

1. Report No. FHWA/TX-98/1813-S		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION OF CRITERIA FOR OPTIMIZATION OF THE TEXAS AIRPORT SYSTEM				5. Report Date November 1998	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) Jeffrey D. Borowiec and George B. Dresser				8. Performing Organization Report No. Report 1813-S	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Texas Transportation Institute The Texas A&M University System College Station, Texas 77843-3135				10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No. Project No. 0-1813	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Texas Department of Transportation Research and Technology Transfer Office P.O. Box 5080 Austin, Texas 78763-5080				13. Type of Report and Period Covered Project Summary: September 1997 - August 1998	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes Research performed in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and the Texas Department of Transportation Research Project Title: Development and Application of Criteria for Optimization of the Texas Airport System					
16. Abstract  This project defines an "ideal" system of general aviation airports that meets the future air transportation needs of the state. Beginning with a "clean slate", so to speak, the ideal airport system is identified using methodology similar to the methodology used to develop the initial version of the Texas Highway Trunk System. Other criteria is also used. This project examines the question of airport system plan optimization, or rationalization, in a comprehensive context to include such factors as public policy considerations, air transportation as a mode of transportation, community economic vitality and competitiveness, traditional airport system criteria, and access to the system.					
17. Key Words Airport System Panning, Texas Airport System, Airport System Optimization			18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document is available to the public through NTIS: National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161		
19. Security Classif.(of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classif.(of this page) Unclassified		21. No. of Pages 94	22. Price



**DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION OF CRITERIA  
FOR OPTIMIZATION OF THE TEXAS AIRPORT SYSTEM**

by

Jeffrey D. Borowiec  
Assistant Research Scientist

and

George B. Dresser  
Research Scientist

Report 1813-S  
Research Project Number 0-1813  
Research Project Title: Development and Application of Criteria  
for Optimization of the Texas Airport System

Sponsored by the  
Texas Department of Transportation  
In Cooperation with  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration

November 1998

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



## **IMPLEMENTATION STATEMENT**

The research documented in this summary report provides information to the Texas Department of Transportation on the state of the current airport system and its importance to the State of Texas and the nation. This information will allow the Department to make more informed decisions regarding the airport system with respect to future projects. In addition, it will help to evaluate how well the current airport system is meeting the needs of the state and the objectives of the Department.



## **DISCLAIMER**

The contents of this report reflect the views of the author who is responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented within. The contents do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Texas Department of Transportation or the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specifications, or regulation. It is not intended for construction, bidding, or permit purposes. The report was prepared by Jeffrey D. Borowiec, assistant research scientist. George B. Dresser, Ph.D. was the research supervisor.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research team wishes to thank the staff at the Texas Department of Transportation for their support of this project from data collection through final review. They would also like to thank the project director, Linda Howard, for her support and guidance throughout the entire project. In addition, the team would also like to thank those individuals who assisted by providing information from their respective organizations. These include:

- Steve Coons, Bureau of Aeronautics, State of Wisconsin
- Terry Barrie, Division of Aeronautics, State of California
- Amy McCormick, Division of Aeronautics, State of Colorado
- Al Roberts, Aviation Office, State of Florida
- Harry Downing, Aviation Office, State of Florida
- Paul Kramer, Division of Aeronautics, State of Illinois
- Dick Tyson, Aeronautics Office, State of Minnesota
- Keith McCrae, Department of Aviation, State of Virginia
- Robert Yatzeck, Federal Aviation Administration
- Mo Haupt, National Business Aviation Association



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables .....	x
Summary .....	xi
Chapter 1. Introduction .....	1
Background and Significance of this Report .....	1
Chapter 2. Literature Review .....	5
General Aviation Airports .....	5
Rural Airports .....	7
Agricultural Airports .....	8
Telephone Interviews .....	9
California .....	9
Colorado .....	9
Florida .....	10
Illinois .....	11
Minnesota .....	11
Virginia .....	12
Wisconsin .....	12
Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) .....	13
National Business Aviation Association (NBAA) .....	13
Summary of Literature Review .....	14
Chapter 3. Methodology .....	17
Texas Highway Trunk System .....	17
Chapter 4. Development of Ideal Texas Airport System Criteria .....	19
Chapter 5. Application of Ideal Airport System Criteria .....	23
Population .....	23
Economic Activity and Retail Sales .....	24
Resources - Oil, Gas, and Agriculture .....	24
Analysis of Specific Counties .....	26
Population Service Coverage .....	27
Additional Indicators .....	30
Optimization .....	35
Chapter 6. Conclusions and Recommendations .....	37
References .....	41
Appendix A .....	43
Appendix B .....	55
Appendix C .....	67
Appendix D .....	79

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	TASP System Airports by Role and Number .....	1
2.	Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for Texas General Aviation Airports Frequency Report .....	2
3.	Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) and Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas (PMSA) in Texas .....	20
4.	Counties Not Included Using Developed Criteria .....	26
5.	Population Service Areas for MSAs/PMSAs .....	28
6.	State Population Coverage of Airports in Population Categories .....	30
7.	Aviation Measures for the MSAs/PMSAs As a Cumulative Percent of State Totals .....	31
8.	State Aviation Activity with Respect to Population Categories .....	32
9.	Economic/Resource Measures for the MSAs/PMSAs As a Cumulative Percent of State Totals .....	33
10.	State Economic/Resource Activity As a Cumulative Percent of State Totals For Population Categories .....	35
11.	Comparison of Current and Ideal Systems As a Percent of State Totals .....	35

## SUMMARY

General aviation includes all the flying that is not conducted by the airlines or the military. While less visible than the commercial air carriers, it is no less important. The literature shows that the general aviation airport concept is not well understood simply because it is not marketed as widely as other products or services. General aviation airports are often overlooked and taken for granted despite playing vital roles in many communities.

Funding continues to be a problem as there simply is not enough money to operate and maintain these airports. Airport managers are very concerned and some have turned to innovative financing methods. Consequently, these managers have become more attuned to public relations to develop support for their airports.

Access to rural communities is of particular concern. Small rural communities are often more dependent on these aviation facilities than other communities. They are essential in attracting and maintaining businesses so the community can remain competitive. They are also critical to certain industries such as agriculture that have special needs and contribute greatly to the economy. Agriculture is big business in Texas and other states and this industry relies on these facilities to operate.

Interviews with several state aviation offices revealed that none have taken steps to optimize their state airport systems. While several states have completed, or are in the process of undertaking, classification studies, none have sought to define an “ideal” airport system. Not all of the states interviewed are having difficulty funding their needs but there does appear to be a consensus that it is becoming more difficult. It is expected that these functional classification studies will help states to prioritize airports and specific projects for funding. However, they will not define an optimal or “ideal” system.

