10,616	235,546	24,930	12	
Port Arthur	114,656	114,274	(382)	0	
San Angelo	87,969	87,710	(259)	0	
Sherman 5	6,168	62,140	5,972	11	
Temple 7	1,937	86,175	14,238	20	
The Woodlands	89,445	180,880	91,435	102	
Texarkana 4	8,767	53,987	5,220	11	
Texas City	96,417	79,122	(17,295)	-18	Dickinson to Houston
Tyler 1	01,494	125,471	23,977	24	
Victoria 6	1,529	65,378	3,849	6	
Waco 1	53,198	170,155	16,957	11	
Wichita Falls	99,396	97,463	(1,933)	-2	
State Funded Urban Totals	3,356,007	3,917,250	561,243	17	
Possible New Urban Transit Districts:					
Cleburne -		51,866	51,866	100	
Conroe -		58,417	58,417	100	
Georgetown -		58,851	58,851	100	
New Braunfels	-	62,419	62,419	100	
San Marcos-Kyle	-	79,748	79,748	100	
Revised State Funded Urban Totals 3,	356,007	4,228,551	872,544	26	
Limited Eligibility Providers					
Arlington 8	6,396	74,561			
Grand Prairie	37,995	32,673			
Mesquite 3	4,209	27,424			
NETS 7	7,713	68,002			
Total Limited Eligibility	236,313	202,660	(33,653)	(14)	
Total Urban and Limited Eligibility 3	,592,320	4,431,211	838,891	23	

(a) Estimate based on trends before Hurricane Ike

The addition of these five new urban transit districts and the merger of McKinney to DFWA and partial Texas City to Houston change the total number of state funded urban transit districts from 30 to 34. The merger of the two small urbanized areas to large urbanized areas does not affect the number of rural transit districts or the rural population and land area. The rural transit district changes in Scenario C are the same as Scenarios A and B.

SUMMARY

Table 12 provides a summary of the population and land area allocations to rural transit districts and state funded urban transit districts for each of three scenarios:

- Scenario A. New Small Urbanized Areas,
- Scenario B. Mergers to Large Urbanized Areas, and
- Scenario C. Most Likely.

Scenario A and Scenario B are developed to reflect a distinction in the probable impact of new small urbanized areas and mergers of areas into large urbanized areas. Scenario A provides the impact of rural areas becoming small urbanized and therefore eligible for state urban funds. Scenario B provides the impact of existing rural or urban transit districts becoming part of large urbanized areas and no longer supported by state funding for transit. Scenario C provides a most likely scenario as defined by IDSER and includes both new small urbanized areas and mergers into larger urbanized areas.

In all three scenarios, the impact on rural transit districts is the same with rural transit districts remaining at a total of 38 and a population increase of 12 percent. For state funded urban transit districts, Scenario A has the greatest number of urban transit districts and the greatest increase in population, 31 percent. Scenario B results in the least number of urban transit districts and the least increase in population, 11 percent. Although limited eligibility provider total area population grows by 13 percent, eligible population decreases 14 percent due to the revised eligible population calculation for persons with disabilities.

Table 12. Summary of Three Scenarios.

State Funded	No. of Transit Providers	2000 Population	Projected 2010 Population Change	Percent
Urban Transit Districts				
Scenario A	31	3,356,007	4,406,128	1,050,121 31%
Scenario B	24	3,356,007	3,736,370	380,363 11%
Scenario C	30	3,356,007	4,228,551	872,544 26%
Limited Eligibility Providers				
All Scenarios Total Population	4	898,883	1,018,822	119,939 13%
Eligible Population Only	2	36,313	202,660	(33,653) (14%)
Rural Transit Districts				
All Scenarios	38	5,762,803	6,455,670	692,867 12%
<i>Rural Land Area in Square Miles</i>		<i>251,954</i>	<i>251,437</i>	<i>(516) -0.2%</i>

CHAPTER 3: IMPACT OF CHANGES IN 2010 POPULATION ON FUNDING FORMULA

The purpose of this chapter is to apply each of the three population scenarios using the current Texas transit funding formula to identify the impacts on funding by transit provider:

- Scenario A. New Small Urbanized Areas,
- Scenario B. Mergers to Large Urbanized Areas, and
- Scenario C. Most Likely.

Researchers projected funding for each state funded urban and rural transit district. For each scenario, researchers determined the transit district needs funding factors and the performance funding factors in order to allocate funds. [Appendices C](#) and [D](#) provide the methodology for determining the funding allocation for needs and performance for each transit district and the calculations.

TEXAS TRANSIT FUNDING FORMULA

The Texas transit funding formula is applied as currently described in Texas Administrative Code ([3](#)). This chapter discusses the formula in more detail. The Texas transit funding formula allocates funds to each transit district according to needs and performance. [Figure 4](#) illustrates the Texas transit funding formula. State funding for public transportation is split 35 percent to urban transit and 65 percent to rural transit. Federal 5311 (rural) funds are distributed to rural areas using the same formula as state rural funds.




Figure 4. Texas Transit Funding Formula.

The urban transit funds are allocated 50 percent to needs and 50 percent to performance. The portion of the formula attributed to needs is allocated to urban transit districts based on population in each urbanized area. For any state funded urban transit district with a population equal to or greater than 200,000, the maximum population of 199,999 is used for allocation of funding for need. Several measures are used to allocate the performance based funds. The four performance measures for urban transit are each weighted differently:

- local investment per operating expense – 30 percent,
- revenue miles per operating expense – 20 percent,
- passengers per revenue mile – 30 percent, and
- passengers per capita – 20 percent.

The population used to calculate the passengers per capita measure for urban transit districts is based on total service area population. This differs from the needs factor calculation where the population is capped at 199,999 to calculate the needs factor.

The rural transit funds are allocated 65 percent to needs and 35 percent to performance. The portion of the formula attributed to needs is allocated to rural transit systems based on 75 percent population and 25 percent land area.

The three performance measures for rural transit are each weighted the same:

- local investment per operating expense – 33.33 percent,
- revenue miles per operating expense – 33.33 percent, and
- passengers per revenue mile – 33.33 percent.

Assumptions for Funding Analysis

The applications of the Texas transit funding formula in this chapter are based on the following assumptions for funding analysis:

- Annual state funds available for public transportation remain at the same level as 2009: \$28,741,068.
- The distribution of annual state funds for public transportation between urban and rural is 35 percent to urban and 65 percent to rural: \$10,059,374 for urban transit districts and \$18,681,694 for rural transit districts.
- The annual allocation of federal Section 5311 Non-Urbanized funds for distribution by the Texas transit funding formula to rural transportation providers is \$20,104,753.
- The formula is applied exactly the same for state rural transit funds and federal Section 5311 funds. Therefore, the results for rural transit districts are presented based on the sum of annual state \$18,681,694 and federal funds \$20,104,352 = \$38,786,046.
- References to “baseline” funding for each transit district are calculated using 2000 Census population and land area for needs.
- Assumptions for performance indicators are the same for the baseline and for all scenarios:
 - 2009 performance indicators for rural transit districts,
 - 2008 performance indicators for urban transit districts (2009 urban transit district data were not finalized at the time of this research), and
 - for any new urban transit district, the 2008 median performance for all urban transit service providers was used for each performance indicator.

Urban Funds for Limited Eligibility Providers

Funding for urban transit is allocated in two tiers—urban transit districts and limited eligibility providers. See [Chapter 2](#) for a discussion of limited eligibility providers. Funds for the four limited eligibility providers are first set-aside based on the populations of seniors and persons with disabilities in the four service areas as compared to the total urban population in the urban

areas eligible for state funds for transit. The formula for the percent limited eligibility provider set-aside is:

$$\text{Eligible Population} / (\text{Eligible Population} + \text{State Funded Urban Transit District Population}) = \text{Percent of Urban Transit Funds Allocated to Limited Eligibility Providers}$$

TxDOT currently sets aside 6.58 percent of the urban funds for limited eligibility providers based on the Census 2000 eligible population calculation (see [Chapter 2](#)). [Table 13](#) calculates the projected 2010 set aside amount for each of the three scenarios.

Table 13. Projected 2010 Limited Eligibility Provider Set-Aside Percent.

	Population			
	Existing	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C
A. Limited Eligibility Provider – Total Eligible Population	236,313	202,660	202,660	202,660
B. Urban Transit District Population	<u>3,356,007</u>	<u>4,406,128</u>	<u>3,736,370</u> 4,	<u>228,551</u>
C. Total	3,592,320	4,608,788	3,939,030	4,431,211
Percent Limited Eligibility (A/C)	6.58% 4.	40%	5.14%	4.57%

Each of the three scenarios reduces the set-aside amount for limited eligibility providers as compared to the current 6.58 percent. The impact is a reduction in funding available to the limited eligibility providers¹. The set asides for limited eligibility providers are as follows:

- Baseline 6.58 percent of \$10,059,374 urban funds = \$661,907
- Scenario A 4.40 percent of \$10,059,374 urban funds = \$442,336
- Scenario B 5.14 percent of \$10,059,374 urban funds = \$517,547
- Scenario C 4.57 percent of \$10,059,374 urban funds = \$460,062

¹The Transportation Code limits formula or discretionary funding for each of the four limited eligibility providers limits funding not to exceed the amount they *each* received in the 1996–1997 biennium (*I*): Arlington \$341,663; Grand Prairie \$170,584; Mesquite \$142,456 and NETS \$116,134. The cap is not exceeded in any of the scenarios developed in this report.

RESULTS FOR SCENARIO A: NEW SMALL URBANIZED AREAS

The results for Scenario A are presented in two parts, first the results for urban transit districts and second the results for rural transit districts.

Scenario A: New Small Urbanized Areas

Scenario A assumes five new state funded urban transit districts, increasing the number of state funded urban transit districts from 26 to 30 (excluding the 4 limited eligibility providers).

- Cleburne (impacts Cleburne Rural Transit District),
- Conroe (impacts Brazos Rural Transit District),
- Georgetown (impacts Capital Area Rural Transportation System),
- New Braunfels (impacts Alamo Area Council of Governments), and
- San Marcos-Kyle (impacts Capital Area Rural Transportation System).

[Table 14](#) documents the results of the analysis for Scenario A for urban transit districts. [Appendix E](#) shows the detailed calculations.

Table 14. Scenario A. Urban Transit State Funding Summary of Results.

Principal City	Current Total	Projected 2010 Total	Difference
Total Urban	\$10,059,374	\$10,059,374	\$0
Existing Urban Districts	\$9,397,468	\$8,569,549	(\$827,919)
<i>Population 3,</i>	<i>356,007</i>	<i>4,094,827</i>	<i>738,820</i>
Abilene \$	364,513	\$318,041	(\$46,472)
Amarillo \$	405,819	\$366,646	(\$39,173)
Beaumont \$	439,859	\$375,318	(\$64,541)
Brownsville \$	569,719	\$532,933	(\$36,786)
College Station-Bryan	\$373,278	\$341,301	(\$31,978)
Galveston \$	511,198	\$454,498	(\$56,699)
Harlingen \$	213,120	\$204,160	(\$8,960)
Killeen \$	404,769	\$380,499	(\$24,270)
Lake Jackson-Angleton	\$173,061	\$151,711	(\$21,350)
Laredo \$	708,885	\$647,622	(\$61,263)
Longview \$	238,830	\$209,757	(\$29,073)
Lubbock \$	634,681	\$544,306	(\$90,375)
McAllen \$	467,943	\$392,121	(\$75,822)
McKinney \$	254,272	\$334,045	\$79,773
Midland-Odessa \$	440,264	\$369,064	(\$71,201)
Port Arthur	\$300,837	\$252,929	(\$47,908)
San Angelo	\$266,188	\$225,691	(\$40,498)
Sherman \$	236,608	\$209,642	(\$26,966)
Temple \$	262,261	\$241,101	(\$21,160)
Texarkana \$	250,284	\$223,843	(\$26,441)
Texas City	\$210,550	\$194,229	(\$16,320)
The Woodlands	\$417,689	\$476,273	\$58,584
Tyler \$	274,861	\$263,737	(\$11,124)
Victoria \$	273,655	\$240,513	(\$33,142)
Waco \$	401,623	\$361,413	(\$40,210)
Wichita Falls	\$302,699	\$255,154	(\$47,545)
New Urban Transit Districts		\$1,047,491	\$ 1,047,491
<i>Population</i>		<i>311,301</i>	<i>311,301</i>
Cleburne (New)		\$196,820	\$196,820
Conroe (New)		\$205,189	\$205,189
Georgetown (New)		\$205,743	\$205,743
New Braunfels (New)		\$210,301	\$210,301
San Marcos (New)		\$232,438	\$232,438
Limited Eligibility Providers	\$661,908	\$442,336	(\$219,572)
<i>Eligible Population</i>	<i>236,313</i>	<i>202,660</i>	<i>(33,653)</i>
Arlington \$	213,558	\$143,227	(\$70,331)
Grand Prairie	\$151,798	\$101,540	(\$50,258)
Mesquite \$	139,415	\$91,080	(\$48,335)
NETS \$	157,134	\$106,488	(\$50,646)

Key findings for Scenario A urban transit districts are as follows.

Requirements for an Increase in Funding

The amount needed to fund the five new urban transit districts for both needs and performance is approximately **\$1,050,000** (see [Table 14](#)).

The increase in population served for the existing 26 urban transit districts (excluding four limited eligibility providers) is 22 percent or 739,000 people (see [Table 14](#)). The baseline, state transit funds per capita for urban transit districts is \$2.80 ($\$10,059,374 - \$661,907 = \$9,397,467 / 3,356,007$), using Census 2000 population (see [Table 14](#)). To maintain an equivalent per capita investment using projected 2010 population, the necessary increase in state funding for the existing 26 urban transit districts is **\$2,069,000** ($739,000 \times \2.80).

The total estimated requirement for additional state urban funds under Scenario A is **\$3,119,000** ($\$1,050,000 + \$2,069,000$).

Funding for Limited Eligibility Providers

The change in basis for estimating seniors and persons with disabilities for limited eligibility providers creates a challenge to estimate 2010 funding requirements. At a minimum, funding requirements under Scenario A will be \$442,000 for 202,660 eligible population or about \$2.18 per capita. This funding level is \$220,000 less than the baseline of \$662,000 for 236,313 eligible population and \$2.80 per capita.

A target of \$2.80 per capita for the limited eligibility population will require funding of \$568,000, or an additional **\$126,000** over \$442,000. This is still below the baseline of \$662,000.

Impact of No New Funding

Without an increase in funding, the baseline funding for Scenario A will be reallocated to include five additional urban transit districts and high growth transit districts (McKinney and The Woodlands). A total of \$1,190,000 will be required, \$1,050,000 for new urbanized areas, and \$140,000 for McKinney and The Woodlands ([Table 14](#)).

Assuming baseline state funds of \$10,059,374 do not change, the funds for additional needs will come from existing urban transit providers and limited eligibility providers. The four limited eligibility transit providers will lose \$220,000, or an average \$55,000 in annual state funding ($\$220,000 / 4 = \$55,000$). This will leave a balance of \$970,000 ($\$1,190,000 - \$220,000 = \$970,000$) to be reallocated from the remaining 24 existing urban transit districts. Each transit

district will lose on average \$40,000 in annual state funding ($\$970,000/24 = \$40,000$). [Figure 5](#) illustrates the impact on each urban transit district (scale is set to be the same for all scenarios).




Figure 5. Scenario A: Urban Transit District State Funding Impact if No New Funds.

Without an increase in funding to address population increases, the per capita investment will be down from \$2.80 in the baseline to \$2.18, calculated from the projected 2010 population for Scenario A ($\$10,059,374 / (4,094,827 + 311,301 + 202,660 = 4,608,788)$) (see [Table 14](#)).

Scenario A: Rural Transit Districts

Scenario A assumes four rural transit districts have portions of areas that become five small urbanized areas [Alamo Area Council of Governments (New Braunfels), Brazos Transit District (Conroe), Capital Area Rural Transportation System (San Marcos and Georgetown) and Cleburne]. This means a loss of land area and population and that will impact the transit funding formula for the needs factor. However, the growth in population for the remainder of the rural service area is large enough to at least partially offset the loss in population for the new urbanized areas for three of the four rural transit districts. If the City of Cleburne becomes an urbanized area, the remaining population in rural Cleburne County is 78,295, and the rural transit district will have a net loss in state and federal funds (\$53,000 state and \$57,000 federal). In the case of Capital Area Rural Transportation System, the increase in population in the rest of the transit district is greater than the loss of population to two new urbanized areas.

[Table 15](#) documents the results of the analysis for Scenario A for rural transit system state funding and [Table 16](#) for rural transit systems federal. [Appendix E](#) shows the detailed calculations.

Table 15. Rural Transit State Funding Summary of Results.

Rural Transit District <i>*Impacted by new urbanized area</i>	Baseline Total	2010	Difference from Baseline	2010	Difference from Baseline
		Projected without New Urbanization		Projected with New Urbanization	
Total	\$18,681,694	\$18,681,694	\$ 0	\$18,681,694	\$ 0
Alamo Area COG*	\$900,803	\$954,961	\$54,158	\$899,103	(\$1,700)
Ark-Tex COG	\$640,334	\$600,626	(\$39,708)	\$615,562	(\$24,772)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt. Ctr.	\$268,166	\$258,330	(\$9,836)	\$261,002	(\$7,164)
Bee Community Action Agency	\$288,586	\$279,235	(\$9,351)	\$284,578	(\$4,008)
Brazos Transit District*	\$1,628,661	\$1,617,004	(\$11,657)	\$1,594,660	(\$34,001)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System* \$	1,032,678	\$1,208,024	\$175,346	\$1,052,835	\$ 20,157
Central Texas Rural Transit District	\$627,089	\$597,581	(\$29,508)	\$610,331	(\$16,758)
Cleburne City of*	\$289,202	\$301,224	\$12,022	\$236,137	(\$53,065)
Collin County Committee on Aging	\$233,830	\$278,880	\$45,050	\$285,438	\$51,608
Colorado Valley Transit	\$396,015	\$393,222	(\$2,793)	\$402,086	\$6,071
Community Act. Council of South Texas	\$359,063	\$361,006	\$1,943	\$367,441	\$8,378
Community Council of Southwest Texas	\$494,477	\$484,034	(\$10,443)	\$491,927	(\$2,550)
Community Services, Inc.	\$423,691	\$439,356	\$15,665	\$450,406	\$26,715
Concho Valley COG	\$411,007	\$400,685	(\$10,322)	\$404,571	(\$6,436)
Del Rio, City of	\$277,937	\$274,537	(\$3,400)	\$277,816	(\$121)
East Texas COG	\$1,110,851	\$1,057,300	(\$53,551)	\$1,097,858	(\$12,993)
El Paso, County of	\$255,042	\$285,036	\$29,994	\$289,043	\$34,001
Fort Bend County	\$280,889	\$288,660	\$7,771	\$291,939	\$11,050
Golden Crescent RPC	\$543,451	\$518,193	(\$25,258)	\$529,365	(\$14,086)
Gulf Coast Center	\$261,982	\$253,361	(\$8,621)	\$260,768	(\$1,214)
Heart of Texas COG	\$463,548	\$440,841	(\$22,707)	\$452,620	(\$10,928)
Hill Country Transit District	\$530,944	\$526,451	(\$4,493)	\$537,987	\$7,043
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	\$331,927	\$378,799	\$46,872	\$387,421	\$55,494
Kleberg County Human Services	\$197,045	\$190,245	(\$6,800)	\$192,430	(\$4,615)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	\$353,318	\$353,439	\$121	\$362,789	\$9,471
Panhandle Community Services	\$841,610	\$805,424	(\$36,186)	\$820,967	(\$20,643)
Public Transit Services	\$412,604	\$417,461	\$4,857	\$426,690	\$14,086
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	\$384,665	\$364,143	(\$20,522)	\$369,729	(\$14,936)
Rural Economic Assist. League	\$389,401	\$373,615	(\$15,786)	\$380,173	(\$9,228)
Services Program for Aging Needs	\$269,408	\$304,138	\$34,730	\$310,695	\$41,287
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	\$295,721	\$295,843	\$122	\$301,672	\$5,951
South East Texas RPC	\$371,103	\$332,731	(\$38,372)	\$340,988	(\$30,115)
South Padre Island, Town of	\$462,634	\$462,391	(\$243)	\$462,512	(\$122)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	\$651,085	\$610,406	(\$40,679)	\$624,006	(\$27,079)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	\$531,036	\$518,407	(\$12,629)	\$533,100	\$2,064
Transit System Inc., The	\$215,727	\$225,198	\$9,471	\$229,327	\$13,600
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	\$263,272	\$276,508	\$13,236	\$278,572	\$15,300
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	\$992,892	\$954,399	(\$38,493)	\$967,150	(\$25,742)

Table 16. Rural Transit *Federal* Funding Summary of Results.

Rural Transit District <i>*Impacted by new urbanized area</i>	Baseline Total	2010	Difference from Baseline	2010	Difference from Baseline
		Projected without New Urbanization		Projected with New Urbanization	
Total	\$20,104,352	\$20,104,352	\$ 0	\$20,104,352	\$ 0
Alamo Area COG*	\$969,402	\$1,027,685	\$58,283	\$967,573	(\$1,829)
Ark-Tex COG	\$689,097	\$646,365	(\$42,732)	\$662,438	(\$26,659)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	\$288,588	\$278,003	(\$10,585)	\$280,878	(\$7,710)
Bee Community Action Agency	\$310,562	\$300,500	(\$10,062)	\$306,250	(\$4,312)
Brazos Transit District*	\$1,752,688	\$1,740,142	(\$12,546)	\$1,716,098	(\$36,590)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System*	\$1,111,318	\$1,300,017	\$188,699	\$1,133,011	\$21,693
Central Texas Rural Transit District	\$674,842	\$643,087	(\$31,755)	\$656,809	(\$18,033)
Cleburne City of*	\$311,225	\$324,162	\$12,937	\$254,119	(\$57,106)
Collin County Committee on Aging	\$251,636	\$300,118	\$48,482	\$307,175	\$55,539
Colorado Valley Transit	\$426,172	\$423,166	(\$3,006)	\$432,706	\$6,534
Community Act. Council of South Texas	\$386,406	\$388,497	\$2,091	\$395,423	\$9,017
Community Council of Southwest Texas	\$532,132	\$520,893	(\$11,239)	\$529,388	(\$2,744)
Community Services, Inc.	\$455,956	\$472,814	\$16,858	\$484,706	\$28,750
Concho Valley COG	\$442,306	\$431,198	(\$11,108)	\$435,380	(\$6,926)
Del Rio, City of	\$299,102	\$295,443	(\$3,659)	\$298,971	(\$131)
East Texas COG	\$1,195,445	\$1,137,816	(\$57,629)	\$1,181,462	(\$13,983)
El Paso, County of	\$274,465	\$306,742	\$32,277	\$311,055	\$36,590
Fort Bend County	\$302,279	\$310,643	\$8,364	\$314,171	\$11,892
Golden Crescent RPC	\$584,835	\$557,654	(\$27,181)	\$569,677	(\$15,158)
Gulf Coast Center	\$281,934	\$272,656	(\$9,278)	\$280,627	(\$1,307)
Heart of Texas COG	\$498,849	\$474,413	(\$24,436)	\$487,088	(\$11,761)
Hill Country Transit District	\$571,376	\$566,541	(\$4,835)	\$578,955	\$7,579
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	\$357,204	\$407,646	\$50,442	\$416,924	\$59,720
Kleberg County Human Services	\$212,051	\$204,733	(\$7,318)	\$207,085	(\$4,966)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	\$380,223	\$380,354	\$131	\$390,416	\$10,193
Panhandle Community Services	\$905,701	\$866,759	(\$38,942)	\$883,486	(\$22,215)
Public Transit Services	\$444,025	\$449,252	\$5,227	\$459,183	\$15,158
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	\$413,958	\$391,874	(\$22,084)	\$397,885	(\$16,073)
Rural Economic Assist. League	\$419,056	\$402,067	(\$16,989)	\$409,124	(\$9,932)
Services Program for Aging Needs	\$289,925	\$327,299	\$37,374	\$334,355	\$44,430
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	\$318,242	\$318,372	\$130	\$324,645	\$6,403
South East Texas RPC	\$399,362	\$358,068	(\$41,294)	\$366,954	(\$32,408)
South Padre Island, Town of	\$497,864	\$497,602	(\$262)	\$497,733	(\$131)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	\$700,667	\$656,890	(\$43,777)	\$671,526	(\$29,141)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	\$571,476	\$557,886	(\$13,590)	\$573,698	\$2,222
Transit System Inc., The	\$232,155	\$242,348	\$10,193	\$246,791	\$14,636
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	\$283,321	\$297,565	\$14,244	\$299,786	\$16,465
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	\$1,068,507	\$1,027,082	(\$41,425)	\$1,040,801	(\$27,706)

Key findings for Scenario A for rural transit districts are as follows.

Requirements for an Increase in Funding

The net increase in population for the 38 rural transit districts (after adjusting for new urbanized population) is 12 percent or 693,000. According to the baseline for rural transit districts, state transit funds per capita are \$3.24 (\$3.49 federal), using Census 2000 population (see [Table 6](#)). To maintain an equivalent per capita investment using projected 2010 rural population, the necessary increase in state funding for the existing 38 rural transit districts is **\$2,250,000** (693,000 x \$3.24). The necessary increase in federal Section 5311 funding is **\$2,420,000** (693,000 x \$3.49).

Impact of No New Funding

Without an increase in funding, the baseline funding for Scenario A will be reallocated among 38 rural transit districts. Twenty-two transit districts lose funds and 16 gain funds (see [Table 14](#)).

The existing investment of state and federal funds per capita is \$3.24 for state funds and \$3.49 for federal funds, based on Census 2000 population. Without an increase in funding, the state and federal investment per capita will drop to \$2.89 state and \$3.11 federal based on projected 2010 population.

Most rural transit districts have an increase in population (35 of the 38). However because the needs factor is a ratio of the needs of each rural transit district to the state total of all rural transit district needs, a rural transit district may have an increase in population but have a decrease in the needs factor due to the change in ratio. In general, the rural transit districts with the highest rate of growth will receive more funding and the rural transit districts with the lower rates of growth (or loss of population) will lose funds from the state and from federal Section 5311. For example, East Texas Council of Governments has a population increase of 59,000; however, because the rate of increase in population in East Texas is not as great as other rural transit districts, the East Texas Council of Governments needs factor drops from 8.32 to 8.21 percent resulting in a decrease in funding (see [Appendix E](#)). Nineteen of the 35 rural transit districts have an increase in population but a decrease in funding.

[Figure 6](#) and [Figure 7](#) illustrate the impact on each rural transit district. A total of \$667,000 (\$320,000 state funds and \$347,000 federal funds) are reallocated from 22 rural transit districts that lose funds (an average of \$30,000 per rural transit district) to the benefit of 16 rural transit districts that gain funds (an average of \$42,000 per rural transit district). The rural transit districts with the largest increase in funds are Collin County Committee on Aging, Kaufman Area Rural Transit, and Service Program for Aging Needs.




Figure 6. Scenario A: Rural Transit District State Funding Impact if No New Funds.




Figure 7. Scenario A: Rural Transit District Federal Funding Impact if No New Funds.

RESULTS FOR SCENARIO B: MERGERS TO LARGE URBANIZED AREAS

Scenario B is based on the merger of urban and rural transit districts into large urbanized areas, decreasing the number of state funded urban transit districts from 26 to 24 (excluding the 4 limited eligibility providers).

State funded urban transit districts that are merged into large urbanized areas under Scenario B:

- The Woodlands with Houston,
- McKinney with DFWA, and
- Partial Texas City (Dickinson) with Houston – Texas City remains as urban district.

Current areas in rural transit districts that are merged into large urbanized areas under the assumptions for Scenario B:

- Cleburne with DFWA,
- Conroe with Houston,
- Georgetown with Austin,
- New Braunfels with San Antonio, and
- San Marcos with Austin.

[Table 17](#) documents the Scenario B analysis for urban transit districts. [Appendix F](#) shows the detailed calculations.

Table 17. Scenario B. Urban Transit State Funding Summary of Results.

Principal City *Impacted by Merger to Very Large Urbanized Area	Current Total	Projected 2010 Total	Difference
Total Urban	\$10,059,374	\$10,059,374	\$0
Existing Urban	\$8,514,956	\$9,350,812	\$835,856
<i>Population</i>	<i>3,115,620</i>	<i>3,657,248</i>	<i>541,628</i>
Abilene \$	364,513	\$396,366	\$31,853
Amarillo \$	405,819	\$452,189	\$46,370
Beaumont \$	439,859	\$468,877	\$29,018
Brownsville \$	569,719	\$656,277	\$86,558
College Station-Bryan	\$373,278	\$422,106	\$48,828
Galveston \$	511,198	\$550,879	\$39,681
Harlingen \$	213,120	\$249,822	\$36,702
Killeen \$	404,769	\$471,953	\$67,184
Lake Jackson-Angleton	\$173,061	\$188,560	\$15,499
Laredo \$	708,885	\$789,909	\$81,024
Longview \$	238,830	\$260,298	\$21,468
Lubbock \$	634,681	\$669,142	\$34,461
McAllen \$	467,943	\$487,048	\$19,105
Midland – Odessa	\$440,264	\$453,790	\$13,526
Port Arthur	\$300,837	\$315,495	\$14,658
San Angelo	\$266,188	\$281,297	\$15,109
Sherman \$	236,608	\$265,365	\$28,757
Temple \$	262,261	\$304,607	\$42,346
Texarkana \$	250,284	\$278,144	\$27,860
Tyler \$	274,861	\$324,385	\$49,524
Victoria \$	273,655	\$301,285	\$27,630
Waco \$	401,623	\$446,521	\$44,898
Wichita Falls	\$302,699	\$316,497	\$13,798
Merged Urbans	\$882,511	\$191,015	(\$691,496)
<i>Population</i>	<i>240,387</i>	<i>79,122</i>	<i>(161,265)</i>
McKinney* \$	254,272	\$0	(\$254,272)
Texas City*	\$210,550	\$191,015	(\$19,535)
The Woodlands*	\$417,689	\$0	(\$417,689)
Limited Eligibility Provider	\$661,907	\$517,547	(\$144,360)
<i>Eligible Population</i>	<i>236,313</i>	<i>202,660</i>	<i>(33,653)</i>
Arlington \$	213,559	\$167,580	(\$45,979)
Grand Prairie	\$151,799	\$118,805	(\$32,994)
Mesquite \$	139,416	\$106,566	(\$32,850)
NETS \$	157,134	\$124,595	(\$32,539)

Key findings for Scenario B for urban transit districts are as follows.

Requirements for an Increase in Funding

The increase in population served for the 24 urban transit districts that remain urban transit districts after mergers (26 less McKinney and The Woodlands equals 24) is 17 percent or 541,628 persons (see [Table 17](#)). The baseline for state transit funds per capita for urban transit districts is \$2.80, using Census 2000 population. To maintain an equivalent per capita investment of \$2.80 using projected 2010 population, the necessary increase in state funding for the existing 24 urban transit districts is **\$1,517,000** ($541,628 \times \2.80).

The total estimated requirement for additional state urban funds under Scenario B is **\$1,517,000**.

Funding for Limited Eligibility Providers

The change in basis for estimating seniors and persons with disabilities for limited eligibility providers creates a challenge to estimate 2010 funding requirements. At a minimum, funding requirements under Scenario B will be \$518,000 or about \$2.55 per capita for the 202,660 eligible population. This funding level is \$144,000 less than the baseline of \$662,000 and \$2.80 per capita.

A target of \$2.80 per capita for the limited eligibility population will require funding of \$568,000, or an additional **\$50,000** over \$518,000. This is still below the baseline of \$662,000.

Impact of No New Funding

Under Scenario B, the mergers of McKinney, The Woodlands, and a portion of Texas City into large urban areas will release \$692,000 in state urban funds (see [Table 17](#)). Based on the revised basis for estimating seniors and persons with disabilities, the four limited eligibility providers will lose \$144,000 or an average \$36,000 per provider ($\$144,000/4 = \$36,000$). The total funding adjustment \$836,000 ($\$692,000 + \$144,000 = \$836,000$) will be reallocated among the remaining 24 urban transit districts. Each of the 24 urban transit districts will gain on average \$35,000 per urban transit district ($\$836,000/24 = \$35,000$). [Figure 8](#) illustrates the impact on each urban transit district.

However, the funding adjustment does not fully address increases in population in the urban transit districts after mergers. Without an increase in funding, the per capita investment will be down from \$2.80 in the baseline to \$2.55, calculated from the projected 2010 population for Scenario B ($\$10,059,374 / (3,657,248 + 79,122 + 202,660 = 3,939,030)$).




Figure 8. Scenario B: Urban Transit District State Funding Impact if No New Funds.

Scenario B: Rural Transit Districts

Scenario B assumes four rural transit districts have portions of areas that will merge into large urban areas [Alamo Area Council of Governments (New Braunfels into San Antonio), Brazos Transit District (Conroe into Houston), Capital Area Rural Transportation System (San Marcos and Georgetown into Austin) and Cleburne (Cleburne urbanized area into DFWA)]. In Scenario B, the same newly urbanized areas that are no longer in rural transit districts are the same as Scenario A (in Scenario A the newly urbanized areas become small urbanized areas and in Scenario B the same areas merge into large urbanized areas). The affect on rural transit district funding is the same for across all scenarios. See Scenario A for a discussion of the impacts on rural transit districts (see [Table 15](#) and [Table 16](#)).

RESULTS FOR SCENARIO C: MOST LIKELY

Scenario C represents the most likely change in population and land area for state funding transit districts as follows:

- **Most likely new state funded urban transit districts:**
 - Cleburne (impacts Cleburne Rural Transit District),
 - Conroe (impacts Brazos Rural Transit District),
 - Georgetown (impacts Capital Area Rural Transportation System),
 - New Braunfels (impacts Alamo Area Council of Governments),
 - San Marcos-Kyle (impacts Capital Area Rural Transportation System);

- **Most likely mergers with large urbanized areas:**
 - McKinney with DFWA, and
 - Partial Texas City (Dickinson) with Houston.

Scenario C increases the number of state funded urban transit districts from 30 to 34 (including 4 limited eligibility providers). [Table 18](#) documents the results of the analysis for Scenario C for urban transit districts. [Appendix G](#) shows the detailed calculations.

Table 18. Scenario C. Urban Transit State Funding Summary of Results.

Principal City <i>*Impacted by Merger to Large UZA</i>	Current Total	Projected 2010 Total	Difference
Total Urban	\$10,059,374	\$10,059,374	\$0
Total Existing Urban (without Mergers)	\$8,932,644	\$8,347,349	(\$585,295)
<i>Population</i>	<i>3,205,065</i>	<i>3,838,128</i>	<i>633,063</i>
Abilene \$	364,513	\$330,623	(\$33,890)
Amarillo \$	405,819	\$382,640	(\$23,178)
Beaumont \$	439,859	\$389,786	(\$50,073)
Brownsville \$	569,719	\$551,232	(\$18,487)
College Station-Bryan	\$373,278	\$355,138	(\$18,140)
Galveston \$	511,198	\$463,755	(\$47,443)
Harlingen \$	213,120	\$213,888	\$767
Killeen \$	404,769	\$397,596	(\$7,173)
Lake Jackson-Angleton	\$173,061	\$159,139	(\$13,922)
Laredo \$	708,885	\$667,168	(\$41,717)
Longview \$	238,830	\$218,126	(\$20,704)
Lubbock \$	634,681	\$563,476	(\$71,206)
McAllen \$	467,943	\$409,001	(\$58,942)
Midland-Odessa \$	440,264	\$384,999	(\$55,265)
Port Arthur	\$300,837	\$263,602	(\$37,235)
San Angelo	\$266,188	\$235,356	(\$30,832)
Sherman \$	236,608	\$219,067	(\$17,541)
Temple \$	262,261	\$251,288	(\$10,974)
Texarkana \$	250,284	\$231,429	(\$18,854)
The Woodlands	\$417,689	\$494,372	\$76,683
Tyler \$	274,861	\$274,262	(\$599)
Victoria \$	273,655	\$249,718	(\$23,937)
Waco \$	401,623	\$376,410	(\$25,213)
Wichita Falls	\$302,699	\$265,275	(\$37,424)
Merged Urban	\$464,822	\$161,002	(\$303,820)
<i>Population</i>	<i>150,942</i>	<i>79,122</i>	<i>(71,820)</i>
McKinney* \$	254,272		(\$254,272)
Texas City*	\$210,550	\$161,002	(\$49,548)
New Urban		\$1,090,961	\$ 1,090,961
<i>Population</i>		<i>311,301</i>	<i>311,301</i>
Cleburne (New)		\$204,282	\$204,282
Conroe (New)		\$213,049	\$213,049
Georgetown (New)		\$213,630	\$213,630
New Braunfels (New)		\$218,405	\$218,405
San Marcos (New)		\$241,595	\$241,595

Table 18 Continued

Principal City *Impacted by Merger to Large UZA	Current Total	Projected 2010 Total	Difference
Limited Eligibility Providers	\$661,908	460,062	(\$201,845)
<i>Population</i>	<i>236,313</i>	<i>202,660</i>	<i>(33,653)</i>
Arlington \$	213,559	\$148,967	(\$64,592)
Grand Prairie	\$151,799	\$105,609	(\$46,189)
Mesquite \$	139,416	\$94,730	(\$44,686)
NETS \$	157,134	\$110,756	(\$46,378)

Key findings for Scenario C urban transit districts are as follows.

Requirements for an Increase in Funding

The amount needed to fund the five new urban transit districts for both needs and performance is approximately **\$1,091,000** (see [Table 18](#)).

- Cleburne \$ 204,000
- Conroe \$ 213,000
- Georgetown \$ 214,000
- New Braunfels \$ 218,000
- San Marcos \$ 242,000
- Total \$ 1,091,000

The increase in population in the existing 24 urban transit districts that remain urban transit districts after mergers (excluding four limited eligibility providers) is 20 percent or 633,063 people (see [Table 18](#)). The baseline state funds per capita for urban transit districts is \$2.80, using Census 2000 population. To maintain an equivalent per capita investment using projected 2010 population, the necessary increase in state funding for the existing 24 urban transit districts is **\$1,773,000** (663,063 x \$2.80).

The total estimated requirement for additional state urban funds under Scenario C is **\$2,864,000** (\$1,091,000 + \$1,773,000).

Funding for Limited Eligibility Providers

The change in basis for estimating seniors and persons with disabilities for limited eligibility providers creates a challenge to estimate 2010 funding requirements. At a minimum, funding requirements under Scenario C will be \$460,000 for 202,660 eligible population, or about \$2.27 per capita. This funding level is \$202,000 less than the baseline of \$662,000 and \$2.80 per capita.

A target of \$2.80 per capita for the limited eligibility population will require funding of \$568,000, or an additional **\$108,000** over \$460,000. This is still below the baseline of \$662,000.

Impact of No New Funding

Without an increase in funding, the baseline funding for Scenario C will be reallocated to include five additional urban transit districts and the one high growth transit district (The Woodlands). A total of \$1,169,000 will be required, \$1,091,000 for new urbanized areas and \$78,000 for the urban transit districts receiving more state funds (see [Table 18](#)).

Under Scenario C, the mergers of McKinney and a portion of Texas City into large urban areas will release \$304,000 in state urban funds (see [Table 18](#)). Based upon the revised basis for estimating seniors and persons with disabilities, the four limited eligibility providers will lose \$202,000 or an average \$51,000 per provider ($\$202,000/4 = \$51,000$). The funding adjustments will partially account for the \$1,169,000 funds needed for new urban areas and the growth of The Woodlands. An additional \$663,000 ($\$1,169,000 - \$304,000 - \$202,000 = \$663,000$) will be reallocated from the other existing transit districts. The \$663,000 will be reallocated among 23 urban transit districts (see [Table 18](#)). Each transit district will lose on average \$29,000 ($\$663,000/23 = \$29,000$). [Figure 9](#) illustrates the impact on each urban transit district.




Figure 9. Scenario C: Urban Transit District State Funding Impact if No New Funds.

Without an increase in funding, the per capita investment will be down from \$2.80 in the baseline to \$2.28, calculated using the projected 2010 population for Scenario C ($\$10,059,374 / (3,838,128 + 79,122 + 311,300 + 202,660 = 4,421,210)$) (see [Table 18](#)).

Scenario C: Rural Transit Districts

Scenario C assumes four rural transit districts have portions of areas that become five small urbanized areas [Alamo Area Council of Governments (New Braunfels), Brazos Transit District (Conroe), Capital Area Rural Transportation System (San Marcos and Georgetown) and Cleburne]. In Scenario C, the same newly urbanized areas that are no longer in rural transit districts are the same as Scenario A.

The affect on rural transit district funding is the same for across all scenarios. See Scenario A for a discussion of the impacts on rural transit districts (see [Table 15](#) and [Table 16](#)).

SUMMARY OF FUNDING ANALYSIS BY SCENARIO

[Table 19](#) provides a summary of the state funding analysis by scenario for each urban transit district. [Table 20](#) provides the summary for state and federal funding by scenario for each rural transit district. Each table documents the difference in funding from baseline by scenario for each transit district.

Table 19. Urban Transit State Funding Differences from Current Funding.

Principal City	Scenario A Difference	Scenario B Difference	Scenario C Difference
Total Urban Transit Districts	\$219,570	\$144,360	\$201,845
Abilene (\$46,472)	\$31,853	(\$33,890)
Amarillo (\$39	,173)	\$46,370	(\$23,178)
Beaumont (\$64,541)	\$29,018	(\$50,073)
Brownsville (\$36	,786)	\$86,558	(\$18,487)
Cleburne (New)	\$196,820		\$204,282
College Station-Bryan	(\$31,978)	\$48,828	(\$18,140)
Conroe (New)	\$205,189		\$213,049
Galveston (\$56,699)	\$39,681	(\$47,443)
Georgetown (New)	\$205,743		\$213,630
Harlingen (\$8,960)	\$36,702	\$767
Killeen (\$24,270)	\$67,184	(\$7,173)
Lake Jackson-Angleton	(\$21,350)	\$15,499	(\$13,922)
Laredo (\$61,263)	\$81,024	(\$41,717)
Longview (\$29,073)	\$21,468	(\$20,704)
Lubbock (\$90,375)	\$34,461	(\$71,206)
McAllen (\$75,822)	\$19,105	(\$58,942)
McKinney (Merged Scenario B & C)	\$79,773	(\$254,272)	(\$254,272)
Midland – Odessa	(\$71,201)	\$13,526	(\$55,265)
New Braunfels (New)	\$210,301		\$218,405
Port Arthur	(\$47,908)	\$14,658	(\$37,235)
San Angelo	(\$40,498)	\$15,109	(\$30,832)
San Marcos (New)	\$232,438		\$241,595
Sherman (\$26,966)	\$28,757	(\$17,541)
Temple (\$21,160)	\$42,346	(\$10,974)
Texarkana (\$26,441)	\$27,860	(\$18,854)
Texas City (Partial Merged Scenario B & C)	(\$16,320)	(\$19,535)	(\$49,548)
The Woodlands (Merged Scenario B)	\$58,584	(\$417,689)	\$76,683
Tyler (\$11,124)	\$49,524	(\$599)
Victoria (\$33,142)	\$27,630	(\$23,937)
Waco (\$40,210)	\$44,898	(\$25,213)
Wichita Falls	(\$47,545)	\$13,798	(\$37,424)
Limited Eligibility Providers	(\$219,572)	(\$14 4,360)	(\$20 1,845)
Arlington	(\$70,331)	(\$45,979)	(\$64,592)
Grand Prairie	(\$50,258)	(\$32,994)	(\$46,189)
Mesquite	(\$48,335)	(\$32,850)	(\$44,686)
NETS	(\$50,646)	(\$32,539)	(\$46,378)

Table 20. Rural Transit State and Federal Funding Differences from Current Funding.