In the final analysis, it is clear that the current airport system provides adequate airport access to the people of the state. Approximately 98% of the state’s population is located within a 25-mile driving radius of an aviation facility. More than 90% of the state’s property tax, retail sales, employment, oil and gas, and agricultural activity occurs within a 25-mile radius of an airport.



## CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

### BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS REPORT

The Texas general aviation airport system developed over time in a relatively unstructured manner. Many system airports were developed as either private strips or surplus military facilities with ownership being transferred to communities that now operate the airports for public use. Therefore, the current airport system may not be the optimum to meet the state's needs.

The airport system is also costly to maintain. The current Texas Airport System Plan (TASP) produced by the Texas Department of Transportation's (TxDOT) Aviation Division projects 0-5 year development costs for general aviation non-reliever facilities at more than \$293 million or \$58.7 million per year. Reliever airport development costs are projected at almost \$301 million or approximately \$60 million per year (1).

Federal funding for state aviation provided to general aviation reliever and non-reliever airports is approximately \$23.0 million. State funding is about \$15 million annually. The annual total amount available for general aviation airports is about \$38 million from all sources. The total amount needed, however, is \$118.7 million, resulting in a shortfall of \$81 million each year.

With the limited resources available, it is understandable that the perception exists that there are too many airports in the Texas airport system. However, where to trim the system is open to debate and depends on the person offering the opinion. In recent telephone interviews conducted with airport managers and city officials at some of the state's general aviation airports, the consensus was virtually unanimous, "Without an Airport, You're Dead" (2). None of the cities or counties that sponsor airports expressed any interest in having their airports deleted from the Texas Airport System Plan. The airport is a vital link in these communities for industry, banking, agriculture, and medical services and improves the standard of living. Table 1 lists the number of airports in the system and their role.

**TABLE 1**  
**TASP System Airports by Role and Number**

<b>Airport Role</b>	<b>Number of Airports</b>
Commercial Service	27
Reliever	24
Transport	66
General Utility	127
Basic Utility	63
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>307</b>

Texas communities recognize the importance of air service to their economic development. However, the airport's viability depends upon the airport condition. Airports are not an asset if they are unusable because the runways have deteriorated. Deteriorating runways are among the largest consumers of available airport funding. Can the state afford to continue putting resources into all the general aviation airports requiring pavement maintenance? The recently completed *Update: Implementation of the Micro PAVER Pavement Management System on TxDOT Aviation Division Airfields* (3) indicates that runway improvements account for almost 67% of the five-year development cost projections for general aviation. More than 25% of the runways at general aviation airports are in fair or poor condition. These surfaces will require improvement within two to three years to maintain their present condition. Table 2 lists the pavement condition for general aviation airports in Texas.

**TABLE 2**  
**Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for Texas General Aviation Airports**  
**Frequency Report**

Condition	PCI Range	Percent of Total Pavement Area	
		January 1994	July 1996
Failed	0-10	6.01	3.71
Very Poor	11-25	7.62	8.00
Poor	26-40	5.19	9.87
Fair	41-55	6.93	10.32
Good	56-70	25.48	24.23
Very Good	71-85	22.52	30.91
Excellent	86-100	26.26	12.96

Note: Runways with a pavement condition index (PCI) rating of 55 or less are considered to be in need of improvement within two to three years.

Source: TTI

In developing the TASP, one of the most important objectives is to formulate a state system that will provide air access to small communities in the state to encourage economic development. Some businesses will not consider locating in communities without scheduled air service. A community without any air service is severely disadvantaged in terms of economic development potential. Therefore, the negative consequences to general aviation in not meeting the projected development needs are twofold. First, general aviation airports may be lost resulting in the community's loss of air access, business, and recreation. Second, the

community may lose the economic development potential that is provided by having air access.

From a policy perspective, TxDOT has a responsibility to use agency resources to support airport projects of state interest and not to fund projects that may have limited or few public benefits. Under the TASP, as currently structured, almost all of the publicly owned airports are eligible for state financial support.

This project will define an “ideal” system of general aviation airports that will meet the future air transportation needs of the state. Beginning with a “clean slate” so to speak, the ideal airport system will be identified using methodology similar to that used to develop the initial version of the Texas Trunk System as well as other criteria. This project examines the question of airport system plan optimization, or rationalization, in a comprehensive context to include factors such as public policy considerations, air transportation as a mode, community economic vitality and competitiveness, and traditional airport system planning criteria. Other factors include the forecast growth of general aviation, impacts of changes in speed limits and driving times, the functionality of each airport identified for inclusion in the ideal system, and access criteria.





## CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### GENERAL AVIATION AIRPORTS

While the commercial air carriers remain the most visible segment of the air transportation system, the majority of aircraft operations occur within the general aviation segment. General aviation is generally considered to include all flying not conducted by commercial airlines. This includes business flying, instructional flying, and personal flying. This activity occurs at the smaller, general aviation airports that comprise 80% of the airports in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) and more than 90% of the airports in the Texas Aeronautical Facilities Plan (TAFP) (4). These facilities provide air access to many population centers across the state. They include both industrial and agricultural uses and they contribute to both natural resource and economic development. It is clear that general aviation is an economic force both in Texas and nationally.

Although general aviation contributes greatly to local, state, and national economies, it is widely accepted that this contribution is not well understood outside of the aviation community (5, 6). The reasons are varied and include the fact that airports are not often marketed as widely as other products and services. Rarely are general aviation airports perceived as the economic engines that they are for many communities. As funding levels decline and uncertainties cloud the future, the issues of management and possible loss of a general aviation airport will rise to the forefront in many communities.

Airports play vital roles in communities, roles that are often taken for granted. They also are important for several industries including agriculture, mining, fishing, and oil exploration and production (6). These airports are often used to bring entertainment to the community during airshows and provide a gateway to a community's recreational facilities. However, they also offer options for medical care. Not only do they provide access for medical evacuation services, but also they provide a facility for delivering medical or emergency supplies as well as evacuation services during natural disasters. Most importantly, general aviation airports provide access to a community for business.

General aviation airport users are not recreational flyers or wealthy individuals enjoying an expensive hobby. The activity at the airport is often associated with business. A survey in Massachusetts showed that 35% of the businesses using general aviation are service businesses, a category that includes consultants, lawyers, doctors, and advertising firms (5). "Manufacturing contributed another 19% of all business users and was dominated by computer, electronics, and machinery manufacturers. An additional 32% of the survey respondents were engaged in diverse industries such as wholesaling, retailing, construction, utilities, agriculture, and fishing" (5).