Rural Transit District	Scenario A, B & C Difference in Funding		
	State Funding	Federal Funding	Funding Total
Alamo Area COG	(\$1,700)	(\$1,829)	(\$3,529)
Ark-Tex COG	(\$24,772)	(\$26,659)	(\$51,431)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	(\$7,164)	(\$7,710)	(\$14,874)
Bee Community Action Agency	(\$4,008)	(\$4,312)	(\$8,320)
Brazos Transit District	(\$34,001)	(\$36,590)	(\$70,591)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	\$20,157	\$21,693	\$41,850
Central Texas Rural Transit District	(\$16,758)	(\$18,033)	(\$34,791)
Cleburne City of	(\$53,065)	(\$57,106)	(\$110,171)
Collin County Committee on Aging	\$51,608	\$55,539	\$107,147
Colorado Valley Transit	\$6,071	\$6,534	\$12,605
Community Act. Council of South Texas	\$8,378	\$9,017	\$17,395
Community Council of Southwest Texas	(\$2,550)	(\$2,744)	(\$5,294)
Community Services, Inc.	\$26,715	\$28,750	\$55,465
Concho Valley COG	(\$6,436)	(\$6,926)	(\$13,362)
Del Rio, City of	(\$121)	(\$131)	(\$252)
East Texas COG	(\$12,993)	(\$13,983)	(\$26,976)
El Paso, County of	\$34,001	\$36,590	\$70,591
Fort Bend County	\$11,050	\$11,892	\$22,942
Golden Crescent RPC	(\$14,086)	(\$15,158)	(\$29,244)
Gulf Coast Center	(\$1,214)	(\$1,307)	(\$2,521)
Heart of Texas COG	(\$10,928)	(\$11,761)	(\$22,689)
Hill Country Transit District \$	7,043	\$7,579	\$14,622
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	\$55,494	\$59,720	\$115,214
Kleberg County Human Services	(\$4,615)	(\$4,966)	(\$9,581)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	\$9,471	\$10,193	\$19,664
Panhandle Community Services	(\$20,643)	(\$22,215)	(\$42,858)
Public Transit Services	\$14,086	\$15,158	\$29,244
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	(\$14,936)	(\$16,073)	(\$31,009)
Rural Economic Assist. League	(\$9,228)	(\$9,932)	(\$19,160)
Services Program for Aging Needs	\$41,287	\$44,430	\$85,717
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	\$5,951	\$6,403	\$12,354
South East Texas RPC	(\$30,115)	(\$32,408)	(\$62,523)
South Padre Island, Town of	(\$122)	(\$131)	(\$253)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	(\$27,079)	(\$29,141)	(\$56,220)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	\$2,064	\$2,222	\$4,286
Transit System Inc., The	\$13,600	\$14,636	\$28,236
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	\$15,300	\$16,465	\$31,765
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	(\$25,742)	(\$27,706)	(\$53,448)

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND KEY POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss findings for the projected changes in population for 2010 and to present the key policy implications in the allocation of funding using the Texas transit funding formula.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The following section summarizes research findings about projected changes in population as of 2010 that affect the Texas transit funding formula.

Population Increase in Urban and Rural Transit Districts

Population is increasing in both urban and rural transit districts. Population in both urban and rural transit districts that receive state funds increase under every scenario analyzed, as illustrated in [Table 21](#).

Table 21. Population Increase 2000 to 2010 for Baseline and Each Scenario.

	2000	2010	Increase	Percent Increase
Baseline				
State Funded Urban Transit	3,592,320	4,297,487	705,167	20%
Rural Transit Districts	<u>5,762,803</u>	<u>6,766,971</u>	<u>1,004,168</u>	17%
	9,355,123	11,064,458	1,709,335	18%
Scenario A - New Urban				
State Funded Urban Transit	3,592,320	4,608,788	1,016,468	28%
Rural Transit Districts	<u>5,762,803</u>	<u>6,455,670</u>	<u>692,867</u>	12%
	9,355,123	11,064,458	1,709,335	18%
Scenario B - Mergers				
State Funded Urban Transit	3,592,320	3,939,030	346,710	10%
Rural Transit Districts	<u>5,762,803</u>	<u>6,455,670</u>	<u>692,867</u>	12%
	9,355,123	10,394,700	1,039,577	11%
Scenario C - Most Likely				
State Funded Urban Transit	3,592,320	4,359,121	766,801	21%
Rural Transit Districts	<u>5,762,803</u>	<u>6,455,670</u>	<u>692,867</u>	12%
	9,355,123	10,814,791	1,459,668	16%

The fastest population growth is in counties around the largest metropolitan areas and communities along the Texas border with Mexico. Existing urbanized areas are expanding in terms of population and land area that is urbanized.

Additional Large Urbanized Areas

Urbanized areas that may reach status as a large urbanized area with a population of 200,000 or more are Laredo, Brownsville, Killeen, and Amarillo. Under the Texas transit funding formula, the population used to calculate funding for needs will be limited to 199,999.

Under Federal Section 5307 funding regulations, an urban transit system in an urbanized area with a population over 200,000 cannot use federal funds for operating expenses. Use of federal funds is up to 80 percent of capital expenses, including preventive maintenance. State funds may be used as local share; however, additional sources of local funds may be required to fully leverage federal dollars. Stakeholders in these urbanized areas should anticipate a change in status of urbanized areas and plan to address funding challenges.

New Small Urbanized Areas

Increasing population in rural Texas will create more urbanized areas. Rapidly urbanizing rural areas could merge into large urban areas or become new urbanized areas. The most likely scenario is that five communities with a population over 50,000 will become small urbanized areas. The new urbanized areas are Cleburne, Conroe, Georgetown, New Braunfels, and San Marcos.

Under the Texas transit funding formula, funds for transit districts in the new urbanized areas will be from the urban category rather than the rural category. The source of federal funds for new urban transit districts will be federal Section 5307. The transit districts may use Section 5307 funds for up to 50 percent of the operating deficit and up to 80 percent of capital expenses, including preventive maintenance. Administrative expenses are considered part of operating cost according to Section 5307; administrative expenses will no longer be eligible for 80 percent federal funding as provided under Section 5311 funding guidelines.

Population Increases in Rural Transit Districts Despite New Urbanized Areas

The population in rural transit districts is growing even though some rural areas are rapidly urbanizing. The increase in rural population is greater than the loss of population to urbanized areas. Population in rural transit districts will increase 12 percent under any scenario for the change in population in urban transit districts (see [Table 21](#) above).

Urbanized Area below 50,000 Population

The population of Galveston may fall below 50,000 due to the impacts of Hurricane Ike in 2008. Such an outcome would place the current small urbanized area into the rural category. This scenario was not modeled in the analysis. Federal legislation may be proposed to grandfather urbanized areas that are recovering from national disasters at the time of the census in 2010.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING

The following section discusses the key policy implications of the projected change in population (and land area) in the allocation of funding using the Texas transit funding formula.

Transit Investments Per Capita are Declining

Assuming no new funds, per capita investment in transit will decline with the 2010 Census data. State funds are \$10,059,374 per year for urban transit districts and \$18,681,694 for rural transit districts. The annual allocation of federal Section 5311 funds under the Texas transit funding formula is \$20,104,753 to rural transit districts. Without an increase in funding, the growth in

2010 population means the investment in public transportation will be less per capita than the existing baseline using 2000 population, as documented in [Table 22](#).

Table 22. Transit Funds per Capita for Baseline and Each Scenario.

Assuming No New Funds				
	Baseline	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C
	2000 Population	2010 New Urban	2010 Mergers	2010 Most Likely
Urban State	\$2.80 \$	2.18 \$	2.55	\$2.28
Limited Eligibility	\$2.80 \$	2.18 \$	2.55	\$2.27
Rural State	\$3.24 \$		2.89	
Federal 5311	\$3.49 \$		3.11	

New Small Urban Transit Districts Require Funds

New small urban transit districts will require funding from urban state funds. The most significant impact on the distribution of state funding will occur if the rapidly urbanizing rural areas become new urban transit districts (Scenarios A and C). A new urban transit district requires funds based on needs and performance, or about \$200,000 per urban transit district. [Table 23](#) highlights the additional state funds required for five new urban transit districts under Scenarios A and C.

Table 23. Required Funding for New Urbanized Areas.

Includes Needs and Performance Allocation			
	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C
	2010 New Urban	2010 Mergers	2010 Most Likely
New Urban Transit Districts (5)	\$1,050,000 \$	0	\$1,091,000

Without additional state resources, the requirement to fund new small urban transit districts will require reallocation of funds from existing urban transit districts that are eligible for state funds. Without additional state funds, some urban transit districts will lose funds although the population in the area is increasing.

Increase in Funding Required to Maintain Per Capita Investment

Additional funds are required to maintain the investment per capita in 2010 compared to the baseline per capita using 2000 population. [Table 24](#) documents the additional state and federal funds required to maintain the per capita investment using 2010 population. The estimate of funds does not include funds for new urban transit districts reported in [Table 23](#).

Table 24. Additional Funding to Maintain Baseline per Capita.

Using 2010 Population

	Baseline	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C
	2000 Population	2010 New Urban	2010 Mergers	2010 Most Likely
Urban State*	\$2.80	\$2,069,000	\$1,517,000	\$1,773,000
Limited Eligibility State	\$2.80	\$126,000	\$50,000	\$108,000
Rural State	\$3.24	\$2,250,000		
Federal 5311	\$3.49	\$2,420,000		

Table 25 summarizes total funds required for new urban transit districts (Table 23) and to maintain per capita investment based on projected 2010 population in urban and rural transit districts (Table 24). State and federal funds are documented.

Table 25. Total Funds Required Based on Projected 2010 Population.

	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C
	2010 New Urban	2010 Mergers	2010 Most Likely
Urban State	\$3,245,000	\$1,567,000	\$2,972,000
Rural State	\$2,250,000		
Total State Urban and Rural	\$5,495,000	\$3,817,000	\$5,222,000
Federal 5311	\$2,420,000		

Funds Needed to Avoid Negative Impacts

Without new funds, current state dollars will be reallocated to provide funding for needs and performance for new urbanized areas and to provide funds for urban and rural transit districts with higher growth rates. The same redistribution occurs for Federal Section 5311 funds for rural transit districts. Without an increase in federal funds to address growth in population, federal funds will be reallocated from one rural transit district to increase the resources for another rural transit district.

The reallocation of funds means many transit districts will lose funding in order to redistribute dollars to the transit districts with higher population growth. Table 26 documents the reallocation of existing dollars and shows what funds will be required to provide sufficient coverage for negative allocations (transit districts with lower growth rates that must reduce funds to provide an increase for other transit districts). These funds simply neutralize funding redistribution and do not provide sufficient resources to maintain per capita investment.

Table 26. Funds Needed to Avoid Negative Impacts after All Reallocation.

	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C
	2010 New Urban	2010 Mergers	2010 Most Likely
New Urban Areas	\$1,050,000	\$ 0	\$1,091,000
Growth Existing	\$140,000	\$ 836,000	\$78,000
Less Mergers	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(\$692,000)</u>	<u>(\$304,000)</u>
Urban	\$1,190,000	\$ 144,000	\$865,000
Less Limited Eligibility	<u>(\$220,000)</u>	<u>(\$144,000)</u>	<u>(\$202,000)</u>
Balance Urban State Needed	\$970,000	\$ 0	\$663,000
Rural State Needed	\$323,000	\$ 323,000	\$323,000
Total State Needed	\$1,293,000	\$323,000	\$986,000
Federal 5311 Needed	\$347,000	\$347,000	\$347,000

Urban and Rural Ratio for Population Eligible for State Transit Funds

The ratio of urban and rural population eligible for funding under the Texas transit funding formula may change. The current percent of state funding allocation is 35 percent to urban and 65 percent to rural. This actual ratio of rural to urban population for the 2000 baseline is 38 percent urban and 62 percent rural. The proportion of population in state funded transit districts will increase for urban as compared to rural according to projected 2010 population for the baseline and for scenarios A and C, is shown in [Table 27](#).

Table 27. Percent Urban/Rural Population for State-Funded Transit Districts.

Urban Transit Includes Eligible Population for Limited Eligibility Providers

	2000 Population	Percent Urban Rural 2000	2010 Population	Percent Urban Rural 2010
Baseline				
State Funded Urban Transit	3,592,320	38%	4,297,487	39%
Rural Transit Districts	<u>5,762,803</u>	62 %	<u>6,766,971</u>	61 %
	9,355,123		11,064,458	
Scenario A - New Urban				
State Funded Urban Transit			4,608,788	42%
Rural Transit Districts			<u>6,455,670</u>	58 %
			11,064,458	
Scenario B - Mergers				
State Funded Urban Transit			3,939,030	38%
Rural Transit Districts			<u>6,455,670</u>	62 %
			10,394,700	
Scenario C - Most Likely				
State Funded Urban Transit			4,359,121	40%
Rural Transit Districts			<u>6,455,670</u>	60 %
			10,814,791	

Limited Eligibility Transit Providers

There are four transit providers in Texas designated as “limited eligibility providers”—Arlington, Northeast Transportation Services (NETS), Grand Prairie and Mesquite. These transit providers restrict transit eligibility to seniors and persons with disabilities. The Texas transit funding formula currently sets aside 6.58 percent of the urban funds for limited eligibility providers based on the Census 2000 eligible population calculation. There are two issues that suggest this percent estimate is not correct. First, researchers discovered that when the Texas transit funding formula was first applied for limited eligibility providers (in 2006), the eligible population for persons with disabilities was based on a Census 2000 report that tallies *disabilities* rather than *persons with disabilities*. This creates an inflated number to represent the eligible population served by limited eligibility providers. Second, the ACS is now used to identify the number of persons with disabilities. The ACS has changed the questions to collect data and the expected impact of the change is a smaller number of persons classified as having a disability. Overall, the number of eligible seniors and persons with disabilities in 2010 may be less than 2000. This will reduce the percent of state funds set aside for limited eligibility transit providers.

Sources of Data for Allocation of State Funds for Performance

Under past practice, when a new rural transit district became eligible for state or federal transit funding under the Texas transit funding formula, the transit district was required to wait a minimum of two years to earn performance dollars (after a period of time to establish transit service and gather performance data). However, when areas that were previously part of rural transit districts become a new urban transit district, there is a history of service. TxDOT will need to develop new procedures to establish the performance statistics that will be used to generate performance funds for the new urban transit district (and what the impact will be on performance statistics for the former rural transit district).

Requirements for Metropolitan Planning Processes

A new urbanized area is required to meet requirements for the metropolitan planning process in order to be eligible for Federal Section 5307 funds. State funds may be used as local share; however, sources of local funds may be required to fully leverage federal dollars. Stakeholders in rapidly urbanizing areas must anticipate the change in status as of 2012 announcements of new urbanized areas in order to fully apply funding opportunities.

Areas that may merge into large urban areas will be subject to allocation of funding by the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the designated recipient(s) for Section 5307 funds. Formal processes are in place for the sub allocation of funds in at least one large urbanized area in Texas. However, not all large urban areas have a formally recognized process for determining the funds that may be allocated to areas outside the service area of the designated recipient(s). Existing transit systems that operate in areas that may be merged into large urbanized areas should discuss the policies and practices for sub allocation of funding with the local MPO and the designated recipient for federal Section 5307 funds.

Gaps in Providing Transit Service

As urbanized areas expand, there are increasing possibilities that some areas are not included within the jurisdiction of a transit provider. In particular, the four rural transit districts that have portions of areas that may become five small urbanized areas [Alamo Area Council of Governments (New Braunfels), Brazos Transit District (Conroe), Capital Area Rural Transportation System (San Marcos and Georgetown) and Cleburne] should begin the conversation to determine how transit service will be delivered and funded after new urbanized areas are announced.

TxDOT Project 0-6473 *Filling the Transit Gap* addresses other urbanized areas that are not included within the transit service area of an existing transit provider (urban gap). Urban gaps occur on the perimeter of urbanized areas that have grown beyond the jurisdiction of the transit provider in the principal city. The projections for expanded urbanized areas as a result of Census 2010 may increase the incidences of urban gaps.

REFERENCES

1. Texas Constitution and Statutes Homepage. Transportation Code, Title 6. Roadways, Subtitle K. Mass Transportation, Chapter 458, Rural and Urban Transit Districts, Sec. 458.001. Definitions. <http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/TN/htm/TN.458.htm>. Accessed August 2009.
2. U.S. Census Bureau. Disability Definitions. http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/disability/disab_defn.html. Cited 2010 February 2010.
3. Texas Administrative Code, Title 43 Transportation, Part 1 Texas Department of Transportation, Chapter 31 Public Transportation, Subchapter B State Programs, Rule §31.11 Formula Program.

APPENDICES

- [Appendix A](#): Population and Land Area for Each County
- [Appendix B](#): Population for Each Urbanized Area
- [Appendix C](#): Needs Funding Methodology and Assumptions
- [Appendix D](#): Performance Funding Methodology and Assumptions
- [Appendix E](#): Scenario A Funding Results
- [Appendix F](#): Scenario B Funding Results
- [Appendix G](#): Scenario C Funding Results

APPENDIX A: POPULATION AND LAND AREA FOR EACH COUNTY

County	2000 Population (Census)	Projected 2010 Population	Difference	% Difference	Land Area (Square Miles)
State Total	20,851,820	25,373,947	4,522,127	21.6%	262,350
Anderson	55,109	57,852	2,743	5.0%	1,071
Andrews	13,004	14,302	1,298	10.0%	1,501
Angelina	80,130	85,116	4,986	6.2%	802
Aransas	22,497	27,530	5,033	22.4%	252
Archer	8,854	9,503	649	7.3%	910
Armstrong	2,148	2,279	131	6.1%	914
Atascosa	38,628	45,883	7,255	18.8%	1,232
Austin	23,590	28,739	5,149	21.8%	653
Bailey	6,594	6,327	(267)	-4.0%	827
Bandera	17,645	21,266	3,621	20.5%	792
Bastrop	57,733	81,717	23,984	41.5%	888
Baylor	4,093	3,996	(97)	-2.4%	871
Bee	32,359	34,105	1,746	5.4%	880
Bell	237,974	291,382	53,408	22.4%	1,060
Bexar	1,392,931	1,636,642	243,711	17.5%	1,247
Blanco	8,418	10,348	1,930	22.9%	711
Borden	729	768	39	5.3%	899
Bosque	17,204	17,775	571	3.3%	989
Bowie	89,306	92,942	3,636	4.1%	888
Brazoria	241,767	319,043	77,276	32.0%	1,386
Brazos	152,415	175,512	23,097	15.2%	586
Brewster	8,866	9,484	618	7.0%	6,193
Briscoe	1,790	1,861	71	4.0%	900
Brooks	7,976	7,866	(110)	-1.4%	943
Brown	37,674	39,915	2,241	5.9%	944
Burleson	16,470	18,691	2,221	13.5%	666
Burnet	34,147	47,581	13,434	39.3%	996
Caldwell	32,194	38,724	6,530	20.3%	546
Calhoun	20,647	23,265	2,618	12.7%	512
Callahan	12,905	14,525	1,620	12.6%	899
Cameron	335,227	417,404	82,177	24.5%	906
Camp	11,549	13,400	1,851	16.0%	198
Carson	6,516	6,772	256	3.9%	923
Cass	30,438	30,631	193	0.6%	937
Castro	8,285	7,384	(901)	-10.9%	898
Chambers	26,031	35,845	9,814	0.0%	599
Cherokee	46,659	49,990	3,331	7.1%	1,052
Childress	7,688	7,935	247	3.2%	710

Source: The Institute for Demographic & Socioeconomic Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio

County	2000 Population (Census)	Projected 2010 Population	Difference	% Difference	Land Area (Square Miles)
Clay	11,006	11,218	212	1.9%	1,098
Cochran	3,730	3,477	(253)	-6.8%	775
Coke	3,864	3,920	56	1.4%	899
Coleman	9,235	8,937	(298)	-3.2%	1,260
Collin	491,675	842,364	350,689	71.3%	848
Collingsworth	3,206	3,155	(51)	-1.6%	919
Colorado	20,390	22,255	1,865	9.1%	963
Comal	78,021	121,020	42,999	55.1%	561
Comanche	14,026	14,267	241	1.7%	938
Concho	3,966	3,851	(115)	-2.9%	991
Cooke	36,363	40,851	4,488	12.3%	874
Coryell	74,978	81,216	6,238	8.3%	1,052
Cottle	1,904	1,873	(31)	-1.6%	901
Crane	3,996	4,299	303	7.6%	786
Crockett	4,099	4,592	493	12.0%	2,807
Crosby	7,072	6,534	(538)	-7.6%	900
Culberson	2,975	2,707	(268)	-9.0%	3,812
Dallam	6,222	6,758	536	8.6%	1,505
Dallas	2,218,899	2,435,919	217,020	9.8%	880
Dawson	14,985	14,792	(193)	-1.3%	902
Deaf Smith	18,561	20,547	1,986	10.7%	1,497
Delta	5,327	5,330	3	0.1%	277
Denton	432,976	706,103	273,127	63.1%	889
De Witt	20,013	20,570	557	2.8%	909
Dickens	2,762	2,795	33	1.2%	904
Dimmit	10,248	9,761	(487)	-4.8%	1,331
Donley	3,828	3,871	43	1.1%	930
Duval	13,120	12,041	(1,079)	-8.2%	1,793
Eastland	18,297	18,800	503	2.7%	926
Ector	121,123	132,817	11,694	9.7%	901
Edwards	2,162	2,213	51	2.4%	2,120
Ellis	111,360	159,281	47,921	43.0%	940
El Paso	679,622	773,125	93,503	13.8%	1,013
Erath	33,001	39,701	6,700	20.3%	1,086
Falls	18,576	18,745	169	0.9%	769
Fannin	31,242	34,764	3,522	11.3%	891
Fayette	21,804	25,232	3,428	15.7%	950
Fisher	4,344	4,165	(179)	-4.1%	901
Floyd	7,771	6,910	(861)	-11.1%	992
Foard	1,622	1,582	(40)	-2.5%	707
Fort Bend	354,452	577,444	222,992	62.9%	875
Franklin	9,458	10,955	1,497	15.8%	286

Source: The Institute for Demographic & Socioeconomic Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio

County	2000 Population (Census)	Projected 2010 Population	Difference	% Difference	Land Area (Square Miles)
Freestone	17,867	20,430	2,563	14.3%	877
Frio	16,252	17,956	1,704	10.5%	1,133
Gaines	14,467	16,459	1,992	13.8%	1,502
Galveston	250,158	293,945	43,787	17.5%	398
Garza	4,872	5,240	368	7.6%	896
Gillespie	20,814	25,873	5,059	24.3%	1,061
Glasscock	1,406	1,525	119	8.5%	901
Goliad	6,928	7,712	784	11.3%	854
Gonzales	18,628	20,371	1,743	9.4%	1,068
Gray	22,744	22,864	120	0.5%	928
Grayson	110,595	120,798	10,203	9.2%	934
Gregg	111,379	122,993	11,614	10.4%	274
Grimes	23,552	26,428	2,876	12.2%	794
Guadalupe	89,023	128,975	39,952	44.9%	711
Hale	36,602	37,156	554	1.5%	1,005
Hall	3,782	3,840	58	1.5%	903
Hamilton	8,229	8,938	709	8.6%	836
Hansford	5,369	5,221	(148)	-2.8%	920
Hardeman	4,724	4,609	(115)	-2.4%	695
Hardin	48,073	52,181	4,108	8.5%	894
Harris	3,400,578	4,096,052	695,474	20.5%	1,729
Harrison	62,110	67,673	5,563	9.0%	899
Hartley	5,537	5,810	273	4.9%	1,462
Haskell	6,093	5,899	(194)	-3.2%	903
Hays	97,589	164,078	66,489	68.1%	678
Hemphill	3,351	3,600	249	7.4%	910
Henderson	73,277	81,314	8,037	11.0%	874
Hidalgo	569,463	793,137	223,674	39.3%	1,570
Hill	32,321	37,008	4,687	14.5%	962
Hockley	22,716	23,855	1,139	5.0%	908
Hood	41,100	54,656	13,556	33.0%	422
Hopkins	31,960	34,605	2,645	8.3%	782
Houston	23,185	24,488	1,303	5.6%	1,231
Howard	33,627	33,536	(91)	-0.3%	903
Hudspeth	3,344	3,812	468	14.0%	4,571
Hunt	76,596	89,977	13,381	17.5%	841
Hutchinson	23,857	23,546	(311)	-1.3%	887
Irion	1,771	1,824	53	3.0%	1,051
Jack	8,763	9,079	316	3.6%	917
Jackson	14,391	15,360	969	6.7%	829
Jasper	35,604	35,873	269	0.8%	937
Jeff Davis	2,207	2,846	639	29.0%	2,264

Source: The Institute for Demographic & Socioeconomic Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio

County	2000 Population (Census)	Projected 2010 Population	Difference	% Difference	Land Area (Square Miles)
Jefferson	252,051	242,826	(9,225)	-3.7%	904
Jim Hogg	5,281	5,506	225	4.3%	1,136
Jim Wells	39,326	42,455	3,129	8.0%	865
Johnson	126,811	169,350	42,539	33.5%	729
Jones	20,785	20,783	(2)	0.0%	931
Karnes	15,446	16,838	1,392	9.0%	750
Kaufman	71,313	107,604	36,291	50.9%	786
Kendall	23,743	35,351	11,608	48.9%	662
Kennedy	414	470	56	13.5%	1,457
Kent	859	860	1	0.1%	902
Kerr	43,653	46,829	3,176	7.3%	1,106
Kimble	4,468	4,784	316	7.1%	1,251
King	356	376	20	5.6%	912
Kinney	3,379	3,449	70	2.1%	1,363
Kleberg	31,549	31,990	441	1.4%	871
Knox	4,253	4,240	(13)	-0.3%	849
Lamar	48,499	50,336	1,837	3.8%	917
Lamb	14,709	15,586	877	6.0%	1,016
Lampasas	17,762	22,609	4,847	27.3%	712
La Salle	5,866	6,029	163	2.8%	1,489
Lavaca	19,210	19,565	355	1.8%	970
Lee	15,657	18,119	2,462	15.7%	629
Leon	15,335	16,966	1,631	10.6%	1,072
Liberty	70,154	81,895	11,741	16.7%	1,160
Limestone	22,051	23,379	1,328	6.0%	909
Lipscomb	3,057	3,167	110	3.6%	932
Live Oak	12,309	12,409	100	0.8%	1,036
Llano	17,044	19,344	2,300	13.5%	935
Loving	67	65	(2)	-3.0%	673
Lubbock	242,628	267,891	25,263	10.4%	899
Lynn	6,550	5,933	(617)	-9.4%	892
McCulloch	8,205	8,669	464	5.7%	1,069
McLennan	213,517	233,552	20,035	9.4%	1,042
McMullen	851	878	27	3.2%	1,113
Madison	12,940	14,495	1,555	12.0%	470
Marion	10,941	11,032	91	0.8%	381
Martin	4,746	5,308	562	11.8%	915
Mason	3,738	3,837	99	2.6%	932
Matagorda	37,957	38,833	876	2.3%	1,114
Maverick	47,297	55,221	7,924	16.8%	1,280
Medina	39,304	45,657	6,353	16.2%	1,328
Menard	2,360	2,444	84	3.6%	902

Source: The Institute for Demographic & Socioeconomic Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio

County	2000 Population (Census)	Projected 2010 Population	Difference	% Difference	Land Area (Square Miles)
Midland	116,009	129,715	13,706	11.8%	900
Milam	24,238	26,461	2,223	9.2%	1,017
Mills	5,151	5,520	369	7.2%	748
Mitchell	9,698	9,802	104	1.1%	910
Montague	19,117	20,232	1,115	5.8%	931
Montgomery	293,768	476,502	182,734	62.2%	1,044
Moore	20,121	21,097	976	4.9%	900
Morris	13,048	13,534	486	3.7%	255
Motley	1,426	1,422	(4)	-0.3%	989
Nacogdoches	59,203	64,297	5,094	8.6%	947
Navarro	45,124	51,617	6,493	14.4%	1,008
Newton	15,072	14,887	(185)	0.0%	933
Nolan	15,802	14,411	(1,391)	-8.8%	912
Nueces	313,645	323,890	10,245	3.3%	836
Ochiltree	9,006	9,985	979	10.9%	918
Oldham	2,185	2,341	156	7.1%	1,501
Orange	84,966	84,911	(55)	-0.1%	356
Palo Pinto	27,026	29,650	2,624	9.7%	953
Panola	22,756	24,119	1,363	6.0%	801
Parker	88,495	118,438	29,943	33.8%	904
Parmer	10,016	10,226	210	2.1%	882
Pecos	16,809	17,819	1,010	6.0%	4,764
Polk	41,133	49,936	8,803	21.4%	1,057
Potter	113,546	126,354	12,808	11.3%	909
Presidio	7,304	8,663	1,359	18.6%	3,856
Rains	9,139	10,962	1,823	19.9%	232
Randall	104,312	120,306	15,994	15.3%	914
Reagan	3,326	3,121	(205)	-6.2%	1,175
Real	3,047	3,351	304	10.0%	700
Red River	14,314	14,392	78	0.5%	1,050
Reeves	13,137	11,067	(2,070)	-15.8%	2,636
Refugio	7,828	7,125	(703)	-9.0%	770
Roberts	887	948	61	6.9%	924
Robertson	16,000	16,893	893	5.6%	855
Rockwall	43,080	85,251	42,171	97.9%	129
Runnels	11,495	11,770	275	2.4%	1,051
Rusk	47,372	50,021	2,649	5.6%	924
Sabine	10,469	10,847	378	3.6%	490
San Augustine	8,946	9,581	635	7.1%	528
San Jacinto	22,246	28,137	5,891	26.5%	571
San Patricio	67,138	70,895	3,757	5.6%	692
San Saba	6,186	6,389	203	3.3%	1,134

Source: The Institute for Demographic & Socioeconomic Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio

County	2000 Population (Census)	Projected 2010 Population	Difference	% Difference	Land Area (Square Miles)
Schleicher	2,935	3,193	258	8.8%	1,311
Scurry	16,361	17,200	839	5.1%	902
Shackelford	3,302	3,464	162	4.9%	914
Shelby	25,224	26,609	1,385	5.5%	794
Sherman	3,186	3,361	175	5.5%	923
Smith	174,706	206,781	32,075	18.4%	928
Somervell	6,809	8,596	1,787	26.2%	187
Starr	53,597	67,382	13,785	25.7%	1,223
Stephens	9,674	10,258	584	6.0%	895
Sterling	1,393	1,473	80	5.7%	923
Stonewall	1,693	1,642	(51)	-3.0%	919
Sutton	4,077	4,630	553	13.6%	1,454
Swisher	8,378	8,209	(169)	-2.0%	900
Tarrant	1,446,219	1,825,548	379,329	26.2%	863
Taylor	126,555	131,285	4,730	3.7%	916
Terrell	1,081	1,107	26	2.4%	2,358
Terry	12,761	11,521	(1,240)	-9.7%	890
Throckmorton	1,850	1,889	39	2.1%	912
Titus	28,118	32,001	3,883	13.8%	411
Tom Green	104,010	103,750	(260)	-0.2%	1,522
Travis	812,280	992,773	180,493	22.2%	989
Trinity	13,779	15,180	1,401	10.2%	693
Tyler	20,871	22,127	1,256	6.0%	923
Upshur	35,291	38,291	3,000	8.5%	588
Upton	3,404	3,148	(256)	-7.5%	1,242
Uvalde	25,926	27,857	1,931	7.4%	1,557
Val Verde	44,856	50,067	5,211	11.6%	3,170
Van Zandt	48,140	53,658	5,518	11.5%	849
Victoria	84,088	89,158	5,070	6.0%	883
Walker	61,758	65,237	3,479	5.6%	787
Waller	32,663	42,309	9,646	29.5%	514
Ward	10,909	9,914	(995)	-9.1%	835
Washington	30,373	33,479	3,106	10.2%	609
Webb	193,117	257,590	64,473	33.4%	3,357
Wharton	41,188	43,789	2,601	6.3%	1,090
Wheeler	5,284	5,138	(146)	-2.8%	914
Wichita	131,664	127,695	(3,969)	-3.0%	628
Wilbarger	14,676	15,287	611	4.2%	971
Willacy	20,082	22,035	1,953	9.7%	597
Williamson	249,967	435,355	185,388	74.2%	1,123
Wilson	32,408	45,517	13,109	40.4%	807

Source: The Institute for Demographic & Socioeconomic Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio

County	2000 Population (Census)	Projected 2010 Population	Difference	% Difference	Land Area (Square Miles)
Winkler	7,173	6,573	(600)	-8.4%	841
Wise	48,793	61,562	12,769	26.2%	905
Wood	36,752	44,888	8,136	22.1%	650
Yoakum	7,322	8,260	938	12.8%	800
Young	17,943	18,637	694	3.9%	922
Zapata	12,182	15,266	3,084	25.3%	997
Zavala	11,600	12,844	1,244	10.7%	1,298

Source: The Institute for Demographic & Socioeconomic Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio

APPENDIX B: POPULATION FOR EACH URBANIZED AREA

Urban Area	Census 2000	Projected		Percent
		2010 Change		
Abilene	107,041	112,000	4,959	4.6
Amarillo	179,312	201,000	21,688	12.1
Austin	901,920	1,183,000	281,080	31.2
Beaumont	139,304	140,000	696	0.5
Brownsville	165,776	215,000	49,224	29.7
Cleburne	36,863	52,000	15,137	41.1
College St - Bryan	132,500	152,000	19,500	14.7
Conroe	41,402	58,000	16,598	40.1
Corpus Christi	293,925	304,000	10,075	3.4
Dallas - Ft Worth - Arlington	4,145,659	5,115,000	969,341	23.4
Denton - Lewisville	299,823	432,000	132,177	44.1
Eagle Pass	41,829	47,000	5,171	12.4
El Paso	648,465	714,000	65,535	10.1
Galveston	54,770	54,000	(770)	-1.4
Georgetown	32,663	59,000	26,337	80.6
Harlingen	110,770	132,000	21,230	19.2
Houston	3,822,509	4,831,000	1,008,491	26.4
Killeen	167,976	200,000	32,024	19.1
Lake Jackson-Angleton	73,416	79,000	5,584	7.6
Laredo	175,586	227,000	51,414	29.3
Longview	78,070	83,000	4,930	6.3
Lubbock	202,225	225,000	22,775	11.3
McAllen	523,144	740,000	216,856	41.5
McKinney	54,525	147,000	92,475	169.6
Midland	99,221	112,000	12,779	12.9
New Braunfels	39,709	62,000	22,291	56.1
Odessa	111,395	123,000	11,605	10.4
Port Arthur	114,656	114,000	(656)	-0.6
San Angelo	87,969	88,000	31	0.0
San Antonio	1,327,554	1,567,000	239,446	18.0
San Marcos - Kyle	47,333	80,000	32,667	69.0
Sherman	56,168	62,000	5,832	10.4
Temple	71,937	86,000	14,063	19.5
Texarkana	48,767	54,000	5,233	10.7
Texas City	96,417	111,000	14,583	15.1
The Woodlands	89,445	183,000	93,555	104.6
Tyler	101,494	125,000	23,506	23.2
Victoria	61,529	65,000	3,471	5.6
Waco	153,198	170,000	16,802	11.0
Wichita Falls	99,396	97,000	(2,396)	-2.4
Total	15,085,079	18,601,000	3,565,339	23.6

APPENDIX C: NEEDS FUNDING METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS

Urban and Rural Transit District Needs Allocation Methodology

The Texas Public Transportation Funding Formula allocates funds to each transit district according to needs and performance. Needs is allocated based on population for state funded urban transit districts and on population and land area for rural transit districts. For state funded urban transit districts, 50 percent of the available funds are allocated to needs and then distributed to each urban transit district based on the transit district portion of the population. For any state funded urban transit district with a population equal to or greater than 200,000, the maximum population of 199,999 is used for allocation of funding for need. For rural transit districts, 65 percent of funds are allocated to needs and then distributed to rural transit districts based the transit district population (weighted 75 percent) and land area (weighted 25 percent). [Figure C1](#) illustrates the needs side of the Texas Public Transportation Funding Formula.

For each scenario, researchers determined for each transit district the needs funding factor. The needs funding factor is a ratio of each transit district needs to total state needs. Researchers then calculated the transit district needs funding level by multiplying this needs factor by the total needs funding available.




Figure C1. State Transit District Needs Funding.

APPENDIX D: PERFORMANCE FUNDING METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS

For each scenario, researchers calculated a performance factor for each of the transit districts. The performance factor portion of the formula is based on several performance measures. The performance measures for urban transit districts are weighted differently as follows:

- local investment per operating expense – 30 percent,
- revenue miles per operating expenses – 20 percent,
- passengers per revenue mile – 30 percent, and
- passengers per capita – 20 percent.

The population used to calculate the passengers per capita measure for urban transit districts is based on total service area population. This differs from the needs factor calculation where the population is capped at 199,999 for calculating the needs factor.

The three performance measures for rural transit districts are weighted equally as follows:

- local investment per operating expense – 33 percent,
- revenue miles per operating expenses – 33 percent, and
- passengers per revenue mile – 33 percent.

For state funded urban transit districts, 50 percent of the available funds are allocated to performance and then distributed to each urban transit district based on the transit district portion of the population. For rural transit districts, 35 percent of funds are allocated to performance.

[Figure D1](#) illustrates the performance side of the Texas Public Transportation Funding Formula.




Figure D1. State Transit District Performance Funding.

For each scenario, researchers calculated the transit district performance measures based on the 2009 rural transit district state reported data and the 2008 urban transit district state reported data (2009 urban transit district data was not finalized at the time of this report). For new transit districts, researchers assumed the median performance for each measure.

Urban Transit District Performance Measures (Fiscal Year 2008 Data).

Principal City	Local Funds/ Operating Expense	Ridership/ Capita	Passengers / Revenue Mile	Revenue Miles / Operating Expense
State-Funded Urban Transit Districts				
Abilene	56%	5.86	0.61	0.35
Amarillo	43%	2.08	0.42	0.22
Beaumont	88%	5.17	0.79	0.19
Brownsville	74%	10.71	1.78	0.15
Cleburne*	45%	2.76	0.56	0.26
College Station-Bryan	45%	4.43	0.64	0.28
Conroe*	45%	2.76	0.56	0.26
Galveston	23%	25.14	2.86	0.15
Georgetown*	45%	2.76	0.56	0.26
Harlingen	5%	0.05	0.11	0.20
Killeen	54%	1.55	0.34	0.33
Lake Jackson-Angleton	10%	0.16	0.08	0.30
Laredo	65%	24.92	2.33	0.14
Longview	25%	2.37	0.53	0.24
Lubbock	72%	15.22	1.38	0.25
McAllen	66%	0.87	0.57	0.22
McKinney	57%	2.72	0.21	0.51
Midland-Odessa	30%	2.28	0.56	0.28
New Braunfels*	45%	2.76	0.56	0.26
Port Arthur	48%	1.26	0.42	0.19
San Angelo	28%	2.81	0.37	0.37
San Marcos*	45%	2.76	0.56	0.26
Sherman	37%	1.80	0.33	0.52
Temple	66%	1.78	0.35	0.26
Texarkana	32%	5.85	0.82	0.27
Texas City	14%	0.23	0.11	0.26
The Woodlands	97%	5.97	1.19	0.26
Tyler	22%	2.66	0.64	0.19
Victoria	46%	5.15	0.57	0.35
Waco	49%	4.87	0.51	0.26
Wichita Falls	28%	3.24	0.67	0.33
Limited Eligibility Providers				
Arlington	45%	0.30	0.14	0.31
Grand Prairie	28%	0.31	0.31	0.23
Mesquite	36%	0.32	0.15	0.39
NETS	11%	0.07	0.11	0.36

*Assumes the median performance for new urban transit districts

Rural Transit District Performance Measures (Fiscal Year 2009 Data).

Rural Transit District	Local Funds/ Operating Expense	Revenue Miles / Operating Expense	Passengers / Revenue Mile
Alamo Area COG	58%	0.41	0.09
Ark-Tex COG	45%	0.55	0.30
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	41%	0.45	0.04
Bee Community Action Agency	25%	0.38	0.12
Brazos Transit District	37%	0.26	0.29
Community Act. Council of South Texas	22%	0.21	0.38
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	123%	0.43	0.19
Community Council of Southwest Texas	67%	0.46	0.13
Cleburne City of	28%	0.29	0.14
Collin County Committee on Aging	15%	0.60	0.11
Concho Valley COG	35%	0.20	0.23
Community Services, Inc.	55%	0.41	0.20
Central Texas Rural Transit District	87%	0.42	0.12
Colorado Valley Transit	62%	0.36	0.15
Del Rio, City of	40%	0.33	0.25
El Paso, County of	55%	0.38	0.26
East Texas COG	21%	0.33	0.09
Fort Bend County	75%	0.40	0.22
Gulf Coast Center	11%	0.26	0.10
Golden Crescent RPC	71%	0.53	0.13
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	46%	0.48	0.13
Hill Country Transit District	62%	0.36	0.20
Heart of Texas COG	22%	0.53	0.09
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	61%	0.48	0.15
Kleberg County Human Services	10%	0.24	0.26
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	23%	0.41	0.14
Panhandle Community Services	31%	0.38	0.30
Public Transit Services	57%	0.63	0.10
Rural Economic Assist. League	43%	0.46	0.31
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	46%	0.43	0.17
South East Texas RPC	50%	0.23	0.15
Services Program for Aging Needs	61%	0.37	0.11
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	50%	0.33	0.13
South Padre Island, Town of	0%	0.41	1.45
Texoma Area Paratransit System	37%	0.44	0.13
Transit System Inc., The	49%	0.28	0.11
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	34%	0.32	0.38
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	64%	0.39	0.08

The transit district performance factor is calculated in a two-step process. First, for each performance measure a ratio is calculated by dividing the transit district performance measure by the sum total of all transit districts for that measure. This ratio differs between scenarios as the number of transit districts changes the denominator, sum total of all transit districts. Second, for each transit district, each of the ratios is then multiplied by the weight for the performance measure and then summed together for a total. An example of the performance factor calculation is shown below. Researchers then calculated the performance funding by transit district by multiplying the performance factor to the total funding available for performance.

Performance Factor Calculation Example

	Local Funds/ Operating Expense (30%)	Ridership / Capita (20%)	Passengers / Revenue Mile (30%)	Revenue Miles / Operating Expense (20%)	Performance Factor
Step 1: Ratio Calculation					
Urban Transit District Performance	56%	5.86	0.61	0.35	
/ Total of all Urban Transit Districts	11.80	139.15	19.20	7.09	
= Ratio	0.0478	0.0421	0.0317	0.0492	
Step 2: Performance Factor					
* Measure Weight	30%	20%	30%	20%	
= Performance Factor	1.44%	.84%	.95%	.98%	4.21%

APPENDIX E: SCENARIO A FUNDING RESULTS

Scenario A. Urban Transit Needs Factor - Current and Projected 2010.

Principal City	Current (based on 2000 Census)			Projected 2010		
	Population	Adjusted Population	Needs Factor	Population	Adjusted Population	Needs Factor
Total Urban	4,254,890	3,256,332		5,424,950	3,966,771	
Total Urban Transit District	3,356,007	3,020,019	100%	4,406,128	3,764,111	100%
Abilene	107,041	107,041	3.5%	112,253	112,253	3.0%
Amarillo	179,312	179,312	5.9%	201,289	199,999	5.3%
Beaumont	139,304	139,304	4.6%	140,223	140,223	3.7%
Brownsville	165,776	165,776	5.5%	214,428	199,999	5.3%
Cleburne (New)				51,866	51,866	1.4%
College Station-Bryan	132,500	132,500	4.4%	151,722	151,722	4.0%
Conroe (New)				58,417	58,417	1.5%
Galveston	54,770	54,770	1.8%	54,240	54,240	1.4%
Georgetown (New)				58,851	58,851	1.6%
Harlingen	110,770	110,770	3.7%	132,033	132,033	3.5%
Killeen	167,976	167,976	5.6%	200,475	199,999	5.3%
Lake Jackson-Angleton	73,416	73,416	2.4%	78,789	78,789	2.1%
Laredo	175,586	175,586	5.8%	227,202	199,999	5.3%
Longview	78,070	78,070	2.6%	83,225	83,225	2.2%
Lubbock	202,225	199,999	6.6%	223,853	199,999	5.3%
McAllen	523,144	199,999	6.6%	739,217	199,999	5.3%
McKinney	54,525	54,525	1.8%	145,824	145,824	3.9%
Midland-Odessa	210,616	199,999	6.6%	235,546	199,999	5.3%
New Braunfels (New)				62,419	62,419	1.7%
Port Arthur	114,656	114,656	3.8%	114,274	114,274	3.0%
San Angelo	87,969	87,969	2.9%	87,710	87,710	2.3%
San Marcos (New)				79,748	79,748	2.1%
Sherman	56,168	56,168	1.9%	62,140	62,140	1.7%
Temple	71,937	71,937	2.4%	86,175	86,175	2.3%
Texarkana	48,767	48,767	1.6%	53,987	53,987	1.4%
Texas City	96,417	96,417	3.2%	110,875	110,875	3.0%
The Woodlands	89,445	89,445	3.0%	180,880	180,880	4.8%
Tyler	101,494	101,494	3.4%	125,471	125,471	3.3%
Victoria	61,529	61,529	2.0%	65,378	65,378	1.7%
Waco	153,198	153,198	5.1%	170,155	170,155	4.5%
Wichita Falls	99,396	99,396	3.3%	97,463	97,463	2.6%
Limited Eligibility Providers	898,883	236,313	100%	1,018,822	202,660	100%
Arlington	335,164	86,396	36.6%	387,086	74,561	36.8%
Grand Prairie	126,889	37,995	16.1%	154,157	32,673	16.1%
Mesquite	123,800	34,209	14.5%	136,565	27,424	13.5%
NETS	313,030	77,713	33.0%	341,014	68,002	33.6%

Scenario A. Rural Transit District Needs Factor - Current and Projected 2010.