Corporate access to general aviation airports is of growing importance to both the business community and the community. As businesses decentralize their operations, it is critical for communities to offer these facilities if they are serious about competing for, and attracting businesses to their area. Without these facilities, cities and towns are jeopardizing their opportunities to grow and economically sustain themselves.

The Massachusetts survey pointed out that general aviation facilities are very important to businesses when they make location decisions. “Any airport that increases the types of aircraft that can use the airport, or the time that the airport can be used, or the reliability for its usage, will encourage greater use of the airport and, hence, attract additional businesses and promote economic growth” (5).

General aviation airports play a critical role in larger urban areas serving as centers of economic growth and as reliever facilities for larger air carrier airports. This provides greater capacity for the air carriers. For the most part, their relationship to larger airports in terms of their roles and their economic significance is understood and appreciated. It is their impact in smaller communities that is less understood. “The public and legislators do not fully appreciate how a small airport in a rural area can contribute to the economic development of that region. While the airport itself is quite visible, the complexity and interaction of the air transport system is much less apparent” (6).

Further, the condition of the airport is paramount to the economic activity that follows. This not only includes the condition of the pavement but also the level of service offered on the field. Without a doubt, the success of the airport and the subsequent economic activity will hinge on the condition of the airport. While it is important to develop such a facility, it is equally important to maintain the facility.

Developing and maintaining these facilities is expensive as noted above. Money continues to be a driving consideration for general aviation airports. There simply is not enough money to fund adequate maintenance. Airport managers across the country are increasingly concerned as funding diminishes. Many who operate reliever airports worry about the reductions as more airports achieve reliever status and still share from the same pot of money. This essentially reduces the amount they would receive. Others are concerned about environmental issues and their associated costs. It is becoming increasingly difficult for managers to balance the needs and requirements of private industry to attract commerce while complying with, and operating under, the regulations and guidelines established by the various levels of governments.

One airport manager underscored the need to educate the public and the government on the importance of reliever airports and the role and function they serve in our communities as well as the economic impact they have. These relievers, if not adequate, can have negative effects on the air transportation system as a whole. As one manager pointed out, “if our federal leaders allow the functional effectiveness of the reliever system to decline, it will have deleterious effects on the air carrier facilities to operate efficiently and safely” (7). It is possible that when the problems are evident in the most visible segment of the air transportation system, the proper attention will be given these issues on a national level.

The persistent funding issues have motivated many to become creative in finding new revenue sources for their airports. Airport managers have become more in-tune with public relations and creating positive experiences and interactions with their communities and their tenants. Some airports have begun mailing newsletters while others have planned air shows to attract the public and introduce them to the airport.

These public relations efforts across the country have also shown the community what opportunities the airport can provide. They have been successful in attracting both aviation and non-aviation businesses to airports (7).

However, airport managers' wish lists really indicate what is needed to make the facility successful. The list includes runway expansions, T-Hangar construction, development of industrial parks, terminal building modernization, installation of modern nav aids and land, and airport rescue and firefighting equipment acquisitions (8).

In addition to the public investment, airports need private investment. "Private money is what makes an airport successful and success is contagious" (8). However, private entities are often reluctant to participate until they are convinced of the airport's viability or stability in the region demonstrated by public support and resources. This catch-22 situation is summed up by Connin and Leggett. In their study on rural airport business travel, they conclude that "often the difference between a moribund rural airport and a prosperous one is the skill and talent of local officials, such as the airport manager, local business groups, and the clout of elected officeholders to deliver funding to their local airports" (9).

## **RURAL AIRPORTS**

While air access is important to communities of all sizes, it is particularly important to rural areas, because they do not have the diversity of goods and services available to them like larger urban areas. An airport is essential for these rural communities to attract and maintain businesses, but it often takes more. It only provides an opportunity or diminishes its competitiveness. A recent Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) study examined the rural air transportation system in Texas (10). The study showed that while rural airport funding has increased in the 1990s, it is still not adequate to meet the needs identified for the facilities. Challenging this funding situation even further is the fact that it costs approximately \$3 million to construct a suitable airport that can provide access for the turboprop or small jet aircraft used by businesses today. To upgrade an existing facility built for primarily single-engine aircraft is approximately \$1 to \$2 million.

The rural airports study examined the 153 airports in the Texas Airport System that fit the classification of rural airports. A rural airport is defined as any airport that serves a community of less than 10,000 located more than 25 miles from an urbanized area of 50,000 or more (10). The study sought to determine the attributes of an airport that contributed to its success. The success or vitality of an airport is a subjective measure. For the rural airport study, success was determined by estimating and weighting several factors. These include the sponsor's level of interest, aircraft activity levels, airport appearance, services available at the facility, and the physical condition of the airport pavement, its markings, and lighting.

Professional judgement was then used to incorporate these factors into a numerically weighted estimate measuring the success of a rural airport (10). The study concluded that four attributes were highly correlated with the success of rural airports in Texas. They are: 1) the number of registered aircraft in the county, 2) the role or design standard of the airport, 3) availability of services at the airport, and 4) whether or not the airport is attended (10).

Not all of these, however, are controlled by the airport sponsor. While a sponsor may impact arrangements for services to be provided at the airport, the number of based aircraft is

more a factor of economics and attractiveness in the airport's service area. Upgrading an airport from a basic utility airport to a general utility airport can make an airport more attractive. However, most rural airports do not have the resources necessary to upgrade their facilities without the assistance of TxDOT or some other source. It is simply cost prohibitive.

The study concludes that transport or general utility airports are more likely to be successful than basic utility airports. Further, since TxDOT does not have sufficient funding to upgrade many basic utility airports, the study supports a recommendation to upgrade airports whose sponsors have demonstrated a desire and intention to have the airport attended, to have additional services provided, and to have fuel available (10).

Other studies have confirmed these recommendations as well. A recent finding showed that the greatest benefits "might come from the improvement of many smaller, existing local airports that currently serve rural areas and might further growth of high-tech development in rural America" (11). This is a balancing act between the large capital costs involved in developing a new airport and the economic disadvantages of not having an adequate facility. Some industries appear to be more sensitive to the availability of an adequate airport in the community.