Rural Transit District	Current (Census 2000)			Projected 2010		
	Population	Land Area	Needs Factor Po	Population	Land Area 25%	Needs Factor
Total	5,762,803	251,954	100%	6,455,67	251,437 10	0%
Alamo Area COG	392,995	10,130	6.12%	439,261	10,090	6.11%
Ark-Tex COG	221,701	5,761	3.46%	230,739	5,761	3.25%
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	39,877	6,317	1.15%	39,478	6,317	1.09%
Bee Community Action Agency	75,844	4,051	1.39%	82,047	4,051	1.36%
Brazos Transit District	798,164	16,910	12.07%	870,258	16,835	11.79%
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	427,869	7,192	6.28%	494,444	7,082	6.45%
Central Texas Rural Transit District	184,925	10,693	3.47%	195,080	10,690	3.33%
Cleburne City of	103,238	710	1.41%	78,295	677	0.98%
Collin County Committee on Aging	56,516	689	0.80%	100,216	650	1.23%
Colorado Valley Transit	117,124	3,220	1.84%	135,438	3,220	1.89%
Community Act. Council of South Texas	84,180	5,149	1.61%	100,195	5,149	1.68%
Community Council of Southwest Texas	109,525	11,138	2.53%	120,725	11,138	2.51%
Community Services, Inc.	135,414	1,924	1.95%	170,698	1,921	2.17%
Concho Valley COG	56,505	15,309	2.26%	58,541	15,309	2.20%
Del Rio, City of	44,856	3,170	0.90%	50,067	3,170	0.90%
East Texas COG	565,616	9,613	8.32%	624,278	9,607	8.21%
El Paso, County of	31,157	809	0.49%	59,174	781	0.77%
Fort Bend County	37,891	747	0.57%	50,701	705	0.66%
Golden Crescent RPC	160,333	7,088	2.79%	169,456	7,087	2.67%
Gulf Coast Center	102,725	1,570	1.49%	114,403	1,545	1.48%
Heart of Texas COG	168,338	5,478	2.73%	180,734	5,473	2.64%
Hill Country Transit District	155,387	8,321	2.85%	179,046	8,313	2.91%
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	82,737	896	1.17%	132,068	886	1.62%
Kleberg County Human Services	31,963	2,328	0.65%	32,460	2,328	0.61%
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	122,660	2,641	1.86%	44,271	2,614	1.94%
Panhandle Community Services	223,550	25,749	5.46%	235,286	25,744	5.29%
Public Transit Services	117,544	2,765	1.80%	141,657	2,763	1.92%
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	86,084	6,553	1.77%	85,719	6,553	1.65%
Rural Economic Assist. League	96,923	2,491	1.51%	102,017	2,491	1.43%
Services Program for Aging Needs	62,453	748	0.89%	99,474	711	1.23%
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	76,596	841	1.08%	89,977	841	1.13%
South East Texas RPC	131,130	2,027	1.91%	125,421	2,023	1.66%
South Padre Island, Town of	2,422	2	0.03%	2,627	2	0.03%
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	201,705	15,342	4.15%	206,432	15,337	3.92%
Texoma Area Paratransit System	200,664	5,601	3.17%	226,167	5,599	3.18%
Transit System Inc., The	47,909	609	0.68%	63,252	609	0.80%
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	17,531	3,314	0.56%	30,388	3,313	0.68%
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	190,752	44,056	6.85%	195,180	44,053	6.65%

Scenario A. Urban Transit Needs State Funding - Current and Projected 2010.

	Current (based on 2000 Census) Pr		Projected 2010		
Principal City	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	Difference
Total Urban		\$5,029,687		\$5,029,687	\$0
Total Urban Transit Districts 1	00%	\$4,698,734	100%	\$4,808,519	\$109,786
Abilene 3	.54%	\$166,541	2.98%	\$143,399	\$(23,142)
Amarillo 5	.94%	\$278,985	5.31%	\$255,492	\$(23,493)
Beaumont 4	.61%	\$216,738	3.73%	\$179,130	\$(37,608)
Brownsville 5	.49%	\$257,925	5.31%	\$255,492	\$(2,433)
Cleburne (New)			1.38%	\$6,257	\$6,257
College Station-Bryan	4.39%	\$206,152	4.03%	\$193,820	\$(12,332)
Conroe (New)			1.55%	\$7,462	\$7,462
Galveston 1.	81%	\$85,215	1.44%	\$69,290	\$(15,925)
Georgetown (New)			1.56%	\$7,518	\$7,518
Harlingen 3	.67%	\$172,343	3.51%	\$168,667	\$(3,675)
Killeen 5	.56%	\$261,348	5.31%	\$255,492	\$(5,856)
Lake Jackson-Angleton	2.43%	\$114,225	2.09%	\$100,650	\$(13,575)
Laredo 5	.81%	\$273,188	5.31%	\$255,492	\$(17,696)
Longview 2.	.59%	\$121,466	2.21%	\$106,317	\$(15,149)
Lubbock 6	.62%	\$311,171	5.31%	\$255,492	\$(55,679)
McAllen 6	.62%	\$311,171	5.31%	\$255,492	\$(55,679)
McKinney	1.81%	\$84,833	3.87%	\$186,285	\$101,452
Midland-Odessa 6	.62%	\$311,171	5.31%	\$255,492	\$(55,679)
New Braunfels (New)			1.66%	\$79,738	\$79,738
Port Arthur	3.80%	\$178,389	3.04%	\$145,981	\$(32,408)
San Angelo	2.91%	\$136,868	2.33%	\$112,046	\$(24,821)
San Marcos (New)			2.12%	\$101,875	\$101,875
Sherman 1.	86%	\$87,390	1.65%	\$79,382	\$(8,008)
Temple 2	.38%	\$111,924	2.29%	\$110,086	\$(1,839)
Texarkana 1.	61%	\$75,875	1.43%	\$68,966	\$(6,908)
Texas City	3.19%	\$150,012	2.95%	\$141,639	\$(8,373)
The Woodlands	2.96%	\$139,164	4.81%	\$231,068	\$91,904
Tyler 3	.36%	\$157,911	3.33%	\$160,285	\$2,374
Victoria 2.	.04%	\$95,731	1.74%	\$83,518	\$(12,213)
Waco 5	.07%	\$238,355	4.52%	\$217,367	\$(20,988)
Wichita Falls	3.29%	\$154,646	2.59%	\$124,506	\$(30,141)
Limited Eligibility Providers 1	00%	\$330,954	100%	\$221,168	\$(109,786)
Arlington 36	.56%	\$120,996	36.79%	\$81,370	\$(39,626)
Grand Prairie	16.08%	\$53,211	16.12%	\$35,657	\$(17,555)
Mesquite 14	.48%	\$47,909	13.53%	\$29,929	\$(17,981)
NETS 32	.89%	\$108,836	33.55%	\$74,212	\$(34,624)

Scenario A. Rural Transit Needs State Funding - Current and Projected 2010.

Cu Rural Transit District	Current		Projected 2010		Difference
	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	
Total	100% \$	12,044,172	100%	\$12,044,172	\$0
Alamo Area COG	6.12%	\$743,158	6.11%	\$741,458	(\$1,700)
Ark-Tex COG	3.46%	\$419,787	3.25%	\$395,015	(\$24,772)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	1.15%	\$139,160	1.09%	\$131,996	(\$7,164)
Bee Community Action Agency	1.39%	\$168,668	1.36%	\$164,660	(\$4,008)
Brazos Transit District	12.07%	\$1,465,065	11.79%	\$1,431,064	(\$34,001)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	6.28%	\$762,830	6.45%	\$782,987	\$20,157
Central Texas Rural Transit District	3.47%	\$421,123	3.33%	\$404,365	(\$16,758)
Cleburne City of	1.41%	\$171,703	0.98%	\$118,638	(\$53,065)
Collin County Committee on Aging	0.80%	\$97,631	1.23%	\$149,239	\$51,608
Colorado Valley Transit	1.84%	\$223,919	1.89%	\$229,990	\$6,071
Community Act. Council of South Texas	1.61%	\$195,140	1.68%	\$203,518	\$8,378
Community Council of Southwest Texas	2.53%	\$307,342	2.51%	\$304,792	(\$2,550)
Community Services, Inc.	1.95%	\$237,276	2.17%	\$263,991	\$26,715
Concho Valley COG	2.26%	\$273,827	2.20%	\$267,391	(\$6,436)
Del Rio, City of	0.90%	\$109,045	0.90%	\$108,924	(\$121)
East Texas COG	8.32%	\$1,009,699	8.21%	\$996,706	(\$12,993)
El Paso, County of	0.49%	\$59,015	0.77%	\$93,016	\$34,001
Fort Bend County	0.57%	\$68,973	0.66%	\$80,023	\$11,050
Golden Crescent RPC	2.79%	\$338,793	2.67%	\$324,707	(\$14,086)
Gulf Coast Center	1.49%	\$181,296	1.48%	\$180,082	(\$1,214)
Heart of Texas COG	2.73%	\$331,992	2.64%	\$321,064	(\$10,928)
Hill Country Transit District	2.85% \$	345,836	2.91%	\$352,879	\$7,043
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	1.17%	\$141,589	1.62%	\$197,083	\$55,494
Kleberg County Human Services	0.65%	\$78,566	0.61%	\$73,951	(\$4,615)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	1.86%	\$225,619	1.94%	\$235,090	\$9,471
Panhandle Community Services	5.46%	\$663,499	5.29%	\$642,856	(\$20,643)
Public Transit Services	1.80%	\$219,062	1.92%	\$233,148	\$14,086
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	1.77%	\$215,054	1.65%	\$200,118	(\$14,936)
Rural Economic Assist. League	1.51%	\$183,239	1.43%	\$174,011	(\$9,228)
Services Program for Aging Needs	0.89%	\$107,709	1.23%	\$148,996	\$41,287
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	1.08%	\$131,145	1.13%	\$137,096	\$5,951
South East Texas RPC	1.91%	\$231,569	1.66%	\$201,454	(\$30,115)
South Padre Island, Town of	0.03%	\$3,886	0.03%	\$3,764	(\$122)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	4.15%	\$503,574	3.92%	\$476,495	(\$27,079)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	3.17%	\$384,572	3.18%	\$386,636	\$2,064
Transit System Inc., The	0.68%	\$83,059	0.80%	\$96,659	\$13,600
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	0.56%	\$67,637	0.68%	\$82,937	\$15,300
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	6.85% \$	832,288	6.65%	\$807,273	(\$25,015)

Scenario A. Rural Transit Needs Federal Funding - Current and Projected 2010.

Cu Rural Transit District	Current		Projected 2010		Difference
	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	
Total 1	00%	\$13,068,091	100%	\$13,068,091	\$0
Alamo Area COG	6.12%	\$799,751	6.11%	\$797,922	(\$1,829)
Ark-Tex COG	3.46%	\$451,755	3.25%	\$425,096	(\$26,659)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	1.15%	\$149,757	1.09%	\$142,047	(\$7,710)
Bee Community Action Agency	1.39%	\$181,512	1.36%	\$177,200	(\$4,312)
Brazos Transit District	12.07%	\$1,576,634	11.79%	\$1,540,044	(\$36,590)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	6.28%	\$820,921	6.45%	\$842,614	\$21,693
Central Texas Rural Transit District	3.47%	\$453,192	3.33%	\$435,159	(\$18,033)
Cleburne City of	1.41%	\$184,779	0.98%	\$127,673	(\$57,106)
Collin County Committee on Aging	0.80%	\$105,065	1.23%	\$160,604	\$55,539
Colorado Valley Transit	1.84%	\$240,971	1.89%	\$247,505	\$6,534
Community Act. Council of South Texas	1.61%	\$210,000	1.68%	\$219,017	\$9,017
Community Council of Southwest Texas	2.53%	\$330,747	2.51%	\$328,003	(\$2,744)
Community Services, Inc.	1.95%	\$255,345	2.17%	\$284,095	\$28,750
Concho Valley COG	2.26%	\$294,680	2.20%	\$287,754	(\$6,926)
Del Rio, City of	0.90%	\$117,349	0.90%	\$117,218	(\$131)
East Texas COG	8.32%	\$1,086,590	8.21%	\$1,072,607	(\$13,983)
El Paso, County of	0.49%	\$63,510	0.77%	\$100,100	\$36,590
Fort Bend County	0.57%	\$74,225	0.66%	\$86,117	\$11,892
Golden Crescent RPC	2.79%	\$364,592	2.67%	\$349,434	(\$15,158)
Gulf Coast Center	1.49%	\$195,103	1.48%	\$193,796	(\$1,307)
Heart of Texas COG	2.73%	\$357,274	2.64%	\$345,513	(\$11,761)
Hill Country Transit District	2.85%	\$372,172	2.91%	\$379,751	\$7,579
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	1.17%	\$152,371	1.62%	\$212,091	\$59,720
Kleberg County Human Services	0.65%	\$84,549	0.61%	\$79,583	(\$4,966)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	1.86%	\$242,800	1.94%	\$252,993	\$10,193
Panhandle Community Services	5.46%	\$714,026	5.29%	\$691,811	(\$22,215)
Public Transit Services	1.80%	\$235,744	1.92%	\$250,902	\$15,158
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	1.77%	\$231,431	1.65%	\$215,358	(\$16,073)
Rural Economic Assist. League	1.51%	\$197,194	1.43%	\$187,262	(\$9,932)
Services Program for Aging Needs	0.89%	\$115,912	1.23%	\$160,342	\$44,430
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	1.08%	\$141,133	1.13%	\$147,536	\$6,403
South East Texas RPC	1.91%	\$249,203	1.66%	\$216,795	(\$32,408)
South Padre Island, Town of	0.03%	\$4,182	0.03%	\$4,051	(\$131)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	4.15%	\$541,923	3.92%	\$512,782	(\$29,141)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	3.17%	\$413,858	3.18%	\$416,080	\$2,222
Transit System Inc., The	0.68%	\$89,384	0.80%	\$104,020	\$14,636
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	0.56%	\$72,788	0.68%	\$89,253	\$16,465
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	6.85%	\$895,669	6.65%	\$867,963	(\$27,706)

Scenario A. Urban Performance State Funding - Current and Projected 2010.

	Current Transit Districts		Scenario A Transit Districts		
Principal City	Performance Factor	Funding for Performance	Performance Factor	Funding for Performance	Difference
Total Urban		\$5,029,687		\$5,029,687	
Total Transit Districts	100%	\$4,698,734	100%	\$4,808,519	\$109,786
Abilene 4	.21%	\$197,971	3.63%	\$174,641	\$(23,330)
Amarillo 2	.70%	\$126,834	2.31%	\$111,154	\$(15,680)
Beaumont 4	.75%	\$223,121	4.08%	\$196,188	\$(26,933)
Brownsville 6	.64%	\$311,795	5.77%	\$277,442	\$(34,353)
Cleburne			2.72%	\$130,563	\$130,563
College Station-Bryan	3.56%	\$167,127	3.07%	\$147,481	\$(19,645)
Conroe			2.72%	\$130,563	\$130,563
Galveston 9	.07%	\$425,983	8.01%	\$385,208	\$(40,775)
Georgetown			2.72%	\$130,563	\$130,563
Harlingen 0.	.87%	\$40,778	0.74%	\$35,493	\$(5,285)
Killeen 3	.05%	\$143,421	2.60%	\$125,007	\$(18,414)
Lake Jackson-Angleton	1.25%	\$58,836	1.06%	\$51,061	\$(7,775)
Laredo 9	.27%	\$435,698	8.15%	\$392,131	\$(43,567)
Longview 2.	.50%	\$117,364	2.15%	\$103,440	\$(13,924)
Lubbock 6	.89%	\$323,510	6.01%	\$288,815	\$(34,696)
McAllen 3	.34%	\$156,772	2.84%	\$136,630	\$(20,143)
McKinney 3	.61%	\$169,439	3.07%	\$147,760	\$(21,678)
Midland-Odessa 2	.75%	\$129,093	2.36%	\$113,572	\$(15,521)
New Braunfels			2.72%	\$130,563	\$130,563
Port Arthur	2.61%	\$122,448	2.22%	\$106,948	\$(15,501)
San Angelo	2.75%	\$129,321	2.36%	\$113,644	\$(15,677)
San Marcos			2.72%	\$130,563	\$130,563
Sherman 3	.18%	\$149,218	2.71%	\$130,260	\$(18,958)
Temple 3	.20%	\$150,337	2.72%	\$131,016	\$(19,322)
Texarkana 3	.71%	\$174,409	3.22%	\$154,876	\$(19,532)
Texas City	1.29%	\$60,538	1.09%	\$52,590	\$(7,948)
The Woodlands	5.93%	\$278,525	5.10%	\$245,205	\$(33,320)
Tyler 2	.49%	\$116,950	2.15%	\$103,452	\$(13,498)
Victoria 3	.79%	\$177,925	3.26%	\$156,995	\$(20,929)
Waco 3	.47%	\$163,268	3.00%	\$144,046	\$(19,222)
Wichita Falls	3.15%	\$148,053	2.72%	\$130,648	\$(17,405)
Limited Eligibility Providers 1	00%	\$330,954	100%	\$221,168	\$(109,786)
Arlington 27	.97%	\$92,562	27.97%	\$61,857	\$(30,705)
Grand Prairie	29.79%	\$98,587	29.79%	\$65,883	\$(32,704)
Mesquite 27	.65%	\$91,506	27.65%	\$61,151	\$(30,355)
NETS 14	.59%	\$48,298	14.59%	\$32,276	\$(16,022)

Scenario A. Rural Performance State Funding - Current and Projected 2010.

Rural Transit District	Current and Projected 2010	
	Composite of all Measures	Performance Funding
Total		\$6,538,725
Alamo Area COG	2.41%	\$157,645
Ark-Tex COG	3.37%	\$220,547
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	1.97%	\$129,006
Bee Community Action Agency	1.83%	\$119,918
Brazos Transit District	2.50%	\$163,596
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	4.13%	\$269,848
Central Texas Rural Transit District	3.15%	\$205,966
Cleburne City of	1.80%	\$117,499
Collin County Committee on Aging	2.08%	\$136,199
Colorado Valley Transit	2.63%	\$172,096
Community Act. Council of South Texas	2.51%	\$163,923
Community Council of Southwest Texas	2.86%	\$187,135
Community Services, Inc.	2.85%	\$186,415
Concho Valley COG	2.10%	\$137,180
Del Rio, City of	2.58%	\$168,892
East Texas COG	1.55%	\$101,152
El Paso, County of	3.00%	\$196,027
Fort Bend County	3.24%	\$211,916
Golden Crescent RPC	3.13%	\$204,658
Gulf Coast Center	1.23%	\$80,686
Heart of Texas COG	2.01%	\$131,556
Hill Country Transit District	2.83%	\$185,108
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	2.91%	\$190,338
Kleberg County Human Services	1.81%	\$118,479
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	1.95%	\$127,699
Panhandle Community Services	2.72%	\$178,111
Public Transit Services	2.96%	\$193,542
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	2.59%	\$169,611
Rural Economic Assist. League	3.15%	\$206,162
Services Program for Aging Needs	2.47%	\$161,699
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	2.52%	\$164,576
South East Texas RPC	2.13%	\$139,534
South Padre Island, Town of	7.02%	\$458,748
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	2.26%	\$147,511
Texoma Area Paratransit System	2.24%	\$146,464
Transit System Inc., The	2.03%	\$132,668
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	2.99%	\$195,635
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	2.46%	\$160,980

Scenario A. Rural Performance Federal Funding - Current and Projected 2010.

Rural Transit District	Current and Projected 2010	
	Composite of all Measures	Performance Funding
Total 1	00.00%	\$7,036,662
Alamo Area COG	2.41%	\$169,651
Ark-Tex COG	3.37%	\$237,342
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	1.97%	\$138,831
Bee Community Action Agency	1.83%	\$129,050
Brazos Transit District	2.50%	\$176,054
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	4.13%	\$290,397
Central Texas Rural Transit District	3.15%	\$221,650
Cleburne City of	1.80%	\$126,446
Collin County Committee on Aging	2.08%	\$146,571
Colorado Valley Transit	2.63%	\$185,201
Community Act. Council of South Texas	2.51%	\$176,406
Community Council of Southwest Texas	2.86%	\$201,385
Community Services, Inc.	2.85%	\$200,611
Concho Valley COG	2.10%	\$147,626
Del Rio, City of	2.58%	\$181,753
East Texas COG	1.55%	\$108,855
El Paso, County of	3.00%	\$210,955
Fort Bend County	3.24%	\$228,054
Golden Crescent RPC	3.13%	\$220,243
Gulf Coast Center	1.23%	\$86,831
Heart of Texas COG	2.01%	\$141,575
Hill Country Transit District	2.83%	\$199,204
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	2.91%	\$204,833
Kleberg County Human Services	1.81%	\$127,502
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	1.95%	\$137,423
Panhandle Community Services	2.72%	\$191,675
Public Transit Services	2.96%	\$208,281
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	2.59%	\$182,527
Rural Economic Assist. League	3.15%	\$221,862
Services Program for Aging Needs	2.47%	\$174,013
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	2.52%	\$177,109
South East Texas RPC	2.13%	\$150,159
South Padre Island, Town of	7.02%	\$493,682
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	2.26%	\$158,744
Texoma Area Paratransit System	2.24%	\$157,618
Transit System Inc., The	2.03%	\$142,771
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	2.99%	\$210,533
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	2.46%	\$173,239

Scenario A. Urban Transit State Funding Summary of Results.

Principal City	Current Total	Projected 2010 Total	Difference	
Total Urban	\$10,059,374	\$10,059,374	\$0	
Total Urban Transit District	\$9,397,468	\$9,617,038	\$219,570	
Abilene \$	364,513	\$318,041	(\$46,472)	
Amarillo \$	405,819	\$366,646	(\$39,173)	
Beaumont \$	439,859	\$375,318	(\$64,541)	
Brownsville \$	569,719	\$532,933	(\$36,786)	
Cleburne (New)		\$196,820	\$196,820	
College Station-Bryan	\$373,278	\$341,301	(\$31,978)	
Conroe (New)		\$205,189	\$205,189	
Galveston \$	511,198	\$454,498	(\$56,699)	
Georgetown (New)		\$205,743	\$205,743	
Harlingen \$	213,120	\$204,160	(\$8,960)	
Killeen \$	404,769	\$380,499	(\$24,270)	
Lake Jackson-Angleton	\$173,061	\$151,711	(\$21,350)	
Laredo \$	708,885	\$647,622	(\$61,263)	
Longview \$	238,830	\$209,757	(\$29,073)	
Lubbock \$	634,681	\$544,306	(\$90,375)	
McAllen \$	467,943	\$392,121	(\$75,822)	
McKinney \$	254,272	\$334,045	\$79,773	
Midland-Odessa \$	440,264	\$369,064	(\$71,201)	
New Braunfels (New)		\$210,301	\$210,301	
Port Arthur	\$300,837	\$252,929	(\$47,908)	
San Angelo	\$266,188	\$225,691	(\$40,498)	
San Marcos (New)		\$232,438	\$232,438	
Sherman \$	236,608	\$209,642	(\$26,966)	
Temple \$	262,261	\$241,101	(\$21,160)	
Texarkana \$	250,284	\$223,843	(\$26,441)	
Texas City	\$210,550	\$194,229	(\$16,320)	
The Woodlands	\$417,689	\$476,273	\$58,584	
Tyler \$	274,861	\$263,737	(\$11,124)	
Victoria \$	273,655	\$240,513	(\$33,142)	
Waco \$	401,623	\$361,413	(\$40,210)	
Wichita Falls	\$302,699	\$255,154	(\$47,545)	
Limited Eligibility Providers	\$661,908	\$442,336	(\$219,572)	
Arlington	\$213,558	\$143,227	(\$70,331)	\$341,663 Cap*
Grand Prairie	\$151,798	\$101,540	(\$50,258)	\$170,584 Cap*
Mesquite	\$139,415	\$91,080	(\$48,335)	\$142,455 Cap*
NETS	\$157,134	\$106,488	(\$50,646)	\$116,134 Cap*

*Limited eligibility providers are limited by statute to funding not to exceed these cap levels

Scenario A. Rural Transit State Funding Summary of Results.

Rural Transit District <i>*Impacted by new urbanized area</i>	Current Total	Projected 2010 Total	Difference
Total \$	18,682,070	\$18,682,070	\$0
Alamo Area COG*	\$900,803	\$899,103	(\$1,700)
Ark-Tex COG	\$640,334	\$615,562	(\$24,772)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	\$268,166	\$261,002	(\$7,164)
Bee Community Action Agency	\$288,586	\$284,578	(\$4,008)
Brazos Transit District*	\$1,628,661	\$1,594,660	(\$34,001)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System*	\$1,032,678	\$1,052,835	\$20,157
Central Texas Rural Transit District	\$627,089	\$610,331	(\$16,758)
Cleburne City of*	\$289,202	\$236,137	(\$53,065)
Collin County Committee on Aging	\$233,830	\$285,438	\$51,608
Colorado Valley Transit	\$396,015	\$402,086	\$6,071
Community Act. Council of South Texas	\$359,063	\$367,441	\$8,378
Community Council of Southwest Texas	\$494,477	\$491,927	(\$2,550)
Community Services, Inc.	\$423,691	\$450,406	\$26,715
Concho Valley COG	\$411,007	\$404,571	(\$6,436)
Del Rio, City of	\$277,937	\$277,816	(\$121)
East Texas COG	\$1,110,851	\$1,097,858	(\$12,993)
El Paso, County of	\$255,042	\$289,043	\$34,001
Fort Bend County	\$280,889	\$291,939	\$11,050
Golden Crescent RPC	\$543,451	\$529,365	(\$14,086)
Gulf Coast Center	\$261,982	\$260,768	(\$1,214)
Heart of Texas COG	\$463,548	\$452,620	(\$10,928)
Hill Country Transit District	\$530,944	\$537,987	\$7,043
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	\$331,927	\$387,421	\$55,494
Kleberg County Human Services	\$197,045	\$192,430	(\$4,615)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	\$353,318	\$362,789	\$9,471
Panhandle Community Services	\$841,610	\$820,967	(\$20,643)
Public Transit Services	\$412,604	\$426,690	\$14,086
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	\$384,665	\$369,729	(\$14,936)
Rural Economic Assist. League	\$389,401	\$380,173	(\$9,228)
Services Program for Aging Needs	\$269,408	\$310,695	\$41,287
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	\$295,721	\$301,672	\$5,951
South East Texas RPC	\$371,103	\$340,988	(\$30,115)
South Padre Island, Town of	\$462,634	\$462,512	(\$122)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	\$651,085	\$624,006	(\$27,079)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	\$531,036	\$533,100	\$2,064
Transit System Inc., The	\$215,727	\$229,327	\$13,600
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	\$263,272	\$278,572	\$15,300
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	\$993,268	\$967,526	(\$25,742)

Scenario A. Rural Transit Federal Funding Summary of Results.

Rural Transit District <i>*Impacted by new urbanized area</i>	Current Total	Projected 2010 Total	Difference
Total \$	20,104,753	\$20,104,753	\$0
Alamo Area COG	\$969,402	\$967,573	(\$1,829)
Ark-Tex COG	\$689,097	\$662,438	(\$26,659)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	\$288,588	\$280,878	(\$7,710)
Bee Community Action Agency	\$310,562	\$306,250	(\$4,312)
Brazos Transit District	\$1,752,688	\$1,716,098	(\$36,590)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	\$1,111,318	\$1,133,011	\$21,693
Central Texas Rural Transit District	\$674,842	\$656,809	(\$18,033)
Cleburne City of	\$311,225	\$254,119	(\$57,106)
Collin County Committee on Aging	\$251,636	\$307,175	\$55,539
Colorado Valley Transit	\$426,172	\$432,706	\$6,534
Community Act. Council of South Texas	\$386,406	\$395,423	\$9,017
Community Council of Southwest Texas	\$532,132	\$529,388	(\$2,744)
Community Services, Inc.	\$455,956	\$484,706	\$28,750
Concho Valley COG	\$442,306	\$435,380	(\$6,926)
Del Rio, City of	\$299,102	\$298,971	(\$131)
East Texas COG	\$1,195,445	\$1,181,462	(\$13,983)
El Paso, County of	\$274,465	\$311,055	\$36,590
Fort Bend County	\$302,279	\$314,171	\$11,892
Golden Crescent RPC	\$584,835	\$569,677	(\$15,158)
Gulf Coast Center	\$281,934	\$280,627	(\$1,307)
Heart of Texas COG	\$498,849	\$487,088	(\$11,761)
Hill Country Transit District	\$571,376	\$578,955	\$7,579
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	\$357,204	\$416,924	\$59,720
Kleberg County Human Services	\$212,051	\$207,085	(\$4,966)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	\$380,223	\$390,416	\$10,193
Panhandle Community Services	\$905,701	\$883,486	(\$22,215)
Public Transit Services	\$444,025	\$459,183	\$15,158
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	\$413,958	\$397,885	(\$16,073)
Rural Economic Assist. League	\$419,056	\$409,124	(\$9,932)
Services Program for Aging Needs	\$289,925	\$334,355	\$44,430
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	\$318,242	\$324,645	\$6,403
South East Texas RPC	\$399,362	\$366,954	(\$32,408)
South Padre Island, Town of	\$497,864	\$497,733	(\$131)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	\$700,667	\$671,526	(\$29,141)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	\$571,476	\$573,698	\$2,222
Transit System Inc., The	\$232,155	\$246,791	\$14,636
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	\$283,321	\$299,786	\$16,465
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	\$1,068,908	\$1,041,202	(\$27,706)

Scenario A. Rural Transit Combined State and Federal Funding Summary of Results.

Rural Transit District <i>*Impacted by new urbanized area</i>	Current Total	Projected 2010 W/O New Urbanized	Difference from Current	Projected 2010 Total with New Urbanized	Difference from Current
Total	\$38,786,046	\$38,786,046	\$0	\$38,786,046	\$0
Alamo Area COG*	\$1,870,205	\$1,982,646	\$112,441	\$1,866,676	(\$3,529)
Ark-Tex COG	\$1,329,431	\$1,246,991	(\$82,440)	\$1,278,000	(\$51,431)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	\$556,754	\$536,333	(\$20,421)	\$541,880	(\$14,874)
Bee Community Action Agency	\$599,148	\$579,735	(\$19,413)	\$590,828	(\$8,320)
Brazos Transit District*	\$3,381,349	\$3,357,146	(\$24,203)	\$3,310,758	(\$70,591)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System*	\$2,143,996	\$2,508,041	\$364,045	\$2,185,846	\$41,850
Central Texas Rural Transit District	\$1,301,931	\$1,240,668	(\$61,263)	\$1,267,140	(\$34,791)
Cleburne City of*	\$600,427	\$625,386	\$24,959	\$490,256	(\$110,171)
Collin County Committee on Aging	\$485,466	\$578,998	\$93,532	\$592,613	\$107,147
Colorado Valley Transit	\$822,187	\$816,388	(\$5,799)	\$834,792	\$12,605
Community Act. Council of South Texas	\$745,469	\$749,503	\$4,034	\$762,864	\$17,395
Community Council of Southwest Texas	\$1,026,609	\$1,004,927	(\$21,682)	\$1,021,315	(\$5,294)
Community Services, Inc.	\$879,647	\$912,170	\$32,523	\$935,112	\$55,465
Concho Valley COG	\$853,313	\$831,883	(\$21,430)	\$839,951	(\$13,362)
Del Rio, City of	\$577,039	\$569,980	(\$7,059)	\$576,787	(\$252)
East Texas COG	\$2,306,296	\$2,195,116	(\$111,180)	\$2,279,320	(\$26,976)
El Paso, County of	\$529,507	\$591,778	\$62,271	\$600,098	\$70,591
Fort Bend County	\$583,168	\$599,303	\$16,135	\$606,110	\$22,942
Golden Crescent RPC	\$1,128,286	\$1,075,847	(\$52,439)	\$1,099,042	(\$29,244)
Gulf Coast Center	\$543,916	\$526,017	(\$17,899)	\$541,395	(\$2,521)
Heart of Texas COG	\$962,397	\$915,254	(\$47,143)	\$939,708	(\$22,689)
Hill Country Transit District	\$1,102,320	\$1,092,992	(\$9,328)	\$1,116,942	\$14,622
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	\$689,131	\$786,445	\$97,314	\$804,345	\$115,214
Kleberg County Human Services	\$409,096	\$394,978	(\$14,118)	\$399,515	(\$9,581)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	\$733,541	\$733,793	\$252	\$753,205	\$19,664
Panhandle Community Services	\$1,747,311	\$1,672,183	(\$75,128)	\$1,704,453	(\$42,858)
Public Transit Services	\$856,629	\$866,713	\$10,084	\$885,873	\$29,244
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	\$798,623	\$756,017	(\$42,606)	\$767,614	(\$31,009)
Rural Economic Assist. League	\$808,457	\$775,682	(\$32,775)	\$789,297	(\$19,160)
Services Program for Aging Needs	\$559,333	\$631,437	\$72,104	\$645,050	\$85,717
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	\$613,963	\$614,215	\$252	\$626,317	\$12,354
South East Texas RPC	\$770,465	\$690,799	(\$79,666)	\$707,942	(\$62,523)
South Padre Island, Town of	\$960,498	\$959,993	(\$505)	\$960,245	(\$253)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	\$1,351,752	\$1,267,296	(\$84,456)	\$1,295,532	(\$56,220)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	\$1,102,512	\$1,076,293	(\$26,219)	\$1,106,798	\$4,286
Transit System Inc., The	\$447,882	\$467,546	\$19,664	\$476,118	\$28,236
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	\$546,593	\$574,073	\$27,480	\$578,358	\$31,765
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	\$2,061,399	\$1,981,481	(\$79,918)	\$2,007,951	(\$53,448)

APPENDIX F: SCENARIO B FUNDING RESULTS

Scenario B. Urban Transit Needs Factor - Current and Projected 2010.

Principal City	Current (based on 2000 Census)			Projected 2010		
	Population	Adjusted Population	Needs Factor Po	pulation	Adjusted Population	Needs Factor
Total Urban	4,254,890	3,256,332	4,	755,192 3,	297,013	
Total Urban Transit Districts	3,356,007	3,020,019	100%	3,736,370	3,094,353	100%
Abilene	107,041	107,041	3.54%	112,253	112,253	3.63%
Amarillo	179,312	179,312	5.94%	201,289	199,999	6.46%
Beaumont	139,304	139,304	4.61%	140,223	140,223	4.53%
Brownsville	165,776	165,776	5.49%	214,428	199,999	6.46%
College Station-Bryan	132,500	132,500	4.39%	151,722	151,722	4.90%
Galveston	54,770	54,770	1.81%	54,240	54,240	1.75%
Harlingen	110,770	110,770	3.67%	132,033	132,033	4.27%
Killeen	167,976	167,976	5.56%	200,475	199,999	6.46%
Lake Jackson-Angleton	73,416	73,416	2.43%	78,789	78,789	2.55%
Laredo	175,586	175,586	5.81%	227,202	199,999	6.46%
Longview	78,070	78,070	2.59%	83,225	83,225	2.69%
Lubbock	202,225	199,999	6.62%	223,853	199,999	6.46%
McAllen	523,144	199,999	6.62%	739,217	199,999	6.46%
McKinney	54,525	54,525	1.81%	-	-	0.00%
Midland - Odessa	210,616	199,999	6.62%	235,546	199,999	6.46%
Port Arthur	114,656	114,656	3.80%	114,274	114,274	3.69%
San Angelo	87,969	87,969	2.91%	87,710	87,710	2.83%
Sherman	56,168	56,168	1.86%	62,140	62,140	2.01%
Temple	71,937	71,937	2.38%	86,175	86,175	2.78%
Texarkana	48,767	48,767	1.61%	53,987	53,987	1.74%
Texas City	96,417	96,417	3.19%	79,122	79,122	2.56%
The Woodlands	89,445	89,445	2.96%	-	-	0.00%
Tyler	101,494	101,494	3.36%	125,471	125,471	4.05%
Victoria	61,529	61,529	2.04%	65,378	65,378	2.11%
Waco	153,198	153,198	5.07%	170,155	170,155	5.50%
Wichita Falls	99,396	99,396	3.29%	97,463	97,463	3.15%
Limited Eligibility Providers	898,883	36,313	100%	1,018,822	202,660	100%
Arlington	335,164	86,396	36.56%	387,086	74,561	36.79%
Grand Prairie	126,889	37,995	16.08%	154,157	32,673	16.12%
Mesquite	123,800	34,209	14.48%	136,565	27,424	13.53%
NETS	313,030	77,713	32.89%	341,014	68,002	33.55%

Scenario B. Rural Transit District Needs Factor - Current and Projected 2010.

Rural Transit District <i>*Impacted by Merger to Very Large Urbanized Area</i>	Current (Census 2000)			Projected 2010		
	Population	Land Area	Needs Factor Po	Population	Land Area 25%	Needs Factor
Total	5,762,803	251,954	100%	6,455,670	251,437	100%
Ark-Tex COG	221,701	5,761	3.46%	230,739	5,761	3.25%
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	9,877	6,317	1.15%	39,478	6,317	1.09%
Bee Community Action Agency	75,844	4,051	1.39%	82,047	4,051	1.36%
Brazos Transit District*	798,164	16,910	12.07%	870,258	16,835	11.79%
Capital Area Rural Transportation System*	427,869	7,192	6.28%	494,444	7,082	6.45%
Central Texas Rural Transit District	184,925	10,693	3.47%	195,080	10,690	3.33%
Cleburne City of*	103,238	710	1.41%	78,295	677	0.98%
Collin County Committee on Aging	56,516	689	0.80%	100,216	650	1.23%
Colorado Valley Transit	117,124	3,220	1.84%	135,438	3,220	1.89%
Community Act. Council of South Texas	84,180	5,149	1.61%	100,195	5,149	1.68%
Community Council of Southwest Texas	109,525	11,138	2.53%	120,725	11,138	2.51%
Community Services, Inc.	135,414	1,924	1.95%	170,698	1,921	2.17%
Concho Valley COG	56,505	15,309	2.26%	58,541	15,309	2.20%
Del Rio, City of	44,856	3,170	0.90%	50,067	3,170	0.90%
East Texas COG	565,616	9,613	8.32%	624,278	9,607	8.21%
El Paso, County of	31,157	809	0.49%	59,174	781	0.77%
Fort Bend County	37,891	747	0.57%	50,701	705	0.66%
Golden Crescent RPC	160,333	7,088	2.79%	169,456	7,087	2.67%
Gulf Coast Center	102,725	1,570	1.49%	114,403	1,545	1.48%
Heart of Texas COG	168,338	5,478	2.73%	180,734	5,473	2.64%
Hill Country Transit District	155,387	8,321	2.85%	179,046	8,313	2.91%
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	82,737	896	1.17%	132,068	886	1.62%
Kleberg County Human Services	31,963	2,328	0.65%	32,460	2,328	0.61%
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	122,660	2,641	1.86%	144,271	2,614	1.94%
Panhandle Community Services	223,550	25,749	5.46%	235,286	25,744	5.29%
Public Transit Services	117,544	2,765	1.80%	141,657	2,763	1.92%
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	86,084	6,553	1.77%	85,719	6,553	1.65%
Rural Economic Assist. League	96,923	2,491	1.51%	102,017	2,491	1.43%
Services Program for Aging Needs	62,453	748	0.89%	99,474	711	1.23%
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	76,596	841	1.08%	89,977	841	1.13%
South East Texas RPC	131,130	2,027	1.91%	125,421	2,023	1.66%
South Padre Island, Town of	2,422	2	0.03%	2,627	2	0.03%
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	201,705	15,342	4.15%	206,432	15,337	3.92%
Texoma Area Paratransit System	200,664	5,601	3.17%	226,167	5,599	3.18%
Transit System Inc., The	47,909	609	0.68%	63,252	609	0.80%
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	17,531	3,314	0.56%	30,388	3,313	0.68%
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	190,752	44,056	6.85%	195,180	44,053	6.65%

Scenario B. Urban Transit Needs Funding - Current and Projected 2010.

Principal City	Current (based on 2000 Census)		Projected 2010		Difference
	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	
Total		\$5,029,687		\$5,029,687	\$0
Total Urban Transit Districts 1	00%	\$4,698,734	100%	\$4,770,914	\$72,180
Abilene 3	.54%	\$166,541	3.63%	\$173,073	\$6,532
Amarillo 5	.94%	\$278,985	6.46%	\$308,361	\$29,376
Beaumont 4	.61%	\$216,738	4.53%	\$216,198	(\$540)
Brownsville 5	.49%	\$257,925	6.46%	\$308,361	\$50,436
College Station-Bryan	4.39%	\$206,152	4.90%	\$233,927	\$27,775
Galveston 1.	81%	\$85,215	1.75%	\$83,628	(\$1,587)
Harlingen 3	.67%	\$172,343	4.27%	\$203,570	\$31,227
Killeen 5	.56%	\$261,348	6.46%	\$308,361	\$47,014
Lake Jackson-Angleton	2.43%	\$114,225	2.55%	\$121,478	\$7,253
Laredo 5	.81%	\$273,188	6.46%	\$308,361	\$35,173
Longview 2.	59%	\$121,466	2.69%	\$128,317	\$6,851
Lubbock 6	.62%	\$311,171	6.46%	\$308,361	(\$2,810)
McAllen 6	.62%	\$311,171	6.46%	\$308,361	(\$2,810)
McKinney 1.	81%	\$84,833	0.00%	\$0	(\$84,833)
Midland - Odessa	6.62%	\$311,171	6.46%	\$308,361	(\$2,810)
Port Arthur	3.80%	\$178,389	3.69%	\$176,189	(\$2,200)
San Angelo	2.91%	\$136,868	2.83%	\$135,232	(\$1,635)
Sherman 1.	86%	\$87,390	2.01%	\$95,808	\$8,419
Temple 2	.38%	\$111,924	2.78%	\$132,866	\$20,942
Texarkana 1.	61%	\$75,875	1.74%	\$83,238	\$7,363
Texas City	3.19%	\$150,012	2.56%	\$121,991	(\$28,020)
The Woodlands	2.96%	\$139,164	0.00%	\$0	(\$139,164)
Tyler 3	.36%	\$157,911	4.05%	\$193,453	\$35,542
Victoria 2.	04%	\$95,731	2.11%	\$100,801	\$5,070
Waco 5	.07%	\$238,355	5.50%	\$262,347	\$23,992
Wichita Falls	3.29%	\$154,646	3.15%	\$150,270	(\$4,377)
Limited Eligibility Provider 1	00%	\$330,954	100%	\$258,773	(\$72,180)
Arlington 3	6.56%	\$120,996	36.79%	\$95,206	(\$25,791)
Grand Prairie	16.08%	\$53,211	16.12%	\$41,720	(\$11,492)
Mesquite 14	.48%	\$47,909	13.53%	\$35,017	(\$12,892)
NETS 3	2.89%	\$108,836	33.55%	\$86,831	(\$22,006)

Scenario B. Rural Transit Needs State Funding - Current and Projected 2010.

Rural Transit District <i>*Impacted by Merger to Very Large Urbanized Area</i>	Current		Projected 2010		Difference
	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	
Total 1	00%	\$12,143,345	100%	\$12,143,345	\$0
Alamo Area COG*	6.12%	\$743,158	6.11%	\$741,458	(\$1,700)
Ark-Tex COG	3.46%	\$419,787	3.25%	\$395,015	(\$24,772)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	1.15%	\$139,160	1.09%	\$131,996	(\$7,164)
Bee Community Action Agency	1.39%	\$168,668	1.36%	\$164,660	(\$4,008)
Brazos Transit District*	12.07%	\$1,465,065	11.79%	\$1,431,064	(\$34,001)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System*	6.28%	\$762,830	6.45%	\$782,987	\$20,157
Central Texas Rural Transit District	3.47%	\$421,123	3.33%	\$404,365	(\$16,758)
Cleburne City of*	1.41%	\$171,703	0.98%	\$118,638	(\$53,065)
Collin County Committee on Aging	0.80%	\$97,631	1.23%	\$149,239	\$51,608
Colorado Valley Transit	1.84%	\$223,919	1.89%	\$229,990	\$6,071
Community Act. Council of South Texas	1.61%	\$195,140	1.68%	\$203,518	\$8,378
Community Council of Southwest Texas	2.53%	\$307,342	2.51%	\$304,792	(\$2,550)
Community Services, Inc.	1.95%	\$237,276	2.17%	\$263,991	\$26,715
Concho Valley COG	2.26%	\$273,827	2.20%	\$267,391	(\$6,436)
Del Rio, City of	0.90%	\$109,045	0.90%	\$108,924	(\$121)
East Texas COG	8.32%	\$1,009,699	8.21%	\$996,706	(\$12,993)
El Paso, County of	0.49%	\$59,015	0.77%	\$93,016	\$34,001
Fort Bend County	0.57%	\$68,973	0.66%	\$80,023	\$11,050
Golden Crescent RPC	2.79%	\$338,793	2.67%	\$324,707	(\$14,086)
Gulf Coast Center	1.49%	\$181,296	1.48%	\$180,082	(\$1,214)
Heart of Texas COG	2.73%	\$331,992	2.64%	\$321,064	(\$10,928)
Hill Country Transit District	2.85%	\$345,836	2.91%	\$352,879	\$7,043
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	1.17%	\$141,589	1.62%	\$197,083	\$55,494
Kleberg County Human Services	0.65%	\$78,566	0.61%	\$73,951	(\$4,615)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	1.86%	\$225,619	1.94%	\$235,090	\$9,471
Panhandle Community Services	5.46%	\$663,499	5.29%	\$642,856	(\$20,643)
Public Transit Services	1.80%	\$219,062	1.92%	\$233,148	\$14,086
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	1.77%	\$215,054	1.65%	\$200,118	(\$14,936)
Rural Economic Assist. League	1.51%	\$183,239	1.43%	\$174,011	(\$9,228)
Services Program for Aging Needs	0.89%	\$107,709	1.23%	\$148,996	\$41,287
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	1.08%	\$131,145	1.13%	\$137,096	\$5,951
South East Texas RPC	1.91%	\$231,569	1.66%	\$201,454	(\$30,115)
South Padre Island, Town of	0.03%	\$3,886	0.03%	\$3,764	(\$122)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	4.15%	\$503,574	3.92%	\$476,495	(\$27,079)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	3.17%	\$384,572	3.18%	\$386,636	\$2,064
Transit System Inc., The	0.68%	\$83,059	0.80%	\$96,659	\$13,600
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	0.56%	\$67,637	0.68%	\$82,937	\$15,300
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	6.85%	\$832,288	6.65%	\$806,546	(\$25,742)

Scenario B. Rural Transit Needs Federal Funding - Current and Projected 2010.