In their study of local airports and business development, Reeder and Wanek suggest that high-tech industries are sensitive to airport availability. "Recent industrial location studies show that high-tech industries rank airports among the most important location factors, and recent empirical studies have shown that these industries do in fact locate and grow fastest in rural and urban areas with good airports" (11). Companies use these airports for a variety of reasons that include transporting employees, clients, and valuable products. They also are used by other industries including recreation and agriculture.

## **AGRICULTURAL AIRPORTS**

Agricultural airports are an important part of general aviation and have special needs. Agriculture is big business in Texas where cash receipts in 1996 exceeded \$13 billion and farm real estate values topped \$71 billion, second in the nation behind California (12). Many businesses, individuals, and financial institutions are involved in agribusiness throughout the state including food and fiber production, processing, transporting, and marketing. According to the Texas Agricultural Extension Service, agriculture was responsible for approximately \$44 billion in economic activity in the state in 1996 and the estimated value of farm assets totaled \$80 billion (13). There is also significant potential for future growth in the agricultural industry in Texas. World demands will play a role in this growth and Texas' ability to capitalize on it is paramount. For many Texas counties, agriculture is the primary economic activity. The use of aerial application aircraft is critical to the success of many crops and some livestock programs, and consequently, to the counties and the state.

Reeder and Wanek conclude, "policymakers should not overlook the importance of upgrading the many smaller local airports that are struggling to maintain and encourage business development" (11). Once airports deteriorate, their impact on a community can be devastating leaving it without the economic activity it once knew and depriving it of an economic opportunity in the future. "With limited federal and state funding available, efforts

should be made to identify those areas that would benefit most from airport improvements, and those places that have the greatest need for fiscal assistance” (11).

The short-term forecast for business aviation is expected to be good. Fueled by economic vitality, new products, and pent-up demand, business aircraft manufacturers and operators are riding a wave of prosperity that, barring any unforeseen economic disasters, will continue unabated for the next 3-5 years (14). This is good news for the general aviation airports that are trying to attract businesses to their facilities, as well as those that are trying to keep their current businesses. The global outlook is positive as some Latin America and European countries are expanding or replacing their fleets, 18% and 22% respectively.

In the U.S., general aircraft demand is expected to be robust for both new and used aircraft. In fact, according to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), “the U.S. general aviation fleet, that includes piston- and turbine-powered airplanes and helicopters, is forecast to grow 0.8% annually in the next 10 years to 196,000 aircraft” (14). Further, the number of active general aviation pilots is also forecast to grow to 712,600 by the year 2008 with the number of recreational pilots expected to reach 117,700 (14).

## **TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS**

In an effort to determine and better understand the current issues facing state general aviation airport systems across the country, the research team contacted several state aviation offices. The states interviewed all have large general aviation airport systems that play a critical role in their state. They also have traditionally strong general aviation programs. Additionally, the research team interviewed staff members at the FAA, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA), and the National Business Aviation Association (NBAA).

### **California**

The staff at the California Division of Aeronautics is currently finalizing the 1996 airport system plan. They have not established any specific criteria for adding or deleting airports to the system, but do have a functional classification system that was recently developed. The purpose of this functional classification system is threefold. First, it is used to identify how each airport functions and the services it provides. Second, it identifies airport classifications that appropriately describe the state aviation system. Third, it determines the role each airport plays in the system.

The state is currently faced with a backlog of airport projects that neither state nor federal resources can meet. The magnitude of this backlog has not been determined but may be in the system requirement element yet to be developed. There has also been a change in the role of some of the general aviation airports in the state with respect to the types of aircraft being served. This has not resulted in any problems, as some of these airports have lengthened runways to accommodate the change in aircraft mix.

### **Colorado**

The Colorado Division of Aeronautics currently has a request for qualifications out to develop an inventory and implementation plan. Colorado’s last system plan was developed in approximately 1992. The state does not specifically have criteria to add or delete airports

from its system. The staff is seeking to develop a core system of airports followed by a secondary level and a tertiary level of airports in the system. The staff does not anticipate proposing any new airports nor do they believe the plan will recommend the closure of any airports. The staff has done very well in meeting the needs of the airports in their system and, until this past year, has always had the funds available to meet identified needs.

The division is beginning to realize the change in aircraft using the state's airports. They have not yet been forced to upgrade facilities to accommodate the larger aircraft being used. However, the regional FAA office has informed the staff that these types of deficiencies need to be addressed before embarking on other types of improvement projects. While not all of the identified deficiencies are a result of the change in aircraft mix, some of them are. Some of the reasons for the change in aircraft being used include tourism and technology. Newer aircraft are capable of flying longer distances and faster, and tourism has increased especially from neighboring Oklahoma and Texas.

### **Florida**

The Florida Aviation Office recently let a \$2.5 million contract to continue and update their Continuing Florida Aviation System Plan. This plan will be somewhat different than past plans. Instead of providing a snapshot of the system at a particular point in time, the new plan will provide information about the system at any point in time. The plan will also include criteria for adding and removing airports from the state system. First, the airport must be open to the public and eligible for both state and federal money. Second, it must maintain its fundability, meaning that it must secure the local funding match.

The state has not had difficulty in meeting the identified needs of the airport system, however it is becoming clear that this ability is changing. Some projects do not receive full funding such as major projects/renovations at large air carrier airports. Other projects that remained unfunded or that were uncompetitive can obtain funding through other state programs. Consequently, there has not been much difficulty in meeting needs.

The state also has what the staff calls an "unloved airport" program. Under this program, airports that have not received federal or state money in the past seven years are eligible to participate in the program. The state will provide 80% of the money and require the local entity to put of 20% of the funds or in-kind services to obtain federal matching funds. This allows the airport to maintain one runway.

The staff has recognized a shift toward more multi-engine and business-class aircraft. For the most part, they have been able to accommodate the funding requirements. This has predominantly occurred in the metropolitan areas. Airports have been upgraded and a new airport was constructed. The North County General Aviation Airport was built in the past five years in the northern part of Palm Beach County as a reliever for Palm Beach International Airport. It was built to shift recreational traffic from Palm Beach International that already has noise and land-use problems. General aviation is blossoming in Florida and some airports are beginning to limit touch-and-go activity while another has restricted landing weights to less than 12,500 pounds. This is particularly the case along the southeast coast of the state along a 30-mile stretch north of Miami.

## **Illinois**

The Illinois Division of Aeronautics has a 1997 version of their airport system plan. Their process does identify needs for additional airports in the state, but they are currently experiencing some over-capacity in the southern third of the state. This is primarily due to the airlines eliminating service and the advent of the highway system that makes the automobile a more attractive option. The state maintains that if there is interest and assistance, it will help maintain an airport. It has not reached a point where a municipality has been unable to afford maintenance costs. Consequently, no airports have been removed from their system.