Rural Transit District <i>*Impacted by Merger to Very Large Urbanized Area</i>	Current		Projected 2010		Difference
	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	
Total		\$20,104,352		\$20,104,352	\$0
Alamo Area COG	6.12%	\$799,751	6.11%	\$797,922	(\$1,829)
Ark-Tex COG	3.46%	\$451,755	3.25%	\$425,096	(\$26,659)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	1.15%	\$149,757	1.09%	\$142,047	(\$7,710)
Bee Community Action Agency	1.39%	\$181,512	1.36%	\$177,200	(\$4,312)
Brazos Transit District	12.07%	\$1,576,634	11.79%	\$1,540,044	(\$36,590)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	6.28%	\$820,921	6.45%	\$842,614	\$21,693
Central Texas Rural Transit District	3.47%	\$453,192	3.33%	\$435,159	(\$18,033)
Cleburne City of	1.41%	\$184,779	0.98%	\$127,673	(\$57,106)
Collin County Committee on Aging	0.80%	\$105,065	1.23%	\$160,604	\$55,539
Colorado Valley Transit	1.84%	\$240,971	1.89%	\$247,505	\$6,534
Community Act. Council of South Texas	1.61%	\$210,000	1.68%	\$219,017	\$9,017
Community Council of Southwest Texas	2.53%	\$330,747	2.51%	\$328,003	(\$2,744)
Community Services, Inc.	1.95%	\$255,345	2.17%	\$284,095	\$28,750
Concho Valley COG	2.26%	\$294,680	2.20%	\$287,754	(\$6,926)
Del Rio, City of	0.90%	\$117,349	0.90%	\$117,218	(\$131)
East Texas COG	8.32%	\$1,086,590	8.21%	\$1,072,607	(\$13,983)
El Paso, County of	0.49%	\$63,510	0.77%	\$100,100	\$36,590
Fort Bend County	0.57%	\$74,225	0.66%	\$86,117	\$11,892
Golden Crescent RPC	2.79%	\$364,592	2.67%	\$349,434	(\$15,158)
Gulf Coast Center	1.49%	\$195,103	1.48%	\$193,796	(\$1,307)
Heart of Texas COG	2.73%	\$357,274	2.64%	\$345,513	(\$11,761)
Hill Country Transit District	2.85%	\$372,172	2.91%	\$379,751	\$7,579
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	1.17%	\$152,371	1.62%	\$212,091	\$59,720
Kleberg County Human Services	0.65%	\$84,549	0.61%	\$79,583	(\$4,966)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	1.86%	\$242,800	1.94%	\$252,993	\$10,193
Panhandle Community Services	5.46%	\$714,026	5.29%	\$691,811	(\$22,215)
Public Transit Services	1.80%	\$235,744	1.92%	\$250,902	\$15,158
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	1.77%	\$231,431	1.65%	\$215,358	(\$16,073)
Rural Economic Assist. League	1.51%	\$197,194	1.43%	\$187,262	(\$9,932)
Services Program for Aging Needs	0.89%	\$115,912	1.23%	\$160,342	\$44,430
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	1.08%	\$141,133	1.13%	\$147,536	\$6,403
South East Texas RPC	1.91%	\$249,203	1.66%	\$216,795	(\$32,408)
South Padre Island, Town of	0.03%	\$4,182	0.03%	\$4,051	(\$131)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	4.15%	\$541,923	3.92%	\$512,782	(\$29,141)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	3.17%	\$413,858	3.18%	\$416,080	\$2,222
Transit System Inc., The	0.68%	\$89,384	0.80%	\$104,020	\$14,636
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	0.56%	\$72,788	0.68%	\$89,253	\$16,465
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	6.85%	\$895,669	6.65%	\$867,963	(\$27,706)

Scenario B. Urban Transit Performance Funding - Current and Projected 2010.

Principal City	Current Transit Districts		Scenario B Transit Districts		Difference
	Performance Factor	Funding for Performance	Performance Factor	Funding for Performance	
Total Urban		\$5,029,687		\$5,029,687	\$0
Total Urban Transit Districts 1	00.00%	\$4,698,734	100.00%	\$4,770,914	\$72,180
Abilene 4.	21%	\$197,971	4.68%	\$223,293	\$25,322
Amarillo 2	.70%	\$126,834	3.01%	\$143,828	\$16,994
Beaumont 4.	75%	\$223,121	5.30%	\$252,679	\$29,558
Brownsville 6	.64%	\$311,795	7.29%	\$347,916	\$36,121
College Station-Bryan	3.56%	\$167,127	3.94%	\$188,179	\$21,052
Galveston 9	.07%	\$425,983	9.79%	\$467,251	\$41,268
Harlingen 0.	87%	\$40,778	0.97%	\$46,252	\$5,474
Killeen 3	.05%	\$143,421	3.43%	\$163,592	\$20,171
Lake Jackson-Angleton	1.25%	\$58,836	1.41%	\$67,082	\$8,246
Laredo 9	.27%	\$435,698	10.09%	\$481,548	\$45,850
Longview 2.	50%	\$117,364	2.77%	\$131,981	\$14,617
Lubbock 6.	89%	\$323,510	7.56%	\$360,781	\$37,271
McAllen 3	.34%	\$156,772	3.75%	\$178,686	\$21,914
McKinney 3	.61%	\$169,439	0.00%	\$0	(\$169,439)
Midland - Odessa	2.75%	\$129,093	3.05%	\$145,429	\$16,336
Port Arthur	2.61%	\$122,448	2.92%	\$139,306	\$16,858
San Angelo	2.75%	\$129,321	3.06%	\$146,065	\$16,744
Sherman 3.	18%	\$149,218	3.55%	\$169,556	\$20,338
Temple 3	.20%	\$150,337	3.60%	\$171,741	\$21,404
Texarkana 3.	71%	\$174,409	4.09%	\$194,906	\$20,497
Texas City	1.29%	\$60,538	1.45%	\$69,024	\$8,486
The Woodlands	5.93%	\$278,525	0.00%	\$0	(\$278,525)
Tyler 2	.49%	\$116,950	2.74%	\$130,932	\$13,982
Victoria 3.	79%	\$177,925	4.20%	\$200,484	\$22,559
Waco 3	.47%	\$163,268	3.86%	\$184,174	\$20,906
Wichita Falls	3.15%	\$148,053	3.48%	\$166,227	\$18,174
Limited Eligibility Providers 1	00.00%	\$330,954	100.00%	\$258,773	(\$72,181)
Arlington 27	.97%	\$92,562	27.97%	\$72,375	(\$20,187)
Grand Prairie	29.79%	\$98,587	29.79%	\$77,085	(\$21,502)
Mesquite 27	.65%	\$91,506	27.65%	\$71,549	(\$19,957)
NETS 14	.59%	\$48,298	14.59%	\$37,764	(\$10,534)

Scenario B. Urban Transit State Funding Summary of Results.

Principal City <i>*Impacted by Merger to Very Large Urbanized Area</i>	Current Total	Projected 2010 Total	Difference	
Total Urban	\$10,059,374	\$10,059,374	\$0	
Total Urban Transit Districts	\$9,397,467	\$9,541,827	\$144,360	
Abilene \$	364,513	\$396,366	\$31,853	
Amarillo \$	405,819	\$452,189	\$46,370	
Beaumont \$	439,859	\$468,877	\$29,018	
Brownsville \$	569,719	\$656,277	\$86,558	
College Station-Bryan	\$373,278	\$422,106	\$48,828	
Galveston \$	511,198	\$550,879	\$39,681	
Harlingen \$	213,120	\$249,822	\$36,702	
Killeen \$	404,769	\$471,953	\$67,184	
Lake Jackson-Angleton	\$173,061	\$188,560	\$15,499	
Laredo \$	708,885	\$789,909	\$81,024	
Longview \$	238,830	\$260,298	\$21,468	
Lubbock \$	634,681	\$669,142	\$34,461	
McAllen \$	467,943	\$487,048	\$19,105	
McKinney* \$	254,272	\$0	(\$254,272)	
Midland - Odessa	\$440,264	\$453,790	\$13,526	
Port Arthur	\$300,837	\$315,495	\$14,658	
San Angelo	\$266,188	\$281,297	\$15,109	
Sherman \$	236,608	\$265,365	\$28,757	
Temple \$	262,261	\$304,607	\$42,346	
Texarkana \$	250,284	\$278,144	\$27,860	
Texas City*	\$210,550	\$191,015	(\$19,535)	
The Woodlands*	\$417,689	\$0	(\$417,689)	
Tyler \$	274,861	\$324,385	\$49,524	
Victoria \$	273,655	\$301,285	\$27,630	
Waco \$	401,623	\$446,521	\$44,898	
Wichita Falls	\$302,699	\$316,497	\$13,798	
Limited Eligibility Provider	\$661,907	\$517,547	(\$144,360)	
Arlington	\$213,559	\$167,580	(\$45,979)	\$341,663 Cap*
Grand Prairie	\$151,799	\$118,805	(\$32,994)	\$170,584 Cap*
Mesquite	\$139,416	\$106,566	(\$32,850)	\$142,455 Cap*
NETS	\$157,134	\$124,595	(\$32,539)	\$116,134 Cap*

*Limited eligibility providers are limited by statute to funding not to exceed these cap levels

Scenario B. Rural Transit State Funding Summary of Results.

Rural Transit District <i>*Impacted by Merger to Very Large Urbanized Area</i>	Current Total	Projected 2010 Total	Difference
Total \$	18,682,070	\$18,682,070	\$0
Alamo Area COG*	\$900,803	\$899,103	(\$1,700)
Ark-Tex COG	\$640,334	\$615,562	(\$24,772)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	\$268,166	\$261,002	(\$7,164)
Bee Community Action Agency	\$288,586	\$284,578	(\$4,008)
Brazos Transit District*	\$1,628,661	\$1,594,660	(\$34,001)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System*	\$1,032,678	\$1,052,835	\$20,157
Central Texas Rural Transit District	\$627,089	\$610,331	(\$16,758)
Cleburne City of*	\$289,202	\$236,137	(\$53,065)
Collin County Committee on Aging	\$233,830	\$285,438	\$51,608
Colorado Valley Transit	\$396,015	\$402,086	\$6,071
Community Act. Council of South Texas	\$359,063	\$367,441	\$8,378
Community Council of Southwest Texas	\$494,477	\$491,927	(\$2,550)
Community Services, Inc.	\$423,691	\$450,406	\$26,715
Concho Valley COG	\$411,007	\$404,571	(\$6,436)
Del Rio, City of	\$277,937	\$277,816	(\$121)
East Texas COG	\$1,110,851	\$1,097,858	(\$12,993)
El Paso, County of	\$255,042	\$289,043	\$34,001
Fort Bend County	\$280,889	\$291,939	\$11,050
Golden Crescent RPC	\$543,451	\$529,365	(\$14,086)
Gulf Coast Center	\$261,982	\$260,768	(\$1,214)
Heart of Texas COG	\$463,548	\$452,620	(\$10,928)
Hill Country Transit District	\$530,944	\$537,987	\$7,043
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	\$331,927	\$387,421	\$55,494
Kleberg County Human Services	\$197,045	\$192,430	(\$4,615)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	\$353,318	\$362,789	\$9,471
Panhandle Community Services	\$841,610	\$820,967	(\$20,643)
Public Transit Services	\$412,604	\$426,690	\$14,086
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	\$384,665	\$369,729	(\$14,936)
Rural Economic Assist. League	\$389,401	\$380,173	(\$9,228)
Services Program for Aging Needs	\$269,408	\$310,695	\$41,287
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	\$295,721	\$301,672	\$5,951
South East Texas RPC	\$371,103	\$340,988	(\$30,115)
South Padre Island, Town of	\$462,634	\$462,512	(\$122)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	\$651,085	\$624,006	(\$27,079)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	\$531,036	\$533,100	\$2,064
Transit System Inc., The	\$215,727	\$229,327	\$13,600
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	\$263,272	\$278,572	\$15,300
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	\$993,268	\$967,526	(\$25,742)

Scenario B. Rural Transit Federal Funding Summary of Results.

Rural Transit District <i>*Impacted by Merger to Very Large Urbanized Area</i>	Current Total	Projected 2010 Total	Difference
Total \$	20,104,753	\$20,104,753	\$0
Alamo Area COG	\$969,402	\$967,573	(\$1,829)
Ark-Tex COG	\$689,097	\$662,438	(\$26,659)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	\$288,588	\$280,878	(\$7,710)
Bee Community Action Agency	\$310,562	\$306,250	(\$4,312)
Brazos Transit District	\$1,752,688	\$1,716,098	(\$36,590)
Community Act. Council of South Texas	\$386,406	\$395,423	\$9,017
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	\$1,111,318	\$1,133,011	\$21,693
Community Council of Southwest Texas	\$532,132	\$529,388	(\$2,744)
Cleburne City of	\$311,225	\$254,119	(\$57,106)
Collin County Committee on Aging	\$251,636	\$307,175	\$55,539
Concho Valley COG	\$442,306	\$435,380	(\$6,926)
Community Services, Inc.	\$455,956	\$484,706	\$28,750
Central Texas Rural Transit District	\$674,842	\$656,809	(\$18,033)
Colorado Valley Transit	\$426,172	\$432,706	\$6,534
Del Rio, City of	\$299,102	\$298,971	(\$131)
El Paso, County of	\$274,465	\$311,055	\$36,590
East Texas COG	\$1,195,445	\$1,181,462	(\$13,983)
Fort Bend County	\$302,279	\$314,171	\$11,892
Gulf Coast Center	\$281,934	\$280,627	(\$1,307)
Golden Crescent RPC	\$584,835	\$569,677	(\$15,158)
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	\$318,242	\$324,645	\$6,403
Hill Country Transit District	\$571,376	\$578,955	\$7,579
Heart of Texas COG	\$498,849	\$487,088	(\$11,761)
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	\$357,204	\$416,924	\$59,720
Kleberg County Human Services	\$212,051	\$207,085	(\$4,966)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	\$380,223	\$390,416	\$10,193
Panhandle Community Services	\$905,701	\$883,486	(\$22,215)
Public Transit Services	\$444,025	\$459,183	\$15,158
Rural Economic Assist. League	\$419,056	\$409,124	(\$9,932)
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	\$413,958	\$397,885	(\$16,073)
South East Texas RPC	\$399,362	\$366,954	(\$32,408)
Services Program for Aging Needs	\$289,925	\$334,355	\$44,430
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	\$700,667	\$671,526	(\$29,141)
South Padre Island, Town of	\$497,864	\$497,733	(\$131)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	\$571,476	\$573,698	\$2,222
Transit System Inc., The	\$232,155	\$246,791	\$14,636
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	\$283,321	\$299,786	\$16,465
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	\$1,068,908	\$1,041,202	(\$27,706)

APPENDIX G: SCENARIO C FUNDING RESULTS

Scenario C. Urban Transit District Needs Factor - Current and Projected 2010.

Principal City	Current (based on 2000 Census)			Projected 2010		
	Population	Adjusted Population	Needs Factor	Population	Adjusted Population	Needs Factor
Total Urban	4,254,890	3,256,332		5,247,373	3,789,194	
Total Urban Transit Districts	3,356,007	3,020,019	100%	4,228,551	3,586,534	100%
Abilene	107,041	107,041	3.54%	112,253	112,253	3.13%
Amarillo	179,312	179,312	5.94%	201,289	199,999	5.58%
Beaumont	139,304	139,304	4.61%	140,223	140,223	3.91%
Brownsville	165,776	165,776	5.49%	214,428	199,999	5.58%
Cleburne (New)				51,866	51,866	1.45%
College Station-Bryan	132,500	132,500	4.39%	151,722	151,722	4.23%
Conroe (New)				58,417	58,417	1.63%
Galveston	54,770	54,770	1.81%	54,240	54,240	1.51%
Georgetown				58,851	58,851	1.64%
Harlingen	110,770	110,770	3.67%	132,033	132,033	3.68%
Killeen	167,976	167,976	5.56%	200,475	199,999	5.58%
Lake Jackson-Angleton	73,416	73,416	2.43%	78,789	78,789	2.20%
Laredo	175,586	175,586	5.81%	227,202	199,999	5.58%
Longview	78,070	78,070	2.59%	83,225	83,225	2.32%
Lubbock	202,225	199,999	6.62%	223,853	199,999	5.58%
McAllen	523,144	199,999	6.62%	739,217	199,999	5.58%
McKinney	54,525	54,525	1.81%	-	-	
Midland-Odessa	210,616	199,999	6.62%	235,546	199,999	5.58%
New Braunfels (New)				62,419	62,419	1.74%
Port Arthur	114,656	114,656	3.80%	114,274	114,274	3.19%
San Angelo	87,969	87,969	2.91%	87,710	87,710	2.45%
San Marcos				79,748	79,748	2.22%
Sherman	56,168	56,168	1.86%	62,140	62,140	1.73%
Temple	71,937	71,937	2.38%	86,175	86,175	2.40%
Texarkana	48,767	48,767	1.61%	53,987	53,987	1.51%
Texas City	96,417	96,417	3.19%	79,122	79,122	2.21%
The Woodlands	89,445	89,445	2.96%	180,880	180,880	5.04%
Tyler	101,494	101,494	3.36%	125,471	125,471	3.50%
Victoria	61,529	61,529	2.04%	65,378	65,378	1.82%
Waco	153,198	153,198	5.07%	170,155	170,155	4.74%
Wichita Falls	99,396	99,396	3.29%	97,463	97,463	2.72%

Limited Eligibility Provider	898,883	236,313	100%	1,018,822	202,660	100%
Arlington	335,164	86,396	36.56%	387,086	74,561	36.79%
Grand Prairie	126,889	37,995	16.08%	154,157	32,673	16.12%
Mesquite	123,800	34,209	14.48%	136,565	27,424	13.53%
NETS	313,030	77,713	32.89%	341,014	68,002	33.55%

Scenario C. Rural Transit District Needs Factor - Current and Projected 2010.

Rural Transit District	Current (Census 2000)			Projected 2010		
	Population	Land Area	Needs Factor Po	pulation	Land Area 25%	Needs Factor
Total	5,762,803	251,954	100%	6,455,670	251,437	100%
Alamo Area COG	392,995	10,130	6.12%	439,261	10,090	6.11%
Ark-Tex COG	221,701	5,761	3.46%	230,739	5,761	3.25%
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	39,877	6,317	1.15%	39,478	6,317	1.09%
Bee Community Action Agency	75,844	4,051	1.39%	82,047	4,051	1.36%
Brazos Transit District	798,164	16,910	12.07%	870,258	16,835	11.79%
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	427,869	7,192	6.28%	494,444	7,082	6.45%
Central Texas Rural Transit District	184,925	10,693	3.47%	195,080	10,690	3.33%
Cleburne City of	103,238	710	1.41%	78,295	677	0.98%
Collin County Committee on Aging	56,516	689	0.80%	100,216	650	1.23%
Colorado Valley Transit	117,124	3,220	1.84%	135,438	3,220	1.89%
Community Act. Council of South Texas	84,180	5,149	1.61%	100,195	5,149	1.68%
Community Council of Southwest Texas	109,525	11,138	2.53%	120,725	11,138	2.51%
Community Services, Inc.	135,414	1,924	1.95%	170,698	1,921	2.17%
Concho Valley COG	56,505	15,309	2.26%	58,541	15,309	2.20%
Del Rio, City of	44,856	3,170	0.90%	50,067	3,170	0.90%
East Texas COG	565,616	9,613	8.32%	624,278	9,607	8.21%
El Paso, County of	31,157	809	0.49%	59,174	781	0.77%
Fort Bend County	37,891	747	0.57%	50,701	705	0.66%
Golden Crescent RPC	160,333	7,088	2.79%	169,456	7,087	2.67%
Gulf Coast Center	102,725	1,570	1.49%	114,403	1,545	1.48%
Heart of Texas COG	168,338	5,478	2.73%	180,734	5,473	2.64%
Hill Country Transit District	155,387	8,321	2.85%	179,046	8,313	2.91%
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	82,737	896	1.17%	132,068	886	1.62%
Kleberg County Human Services	31,963	2,328	0.65%	32,460	2,328	0.61%
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	122,660	2,641	1.86%	144,271	2,614	1.94%
Panhandle Community Services	223,550	25,749	5.46%	235,286	25,744	5.29%
Public Transit Services	117,544	2,765	1.80%	141,657	2,763	1.92%
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	86,084	6,553	1.77%	85,719	6,553	1.65%
Rural Economic Assist. League	96,923	2,491	1.51%	102,017	2,491	1.43%
Services Program for Aging Needs	62,453	748	0.89%	99,474	711	1.23%
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	76,596	841	1.08%	89,977	841	1.13%
South East Texas RPC	131,130	2,027	1.91%	125,421	2,023	1.66%
South Padre Island, Town of	2,422	2	0.03%	2,627	2	0.03%
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	201,705	15,342	4.15%	206,432	15,337	3.92%
Texoma Area Paratransit System	200,664	5,601	3.17%	226,167	5,599	3.18%
Transit System Inc., The	47,909	609	0.68%	63,252	609	0.80%
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	17,531	3,314	0.56%	30,388	3,313	0.68%

Scenario C. Urban Transit Needs State Funding - Current and Projected 2010.

Principal City	Current (based on 2000 Census)		Projected 2010		Difference
	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	
Total Urban		\$ 5,029,687		\$5,029,687	\$0
Total Urban Transit Districts 1	00%	\$4,698,734	100%	\$4,799,656	\$100,922
Abilene 3	.54%	\$166,541	3.13%	\$150,222	(\$16,319)
Amarillo 5	.94%	\$278,985	5.58%	\$267,647	(\$11,337)
Beaumont 4	.61%	\$216,738	3.91%	\$187,653	(\$29,085)
Brownsville 5	.49%	\$257,925	5.58%	\$267,647	\$9,723
Cleburne			1.45%	\$6 9,409	\$6 9,409
College Station-Bryan	4.39%	\$206,152	4.23%	\$203,041	(\$3,111)
Conroe			1.63%	\$7 8,176	\$7 8,176
Galveston 1.	81%	\$85,215	1.51%	\$72,586	(\$12,628)
Georgetown			1.64%	\$7 8,757	\$7 8,757
Harlingen 3	.67%	\$172,343	3.68%	\$176,692	\$4,349
Killeen 5	.56%	\$261,348	5.58%	\$267,647	\$6,300
Lake Jackson-Angleton	2.43%	\$114,225	2.20%	\$105,439	(\$8,786)
Laredo 5	.81%	\$273,188	5.58%	\$267,647	(\$5,540)
Longview 2	.59%	\$121,466	2.32%	\$111,375	(\$10,091)
Lubbock 6	.62%	\$311,171	5.58%	\$267,647	(\$43,524)
McAllen 6	.62%	\$311,171	5.58%	\$267,647	(\$43,524)
McKinney 1	.81%	\$84,833			(\$84,833)
Midland-Odessa 6	.62%	\$311,171	5.58%	\$267,647	(\$43,524)
New Braunfels			1.74%	\$8 3,532	\$8 3,532
Port Arthur	3.80%	\$178,389	3.19%	\$152,926	(\$25,462)
San Angelo	2.91%	\$136,868	2.45%	\$117,377	(\$19,490)
San Marcos			2.22%	\$106,722	\$106,722
Sherman 1.	86%	\$87,390	1.73%	\$83,158	(\$4,231)
Temple 2	.38%	\$111,924	2.40%	\$115,323	\$3,399
Texarkana 1.	61%	\$75,875	1.51%	\$72,248	(\$3,627)
Texas City	3.19%	\$150,012	2.21%	\$105,885	(\$44,127)
The Woodlands	2.96%	\$139,164	5.04%	\$242,061	\$102,897
Tyler 3	.36%	\$157,911	3.50%	\$167,911	\$10,000
Victoria 2.	04%	\$95,731	1.82%	\$87,492	(\$8,239)
Waco 5	.07%	\$238,355	4.74%	\$227,709	(\$10,646)
Wichita Falls	3.29%	\$154,646	2.72%	\$130,429	(\$24,217)
Limited Eligibility Provider 1	00%	\$330,954	100%	\$230,031	(\$100,922)
Arlington 3	6.56%	\$120,996	36.79%	\$84,631	(\$36,365)
Grand Prairie	16.08%	\$53,211	16.12%	\$37,086	(\$16,126)
Mesquite 14	.48%	\$47,909	13.53%	\$31,128	(\$16,781)
NETS 3	2.89%	\$108,836	33.55%	\$77,186	(\$31,650)

Scenario C. Rural Transit Needs State Funding - Current and Projected 2010.

Cu Rural Transit District	Current		Projected 2010		Difference
	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	
Total 1	00%	\$12,143,345	100%	\$12,143,345	\$0
Alamo Area COG	6.12%	\$743,158	6.11%	\$741,458	(\$1,700)
Ark-Tex COG	3.46%	\$419,787	3.25%	\$395,015	(\$24,772)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	1.15%	\$139,160	1.09%	\$131,996	(\$7,164)
Bee Community Action Agency	1.39%	\$168,668	1.36%	\$164,660	(\$4,008)
Brazos Transit District	12.07%	\$1,465,065	11.79%	\$1,431,064	(\$34,001)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	6.28%	\$762,830	6.45%	\$782,987	\$20,157
Central Texas Rural Transit District	3.47%	\$421,123	3.33%	\$404,365	(\$16,758)
Cleburne City of	1.41%	\$171,703	0.98%	\$118,638	(\$53,065)
Collin County Committee on Aging	0.80%	\$97,631	1.23%	\$149,239	\$51,608
Colorado Valley Transit	1.84%	\$223,919	1.89%	\$229,990	\$6,071
Community Act. Council of South Texas	1.61%	\$195,140	1.68%	\$203,518	\$8,378
Community Council of Southwest Texas	2.53%	\$307,342	2.51%	\$304,792	(\$2,550)
Community Services, Inc.	1.95%	\$237,276	2.17%	\$263,991	\$26,715
Concho Valley COG	2.26%	\$273,827	2.20%	\$267,391	(\$6,436)
Del Rio, City of	0.90%	\$109,045	0.90%	\$108,924	(\$121)
East Texas COG	8.32%	\$1,009,699	8.21%	\$996,706	(\$12,993)
El Paso, County of	0.49%	\$59,015	0.77%	\$93,016	\$34,001
Fort Bend County	0.57%	\$68,973	0.66%	\$80,023	\$11,050
Golden Crescent RPC	2.79%	\$338,793	2.67%	\$324,707	(\$14,086)
Gulf Coast Center	1.49%	\$181,296	1.48%	\$180,082	(\$1,214)
Heart of Texas COG	2.73%	\$331,992	2.64%	\$321,064	(\$10,928)
Hill Country Transit District	2.85%	\$345,836	2.91%	\$352,879	\$7,043
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	1.17%	\$141,589	1.62%	\$197,083	\$55,494
Kleberg County Human Services	0.65%	\$78,566	0.61%	\$73,951	(\$4,615)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	1.86%	\$225,619	1.94%	\$235,090	\$9,471
Panhandle Community Services	5.46%	\$663,499	5.29%	\$642,856	(\$20,643)
Public Transit Services	1.80%	\$219,062	1.92%	\$233,148	\$14,086
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	1.77%	\$215,054	1.65%	\$200,118	(\$14,936)
Rural Economic Assist. League	1.51%	\$183,239	1.43%	\$174,011	(\$9,228)
Services Program for Aging Needs	0.89%	\$107,709	1.23%	\$148,996	\$41,287
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	1.08%	\$131,145	1.13%	\$137,096	\$5,951
South East Texas RPC	1.91%	\$231,569	1.66%	\$201,454	(\$30,115)
South Padre Island, Town of	0.03%	\$3,886	0.03%	\$3,764	(\$122)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	4.15%	\$503,574	3.92%	\$476,495	(\$27,079)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	3.17%	\$384,572	3.18%	\$386,636	\$2,064
Transit System Inc., The	0.68%	\$83,059	0.80%	\$96,659	\$13,600
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	0.56%	\$67,637	0.68%	\$82,937	\$15,300

Scenario C. Rural Transit Needs Federal Funding - Current and Projected 2010.

Cu Rural Transit District	Current		Projected 2010		Difference
	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	Needs Factor	Needs Funding	
Total 1	00%	\$13,068,091	100%	\$13,068,091	\$0
Alamo Area COG	6.12%	\$799,751	2.41%	\$797,922	(\$1,829)
Ark-Tex COG	3.46%	\$451,755	3.37%	\$425,096	(\$26,659)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	1.15%	\$149,757	1.97%	\$142,047	(\$7,710)
Bee Community Action Agency	1.39%	\$181,512	1.83%	\$177,200	(\$4,312)
Brazos Transit District	12.07%	\$1,576,634	2.50%	\$1,540,044	(\$36,590)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	6.28%	\$820,921	4.13%	\$842,614	\$21,693
Central Texas Rural Transit District	3.47%	\$453,192	3.15%	\$435,159	(\$18,033)
Cleburne City of	1.41%	\$184,779	1.80%	\$127,673	(\$57,106)
Collin County Committee on Aging	0.80%	\$105,065	2.08%	\$160,604	\$55,539
Colorado Valley Transit	1.84%	\$240,971	2.63%	\$247,505	\$6,534
Community Act. Council of South Texas	1.61%	\$210,000	2.51%	\$219,017	\$9,017
Community Council of Southwest Texas	2.53%	\$330,747	2.86%	\$328,003	(\$2,744)
Community Services, Inc.	1.95%	\$255,345	2.85%	\$284,095	\$28,750
Concho Valley COG	2.26%	\$294,680	2.10%	\$287,754	(\$6,926)
Del Rio, City of	0.90%	\$117,349	2.58%	\$117,218	(\$131)
East Texas COG	8.32%	\$1,086,590	1.55%	\$1,072,607	(\$13,983)
El Paso, County of	0.49%	\$63,510	3.00%	\$100,100	\$36,590
Fort Bend County	0.57%	\$74,225	3.24%	\$86,117	\$11,892
Golden Crescent RPC	2.79%	\$364,592	3.13%	\$349,434	(\$15,158)
Gulf Coast Center	1.49%	\$195,103	1.23%	\$193,796	(\$1,307)
Heart of Texas COG	2.73%	\$357,274	2.01%	\$345,513	(\$11,761)
Hill Country Transit District	2.85%	\$372,172	2.83%	\$379,751	\$7,579
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	1.17%	\$152,371	2.91%	\$212,091	\$59,720
Kleberg County Human Services	0.65%	\$84,549	1.81%	\$79,583	(\$4,966)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	1.86%	\$242,800	1.95%	\$252,993	\$10,193
Panhandle Community Services	5.46%	\$714,026	2.72%	\$691,811	(\$22,215)
Public Transit Services	1.80%	\$235,744	2.96%	\$250,902	\$15,158
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	1.77%	\$231,431	2.59%	\$215,358	(\$16,073)
Rural Economic Assist. League	1.51%	\$197,194	3.15%	\$187,262	(\$9,932)
Services Program for Aging Needs	0.89%	\$115,912	2.47%	\$160,342	\$44,430
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	1.08%	\$141,133	2.52%	\$147,536	\$6,403
South East Texas RPC	1.91%	\$249,203	2.13%	\$216,795	(\$32,408)
South Padre Island, Town of	0.03%	\$4,182	7.02%	\$4,051	(\$131)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	4.15%	\$541,923	2.26%	\$512,782	(\$29,141)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	3.17%	\$413,858	2.24%	\$416,080	\$2,222
Transit System Inc., The	0.68%	\$89,384	2.03%	\$104,020	\$14,636
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	0.56%	\$72,788	2.99%	\$89,253	\$16,465
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	6.85%	\$895,669	2.46%	\$867,963	(\$27,706)

Scenario C. Urban Performance State Funding - Current and Projected 2010.

Principal City	Current Transit Districts		Scenario C Transit Districts		Difference
	Performance Factor	Funding for Performance	Performance Factor	Funding for Performance	
Total Urban		\$5,029,687		\$5,029,687	\$0
Total Urban Transit Districts 1	00.00%	\$4,698,734	100.00%	\$4,799,656	\$100,922
Abilene 4	.21%	\$197,971	3.76%	\$180,401	(\$17,570)
Amarillo 2	.70%	\$126,834	2.40%	\$114,993	(\$11,841)
Beaumont 4	.75%	\$223,121	4.21%	\$202,134	(\$20,987)
Brownsville 6	.64%	\$311,795	5.91%	\$283,585	(\$28,210)
Cleburne			2.81%	\$134,873	\$134,873
College Station-Bryan	3.56%	\$167,127	3.17%	\$152,097	(\$15,030)
Conroe			2.81%	\$134,873	\$134,873
Galveston 9	.07%	\$425,983	8.15%	\$391,168	(\$34,815)
Georgetown			2.81%	\$134,873	\$134,873
Harlingen 0.	.87%	\$40,778	0.77%	\$37,195	(\$3,582)
Killeen 3	.05%	\$143,421	2.71%	\$129,949	(\$13,473)
Lake Jackson-Angleton	1.25%	\$58,836	1.12%	\$53,700	(\$5,136)
Laredo 9	.27%	\$435,698	8.32%	\$399,521	(\$36,177)
Longview 2	.50%	\$117,364	2.22%	\$106,751	(\$10,613)
Lubbock 6	.89%	\$323,510	6.16%	\$295,828	(\$27,682)
McAllen 3	.34%	\$156,772	2.95%	\$141,354	(\$15,418)
McKinney 3	.61%	\$169,439			(\$169,439)
Midland-Odessa 2	.75%	\$129,093	2.45%	\$117,352	(\$11,741)
New Braunfels			2.81%	\$134,873	\$134,873
Port Arthur	2.61%	\$122,448	2.31%	\$110,676	(\$11,773)
San Angelo	2.75%	\$129,321	2.46%	\$117,979	(\$11,342)
San Marcos			2.81%	\$134,873	\$134,873
Sherman 3	.18%	\$149,218	2.83%	\$135,908	(\$13,310)
Temple 3	.20%	\$150,337	2.83%	\$135,964	(\$14,373)
Texarkana 3	.71%	\$174,409	3.32%	\$159,182	(\$15,227)
Texas City	1.29%	\$60,538	1.15%	\$55,117	(\$5,421)
The Woodlands	5.93%	\$278,525	5.26%	\$252,311	(\$26,214)
Tyler 2	.49%	\$116,950	2.22%	\$106,351	(\$10,599)
Victoria 3	.79%	\$177,925	3.38%	\$162,227	(\$15,698)
Waco 3	.47%	\$163,268	3.10%	\$148,702	(\$14,567)
Wichita Falls	3.15%	\$148,053	2.81%	\$134,846	(\$13,207)
Limited Eligibility Providers 1	00.00%	\$330,954	100.00%	\$230,031	(\$100,922)
Arlington 27	.97%	\$92,562	27.97%	\$64,336	(\$28,226)
Grand Prairie	29.79%	\$98,587	29.79%	\$68,523	(\$30,064)
Mesquite 27	.65%	\$91,506	27.65%	\$63,602	(\$27,904)
NETS 14	.59%	\$48,298	14.59%	\$33,570	(\$14,728)

Scenario C. Urban Transit State Funding Summary of Results.

Principal City <i>*Impacted by Merger to Very Large Urbanized Area</i>	Current Total	Projected 2010 Total	Difference	
Total Urban	\$10,059,374	\$10,059,374	\$0	
Total Urban Transit Districts	\$9,397,467	\$9,599,312	\$201,845	
Abilene \$	364,513	\$330,623	(\$33,890)	
Amarillo \$	405,819	\$382,640	(\$23,178)	
Beaumont \$	439,859	\$389,786	(\$50,073)	
Brownsville \$	569,719	\$551,232	(\$18,487)	
Cleburne		\$204,282	\$204,282	
College Station-Bryan	\$373,278	\$355,138	(\$18,140)	
Conroe		\$213,049	\$213,049	
Galveston \$	511,198	\$463,755	(\$47,443)	
Georgetown		\$213,630	\$213,630	
Harlingen \$	213,120	\$213,888	\$767	
Killeen \$	404,769	\$397,596	(\$7,173)	
Lake Jackson-Angleton	\$173,061	\$159,139	(\$13,922)	
Laredo \$	708,885	\$667,168	(\$41,717)	
Longview \$	238,830	\$218,126	(\$20,704)	
Lubbock \$	634,681	\$563,476	(\$71,206)	
McAllen \$	467,943	\$409,001	(\$58,942)	
McKinney \$	254,272		(\$254,272)	
Midland-Odessa \$	440,264	\$384,999	(\$55,265)	
New Braunfels		\$218,405	\$218,405	
Port Arthur	\$300,837	\$263,602	(\$37,235)	
San Angelo	\$266,188	\$235,356	(\$30,832)	
San Marcos		\$241,595	\$241,595	
Sherman \$	236,608	\$219,067	(\$17,541)	
Temple \$	262,261	\$251,288	(\$10,974)	
Texarkana \$	250,284	\$231,429	(\$18,854)	
Texas City	\$210,550	\$161,002	(\$49,548)	
The Woodlands	\$417,689	\$494,372	\$76,683	
Tyler \$	274,861	\$274,262	(\$599)	
Victoria \$	273,655	\$249,718	(\$23,937)	
Waco \$	401,623	\$376,410	(\$25,213)	
Wichita Falls	\$302,699	\$265,275	(\$37,424)	
Limited Eligibility Providers			(\$201,845)	
Arlington	\$213,559	\$148,967	(\$64,592)	\$341,663 Cap*
Grand Prairie	\$151,799	\$105,609	(\$46,189)	\$170,584 Cap*
Mesquite	\$139,416	\$94,730	(\$44,686)	\$142,455 Cap*
NETS	\$157,134	\$110,756	(\$46,378)	\$116,134 Cap*

*Limited eligibility providers are limited by statute to funding not to exceed these cap levels

Scenario C. Rural Transit State Funding Summary of Results.

Rural Transit District <i>*Impacted by new urbanized area</i>	Current Total	Projected 2010 Total	Difference
Total \$	18,682,070	\$18,682,070	\$0
Alamo Area COG*	\$900,803	\$899,103	(\$1,700)
Ark-Tex COG	\$640,334	\$615,562	(\$24,772)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	\$268,166	\$261,002	(\$7,164)
Bee Community Action Agency	\$288,586	\$284,578	(\$4,008)
Brazos Transit District*	\$1,628,661	\$1,594,660	(\$34,001)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System*	\$1,032,678	\$1,052,835	\$20,157
Central Texas Rural Transit District	\$627,089	\$610,331	(\$16,758)
Cleburne City of*	\$289,202	\$236,137	(\$53,065)
Collin County Committee on Aging	\$233,830	\$285,438	\$51,608
Colorado Valley Transit	\$396,015	\$402,086	\$6,071
Community Act. Council of South Texas	\$359,063	\$367,441	\$8,378
Community Council of Southwest Texas	\$494,477	\$491,927	(\$2,550)
Community Services, Inc.	\$423,691	\$450,406	\$26,715
Concho Valley COG	\$411,007	\$404,571	(\$6,436)
Del Rio, City of	\$277,937	\$277,816	(\$121)
East Texas COG	\$1,110,851	\$1,097,858	(\$12,993)
El Paso, County of	\$255,042	\$289,043	\$34,001
Fort Bend County	\$280,889	\$291,939	\$11,050
Golden Crescent RPC	\$543,451	\$529,365	(\$14,086)
Gulf Coast Center	\$261,982	\$260,768	(\$1,214)
Heart of Texas COG	\$463,548	\$452,620	(\$10,928)
Hill Country Transit District	\$530,944	\$537,987	\$7,043
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	\$331,927	\$387,421	\$55,494
Kleberg County Human Services	\$197,045	\$192,430	(\$4,615)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	\$353,318	\$362,789	\$9,471
Panhandle Community Services	\$841,610	\$820,967	(\$20,643)
Public Transit Services	\$412,604	\$426,690	\$14,086
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	\$384,665	\$369,729	(\$14,936)
Rural Economic Assist. League	\$389,401	\$380,173	(\$9,228)
Services Program for Aging Needs	\$269,408	\$310,695	\$41,287
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	\$295,721	\$301,672	\$5,951
South East Texas RPC	\$371,103	\$340,988	(\$30,115)
South Padre Island, Town of	\$462,634	\$462,512	(\$122)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	\$651,085	\$624,006	(\$27,079)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	\$531,036	\$533,100	\$2,064
Transit System Inc., The	\$215,727	\$229,327	\$13,600
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	\$263,272	\$278,572	\$15,300
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	\$993,268	\$967,526	(\$25,742)

Scenario C. Rural Transit *Federal* Funding Summary of Results.

Rural Transit District <i>*Impacted by new urbanized area</i>	Current Total	Projected 2010 Total	Difference
Total \$	20,104,753	\$20,104,753	\$0
Alamo Area COG	\$969,402	\$967,573	(\$1,829)
Ark-Tex COG	\$689,097	\$662,438	(\$26,659)
Aspermont Small Bus. Dvlpmt Ctr.	\$288,588	\$280,878	(\$7,710)
Bee Community Action Agency	\$310,562	\$306,250	(\$4,312)
Brazos Transit District	\$1,752,688	\$1,716,098	(\$36,590)
Capital Area Rural Transportation System	\$1,111,318	\$1,133,011	\$21,693
Central Texas Rural Transit District	\$674,842	\$656,809	(\$18,033)
Cleburne City of	\$311,225	\$254,119	(\$57,106)
Collin County Committee on Aging	\$251,636	\$307,175	\$55,539
Colorado Valley Transit	\$426,172	\$432,706	\$6,534
Community Act. Council of South Texas	\$386,406	\$395,423	\$9,017
Community Council of Southwest Texas	\$532,132	\$529,388	(\$2,744)
Community Services, Inc.	\$455,956	\$484,706	\$28,750
Concho Valley COG	\$442,306	\$435,380	(\$6,926)
Del Rio, City of	\$299,102	\$298,971	(\$131)
East Texas COG	\$1,195,445	\$1,181,462	(\$13,983)
El Paso, County of	\$274,465	\$311,055	\$36,590
Fort Bend County	\$302,279	\$314,171	\$11,892
Golden Crescent RPC	\$584,835	\$569,677	(\$15,158)
Gulf Coast Center	\$281,934	\$280,627	(\$1,307)
Heart of Texas COG	\$498,849	\$487,088	(\$11,761)
Hill Country Transit District	\$571,376	\$578,955	\$7,579
Kaufman Area Rural Transportation	\$357,204	\$416,924	\$59,720
Kleberg County Human Services	\$212,051	\$207,085	(\$4,966)
Lower Rio Grande Valley Dev. Council	\$380,223	\$390,416	\$10,193
Panhandle Community Services	\$905,701	\$883,486	(\$22,215)
Public Transit Services	\$444,025	\$459,183	\$15,158
Rolling Plains Management Corp.	\$413,958	\$397,885	(\$16,073)
Rural Economic Assist. League	\$419,056	\$409,124	(\$9,932)
Services Program for Aging Needs	\$289,925	\$334,355	\$44,430
Snr Center Res. & Public Transit Inc.	\$318,242	\$324,645	\$6,403
South East Texas RPC	\$399,362	\$366,954	(\$32,408)
South Padre Island, Town of	\$497,864	\$497,733	(\$131)
South Plains Comm. Action Assoc.	\$700,667	\$671,526	(\$29,141)
Texoma Area Paratransit System	\$571,476	\$573,698	\$2,222
Transit System Inc., The	\$232,155	\$246,791	\$14,636
Webb Co. Community Action Agency	\$283,321	\$299,786	\$16,465
West Texas Opportunities, Inc.	\$1,068,908	\$1,041,202	(\$27,706)