The state is finding it difficult to meet the financial needs of the system. The state has increased its level of funding over the past five to eight years from approximately \$3-\$5 million to approximately \$10 million to help offset reductions in federal funding. However, the state does not have sufficient funding for justifiable projects. The backlog in the number of years to get projects completed depends on the area of the state. The factors are different in the Chicago and St. Louis metropolitan areas compared to the rest of the state. However, the backlog can be approximated at three years. About two years worth of projects are being completed in a five-year period.

A change in the types of aircraft being used at general aviation airports is more apparent in the metropolitan areas where users are moving away from busier air carrier airports. This type of second-tier reliever airport activity is being experienced in the metropolitan areas within a 50 to 70 mile radius. The non-metro areas are somewhat static and the situation is more dependent on the location and proximity of the airport to interstates and driving times to the larger population centers.

## **Minnesota**

The Minnesota Aeronautics Office is in the process of completing its system plan. It is expected that it will be finalized in September. The staff has set out general criteria for airports in the system stating that 90% of the state's population should be within 30 minutes of a paved and lighted airport. Currently the criteria have been met and there are no plans to add airports to the system. There will not be any airports deleted from the system in the current plan. There were two landing sites (grass strips) closed, however, because the small communities that they serve could no longer afford to keep them open.

The state has been able to meet the financial needs of the system up until now. Some projects have been delayed for a year or so due to environmental reasons and not funding problems. The office has not yet rejected a project, but it may take one to two years to get it completed. Funding has not been a large problem.

The state, like others, has seen a shift in the type of aircraft using general aviation facilities. The trend is toward business aircraft including the larger turbo-props and more sophisticated aircraft. The state has completed necessary upgrades that have included runway expansions and instrument landing systems. The aeronautics office has made an effort to keep small communities economically viable by meeting the needs of their airports.

## **Virginia**

The current Virginia plan is quite old having been completed approximately 10 years ago. An update is expected in the next year or so. The plan does provide some criteria for adding and removing airports from the system, but the criteria are not spelled out in a comprehensive manner for use in all situations. It employs professional judgement and is specific to a particular market area. No computer models are used but the process does include the role of the airport, its services, usefulness, airspace, and terrain. The coverage area of the state's population in proximity to an airport is not a criterion, but is a goal.

The state has not had much difficulty meeting its financial needs but does feel that it is getting tougher. The state's eligibility, like some others, is open to a greater variety of projects than the federal program but they tend to be smaller in size. Some local agencies have difficulty in meeting their part of the match. Considering that this match only takes 2% for some projects, there is no state assistance or intervention if local agencies are unable to meet the funding match.

The state has also seen an increase in the number of multi-engine, corporate-class equipment being used at the general aviation airports. At the same time, there has been no decrease of single-engine traffic. The aircraft mix has become more varied. It has become difficult to determine whether a sponsor's requests are based on this trend or on their desire for an improved facility. Most of the sponsor's requests are related to these trend changes and are based on demonstrated or forecast need. The state has not had any difficulty funding these upgrades. It has been relatively unconstrained.

## **Wisconsin**

The Wisconsin Bureau of Aeronautics began updating its system plan in 1994 and the update is an on-going effort. A portion of its current work includes a classification update and review as well as a reliever study. No airports have been added or removed from the system recently. There were three proposed airport sites deleted however, and the process was subjective. The state does have some large privately owned airports that are open to the public and used by corporations. To date, only one of these airports has achieved designated reliever status. This was accomplished in 1995 and the airport has not yet received state money.

The state is not able to meet the financial needs of its system airports. According to the staff, the state has always run a backlog. The state's funding has remained constant at approximately \$10 million per year. This money is raised through an airline property tax, general aviation fuel taxes, and aircraft registration fees. The federal and local money for airport projects is approximately \$20 million and \$7 million, respectively. For 1998, the current need is approximately \$47 million leaving \$10 million in unfunded needs.

The staff has also seen a shift in the types of aircraft used at the general aviation airports. There has been a shift towards more multi-engine and corporate aircraft. This shift has not rendered the airports obsolete because these facilities have been continually upgraded. This shift of aircraft mix has, in part, prompted the state to undertake the classification study.



### **Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)**

Staff at the FAA, National Planning Division expect future funding levels to remain similar to current levels. Because the current grant program ends at the end of the current fiscal year, it is expected that Congress will approve a one-year stopgap bill. The issues facing the program require significant discussion and analysis by all involved parties. Because appropriate time was not available, a comprehensive re-authorization bill is not expected at this time.

Funding levels for general aviation airports are expected to remain largely unchanged. Fiscal year expenditures for the entire program are expected to remain unchanged at approximately \$1.8 billion and general aviation airports may experience a slight funding increase.

There is also some discussion about freeing up funds that have typically gone to the 29 largest airports. If these larger airports are allowed to raise money at the facility, i.e., through increased passenger facility charges, they may be able to relinquish their claim to the federal funds. This would free up more money for the airports at the other end of the spectrum because the 29 largest airports in the country do not depend on the federal money as much as the other airports. There is an on-going debate with the state planning officials regarding the lack of focus on general aviation airports. The outlook does, however, appear to be more favorable for general aviation airports in the future.

Currently, there is no effort at the federal level to change the criteria for inclusion of general aviation airports in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS). The reliever airport program has been under fire for the past few years. The funding level for the program was cut from 10% to 5% and then completely eliminated as a set-aside. There are plans to tighten the criteria for relievers and the issue is currently under internal review by the FAA.

### **National Business Aviation Association (NBAA)**

The NBAA is a professional group representing the interests of nearly 5,000 companies that own and operate approximately 7,000 aircraft. The NBAA communicates the interests and business of the organization to the executive, legislative, and regulatory agencies at the federal, state, and local levels. The organization studies issues ranging from air traffic procedures and aviation weather to airspace access and equipment specifications. The organization also provides technical expertise and information on safety, noise, and other important regulations that affect business aviation supporting the daily flying activities of its corporate members.

The NBAA identified three issues that are critical to the success of general aviation airports. The first is funding. The FAA funding resources are simply not sufficient. The disproportionate amount air carrier airports receive leaves very little for other airports. The NBAA also recognizes that these air carriers are more capable of raising money than the smaller general aviation airports because of the passenger facility charge (PFC) program that is available to them. Allowing additional large air carrier airports to raise more of their own revenue at the facilities themselves is a positive step for airports that currently do not have this option. The second issue is local sponsorship. The NBAA believes there is a lack of

funding at the local level for airport projects. Yet, they understand that local sponsorship is very important if a community desires to operate a successful airport. Often, communities do not readily understand the benefits and impacts that the airport does have and, consequently, its support level suffers.

The third issue is the alternative use of airport land. Encroaching development on land surrounding airports continues to be problematic. These developed areas adjacent to airports become sensitive to the noise despite the fact that the airports existed prior to the development. Inadequate zoning is detrimental to the success of airports. The appropriate land use surrounding the airport is essential to the success of the airport.

The NBAA publishes an airport handbook to assist local communities in organizing to fight airport closings. The organization opposes closings and offers assistance to communities to help them organize and create successful airports. The organization is also aware of the shift in the aircraft mix of its industry members to larger aircraft. However, they do not believe that this shift has created the need for immediate safety upgrades.

The NBAA recommends that general aviation airports have at least 5,000 feet of runway and prefer longer runways. The organization believes the funding situation is improving and recognizes that some states operate their programs better than others operate their programs. The state of Illinois was specifically mentioned as a national leader with an excellent program.

## **SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW**

General aviation includes all the flying that is not conducted by the airlines or the military. While less visible than the commercial air carriers, it is no less important. The literature shows that the general aviation airport concept is not well understood because it is not marketed as widely as other products or services. These airports are often overlooked and taken for granted despite playing vital roles in many communities.

These airports are important in several industries including agriculture, mining, fishing, emergency services, and oil exploration. They also play a role in larger urban areas where they serve as economic hubs and relieve the larger air carrier airports of smaller traffic thus increasing capacity. These airports are used not only by recreational flyers and wealthy individuals, but also by all industries including large and small corporations, which often require adequate aviation facilities before making business location decisions.

Funding continues to be a problem as there simply is not enough money to operate and maintain these airports. Airport managers are very concerned and some have turned to innovative methods of financing. Consequently, these managers have become more public relations savvy to gain support for their airports.

Access to rural communities is of particular concern. Rural communities are often more dependent on small general aviation airports than other communities. They are essential to attract and maintain businesses to remain competitive. These airports are also critical to certain industries, i.e., agriculture, which have special needs but contribute greatly to the economy. Agriculture is big business in Texas and other states and this industry relies on the general aviation airports to operate.

The interviews of state aviation offices revealed that none have taken steps to optimize their state airport systems. While several states have completed or are in the process of undertaking classification studies, none have sought to define an ideal airport system. Not all of the states interviewed are having difficulty funding their needs but there does appear to be a consensus that it is becoming more difficult to secure funding. It is expected that these functional classification studies will help states prioritize airports and projects for funding, but these studies will not help them define an optimal or ideal system.



## CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this study to identify the ideal airport system is similar to that used to develop the initial version of the Texas Highway Trunk System. Criteria for selection to the system were developed and then applied to create the “ideal” airport system. This includes multiple tiers of criteria that are applied in a hierarchical fashion to build the ideal system from the ground up.

### TEXAS HIGHWAY TRUNK SYSTEM

The Texas Highway Trunk System is a system of planned rural four-lane divided highways that includes and complements the interstate highway system in Texas (15). The concept evolved in the late 1980s to connect the major population centers in Texas and provide adequate access to the state’s major ports of entry and its military installations. It is perceived as being more efficient and safer than the rural two-lane highway network as it provides separation between oncoming traffic. It was also intended to increase mobility within the state and aid in economic growth.

The trunk system concept was based on three criteria: population, circuitry of travel, and other considerations. The system is prioritized using population. The population centers are connected based on circuitry of travel. Finally, other criteria and situations are examined and considered to include factors such as national defense needs, national parks/recreational facilities, and ports of entry.

The research team used county population and populations for the U.S. Census Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas (PMSA) or Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA). The county population estimates were provided by the Texas Water Development Board (1990). The population categories used were: 1 million or larger; 300,000 to 1 million; 100,000 to 300,000; 50,000 to 100,000; 25,000 to 50,000; and 10,000 to 25,000. The circuitry of travel criteria was based on two considerations. The first was the need to connect population centers, specifically smaller areas to larger areas. The second was the ability to travel between population centers with a minimum of circuitry of travel. Circuitry of travel is the direct connections between cities that are not more than 10% greater than the straight-line distance between the city pairs. Following the application of the final criteria mentioned above, the network is refined by connecting obvious gaps in the system.

The population areas were connected beginning with the 1 million or larger areas. The 300,000 or larger areas were then connected to the 1 million or larger areas and they were then connected to each other. The 100,000 or larger areas were then connected to the 1 million or larger areas and then to the 300,000 or larger areas. The 50,000 or larger areas were the connected to the 1 million or larger areas. Not all categories were connected to each other because this would have yielded a costly network of highways.

A secondary set of criteria was then applied (15). All cities with a population of at least 20,000 were provided access to the established network using the primary criteria. Cities with a population of at least 10,000 were provided access to the network providing they were more than 25 miles from the established network. Roadways that connected with principal roadways in other states were added if they carried a minimum average daily traffic count of

1,000. Deepwater ports with 40-foot draft waterways that provided at least 1.5 million tons of goods per year were also provided access to the network. International crossings with Mexico were connected to the network if they carried a minimum count of 5,000 average daily traffic and were more than 25 miles from the network. Major truck routes were also added if they carried more than 1,850 trucks per day. Finally, major tourist and recreational areas and significant military bases were also provided access to the network. The network created with the primary and secondary criteria was then taken and further refined in the public involvement process.

## **CHAPTER 4. DEVELOPMENT OF IDEAL TEXAS AIRPORT SYSTEM CRITERIA**

Similar to the methodology of the Texas Highway Trunk System, the primary criterion used to develop this system is population. Population categories were developed for Texas counties similar to the categories used in the highway system. Using 1996 population estimates from the Texas State Data Center, counties were categorized in the following way: 1 million or larger; 250,000 to 1 million; 100,000 to 250,000; 50,000 to 100,000; 25,000 to 50,000; 10,000 to 25,000; and below 10,000. For the metropolitan areas, MSA and PMSA were used and included all of the counties in that particular MSA or PMSA. The research team used the 27 MSAs and PMSAs defined by the federal government located in the state encompassing 58 of the 254 counties in Texas. These areas are listed in Table 3. These metropolitan statistical areas use the following population categories: 1 million or larger; 250,000 to 1 million; 100,000 to 150,000; and under 100,000. The additional categories listed earlier break down further the Texas counties with populations under 100,000.

Statistical analysis of county population data showed that it is useful in identifying counties suitable for an airport. In using current data and identifying those counties in Texas with and without airports, there was a statistical difference between the population means for those counties with versus those without airports. It should be noted that counties where a proposed new airport was listed in the Texas Aeronautical Facilities Plan (4) were considered as having an airport to reflect the policy and planning decision-making that had already occurred. This difference suggests that population is a good indicator for determining the location of an airport. Further review of the data indicates that populations above approximately 6,500 may be capable of supporting an airport based on the current county and airport data. Based on this analysis and the methodology established in the Texas Highway Trunk System, the research team used population as the primary criteria in developing the "ideal" airport system. Further, the demographic breakdowns used in the Texas Highway Trunk System methodology and the U.S. Census Bureau are employed in the development of this system. These breakdowns range from those counties and MSAs/PMSAs above 1 million to those below 10,000.

**TABLE 3**  
**Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) and Primary Metropolitan**  
**Statistical Areas (PMSA) in Texas**

<b>MSA/PMSA</b>	<b>Counties</b>	<b>Population</b>
Houston	Chambers, Fort Bend, Harris, Liberty, Montgomery, and Waller	3,775,328
Dallas	Collin, Dallas, Denton, Ellis, Henderson, Hunt, Kaufman, and Rockwall	3,050,169
Fort Worth- Arlington	Hood, Johnson, Parker, and Tarrant	1,522,760
San Antonio	Bexar, Comal, Guadalupe, and Wilson	1,487,624
Austin-San Marcos	Bastrop, Caldwell, Hays, Travis, and Williamson	1,034,590
El Paso	El Paso	673,893
McAllen-Edinburgh-Mission	Hidalgo	496,485
Beaumont-Port Arthur	Hardin, Jefferson, and Orange	377,649
Corpus Christi	Nueces and San Patricio	376,566
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito	Cameron	312,064
Killeen-Temple	Bell and Coryell	296,265
Galveston-Texas City	Galveston	241,981
Odessa-Midland	Ector and Midland	239,978
Lubbock	Lubbock	233,496
Brazoria	Brazoria	219,898
Amarillo	Potter and Randall	209,165
Longview-Marshall	Gregg, Harrison, and Upshur	206,867
Waco	McLennan	202,679



**TABLE 3**  
**Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) and Primary Metropolitan**  
**Statistical Areas (PMSA) in Texas (continued)**

MSA/PMSA	Counties	Population
Laredo	Webb	177,147
Tyler	Smith	164,547
Wichita Falls	Archer and Wichita	140,255
Bryan-College Station	Brazos	138,093
Abilene	Taylor	127,440
Texarkana	Bowie and Miller (AK)	85,080 (123,877 Total)
San Angelo	Tom Green	104,973
Sherman-Denison	Grayson	100,611
Victoria	Victoria	81,023
Total	58 Counties	16,076,626

Source: *Texas Almanac, 1998-1999* and The Texas State Data Center 1996 Estimates.

Secondary criteria were used to identify additional counties capable of and suitable for inclusion into the airport system that were not added using the population criteria. This criterion, therefore, was used to identify airports in areas where populations fell below the 10,000 threshold. This secondary criterion is related to an area or county's financial capability for supporting an airport. Some counties or areas may include economic generators that other larger, more populated counties do not. Subsequently, a smaller county may have a larger per capita tax base for supporting an airport.

This secondary criterion consists of county retail sales values. The sales tax dollars returned to the county and the cities in those counties were not used as a criteria because there are counties and cities that do not levy any sales taxes. Further, while sales tax is a factor of the total retail sales in a particular city or county, it is subject to local tax policy that may or may not be consistent throughout the state. Therefore, retail sales values were selected to represent economic activity.

Statistical analysis of the county retail sales data showed that it is a useful variable in determining the location of an airport in the current system. The mean retail sales values for counties in Texas with airports were statistically different from those counties without airports indicating its usefulness as a measure. Further analysis showed that retail sales data

could be used to include those counties that were included in the first three quartiles of the retail sales data.

Additional criteria were also developed allowing for proper consideration of two of the largest industries in the state, agriculture and oil. Texas is a large and diverse state in many respects. Despite its several large population centers, Texas is a large rural state as well. These rural areas are often the venue for agricultural and oil production. These activities occur in the less populated regions of the state, but they provide a tremendous economic boost throughout the entire state and country. Because of the services needed in these rural areas and the reliance on the transportation system for maintaining operations, it is important to include these industries when considering access to the air transportation system. The primary and secondary criteria mentioned above do not account for these special situations and, therefore, additional criteria were developed to accommodate for the role they play in the state and national economies. This additional criterion includes agricultural cash values and mineral property tax for oil and gas.

Quartile analysis was also used to categorize and break down the county data with respect to oil and gas property tax and agricultural cash values. Both of these values provide more information about the economic make-up of a county that is not readily illustrated when reviewing population numbers or retail sales data.

In examining the data, it was determined that those counties whose oil and gas property tax values and agricultural cash values were in the top two quartiles, or above the median value for all 254 counties in the state, should be considered as viable locations for state system airports. This criterion pertains to those counties that do not meet the population or retail sales criteria. Therefore, this criterion should be more stringent because the counties do not have the benefit of population and retail sales activity to further support their claim of economic viability. Selecting those counties above the median levels for these values meets this demand.

## CHAPTER 5. APPLICATION OF IDEAL AIRPORT SYSTEM CRITERIA

The criteria developed previously were applied to identify the “ideal” airport system in Texas. As counties meet the criteria, the airports within the counties are added to the “ideal” system in a hierarchical fashion. No effort was made to determine whether a particular airport in a county was justified or should be located there. The airports were simply added to the system. This is noteworthy because there are metropolitan areas that contain several general aviation airports.

The efforts of this study were to identify an airport system that was a viable system. It was not to address current politics or policies. Therefore, when a county or region contained more than one airport, all airports were included. In addition, the corresponding coverage area for those airports was reported. The service coverage area consists of the population served by the airport and is calculated by including the population within a 25-mile driving radius, or 30-minute driving time, of the given airport. The basis for this measure is provided for in two ways. First, the Advisory Circular *Planning the State Aviation System* (AC 150/5050-3B) provides guidance for such a statement of objective. In this case, the advisory circular specifically refers to the “adequacy of general aviation airport facilities with reasonable surface access time to aircraft owners/users” (16). Secondly, The Texas Aeronautical Facilities Plan system goals and objectives state that “the goal of adequate air service has been expressed in terms of the proximity of activity centers to a TAFP airport.” More specifically, this goal is “to provide airports capable of supporting business jet activity within a 30-minute drive of population and mineral resource centers and the economic activity generated by urban development” and “to provide airports capable of supporting single- and twin-engined piston-powered aircraft within a 30-minute drive of agricultural resource centers” (4).

The appendices in the back of this report show the “ideal” system in the order that it was built and the criteria used to build it. Appendix A and Appendix B show the system and the criteria in terms of numbers and percentages of state totals, respectively. Appendix C shows the system and the aviation activity measures associated with it. Appendix D lists the sources for the data used in this analysis.

### POPULATION

Beginning with the primary criteria of population, counties meeting the population criteria were selected. The population criterion includes all counties whose population exceeded 10,000. This included 166 of the 254 counties in the state and covers 97% of the state’s population. One of these counties, Archer County, has a population that is less than 10,000 but it is included in this criteria group because it is part of the Wichita Falls Metropolitan Statistical Area. Of these 166 counties, 10 do not have airports. A total of five of these counties, Archer, Comal, Hays, Waller, and Wilson are included in the previously defined metropolitan statistical areas. The remaining five counties are Bandera, Callahan, Camp, Clay and San Jacinto.

Although Bandera County meets the population criteria, it does not have an airport. The county and its population center, however, are in close proximity to the new Kendall County-Boerne Airport proposed in the Texas Aeronautical Facilities Plan Summary (4). Callahan County also meets the population criteria but does not have an airport in the county. It is, however, adjacent to Taylor County and a significant amount of its population is in close proximity to the Abilene Regional Airport.

Camp County, located in the northeast corner of the state, does not have an airport despite meeting population, retail sales, and agriculture criteria. Factors influencing this are the county's population centers located within close proximity to three other airports in the area. These include the Mount Vernon/ Franklin County Airport, Mount Pleasant Municipal Airport, and Daingerfield/ Greater Morris County Airport.

Clay County is another county meeting the criteria that does not have an airport. It meets criteria for population, retail sales, and agricultural values. It is, however, adjacent to Wichita and Archer counties and has the majority of its population (70%) within a 25-mile radius of the Wichita Falls Municipal Airport.

San Jacinto County, which meets population, minerals, and retail sales criteria, does not have an airport despite the area's attraction as a large recreational area with the presence of Lake Livingston. This is mitigated by the presence of Livingston Municipal Airport in neighboring Polk County.

## **ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND RETAIL SALES**

The second criterion applied to identify the "ideal" system is retail sales. The research team applied this criterion to the remaining 88 counties. In all, 27 counties were selected using this criterion and added to the "ideal" system. All of the 27 counties with one exception currently had airports in the county. The one exception, Dallam County, meets the retail sales and agriculture criteria and was the third largest agricultural producer in terms of net cash return for the year the data was collected. This is also the latest year for available Agricultural Census data that is collected every five years. Dallam County does not currently have an airport but its population is primarily located in Dalhart and is served by Dalhart Municipal airport.

## **RESOURCES - OIL, GAS, AND AGRICULTURE**

The third criterion is oil and gas property tax values and agricultural net cash return. This criterion was established to illustrate the importance of these two industries on a local, state, and national level and the significance of the transportation system to their operation and development. The need for an airport or a county's ability to support an airport in Texas may not be identified in only using population and retail sales criteria. The development of these mineral and agricultural criteria show that need and financial capability may be present when examining specific industries that have a substantial economic impact in the state.

This criterion was applied to the 61 remaining counties. Those counties that met or exceeded the median values for the county data were selected for inclusion to the "ideal" system. Under the oil and gas criteria, 30 counties were selected with an additional 14 being selected based on agricultural data. Of the additional 44 counties selected, 11 currently do not

have airports. These include Glasscock, Borden, McMullen, Irion, King, Sterling, Kenedy, Loving, Goliad, Throckmorton, and Armstrong. All of these counties were selected because they met the criteria for oil and gas property tax with the exception of Armstrong, which meets the agricultural criteria.

Despite meeting the criteria and not having an airport within the county, the counties listed above do have access to general aviation airports. Geographic boundaries aside, many of these counties are within a 25-mile driving radius of an airport. Glasscock County has very large oil and gas operations and a low population of approximately 1,500 people. Those living in the county, including those in the county seat of Garden City, have access to the airports in Midland County, which are approximately 40 miles away. Borden County also has significant oil and gas operations. It too has access to airports in the adjacent counties. These include Lamesa Municipal in Dawson County and Snyder's Winston Field in Scurry County, both approximately 35 miles away.

McMullen County meets the oil and gas criteria and has access to the George West Airport approximately 35 miles away in Live Oak County. Irion County, flanked by Reagan and Tom Green counties, has access to both of those counties' airports that are within 35 miles of the county's population centers. King County is surrounded by counties that have airports, the nearest being in neighboring Knox County, that is 35 miles east in Knox County.

Sterling County has access to both Mathis Field which is less than 50 miles southeast in Tom Green County and Robert Lee Airport which is approximately 35 miles east in Coke County. Neither of these facilities is within a 25-mile radius, but are reasonably close when considering the size and remote location of the county.

Kenedy County in South Texas is also surrounded by counties with airports. The 418 county residents have access to Kleberg County Airport to the north, Brooks County Airport in Falfurrias to the west, and Charles R. Johnson Airport in Willacy County to the south. The Kleberg County Airport and the Brooks County Airport are the nearest and are both approximately 25 miles from the county seat of Sarita, which includes almost all of the county's population.

Loving County in West Texas is the least populated county in the state. Although there is an extensive amount of oil and gas activity in the county, it is remote. It does, however, border New Mexico near what is a popular tourism location at Carlsbad, New Mexico. Residents of the county, primarily located in the city of Mentone, have access to the Winkler County Airport in Wink, approximately 40 miles away. The marginal distance for airport access is insignificant when considering the remote location and small population.

Goliad County is also surrounded by counties that have airports which are all approximately 30 to 35 miles away. Users can choose from Victoria Regional Airport in Victoria County, Rooke Field in Refugio County, Beeville Municipal Airport in Bee County, Karnes County Airport in Kenedy, and Cuero Municipal Airport in Dewitt County. Throckmorton County also has access to multiple airports. It is within 40 miles of the Haskell Municipal Airport in Haskell County and the Graham Municipal Airport in Young County. Armstrong County in the Panhandle is the final county selected that does not have an airport. Its proximity to two airports in the Amarillo area and Clarendon Municipal Airport in Donley County, all within approximately 40 miles, provide users access to the airport system.

## ANALYSIS OF SPECIFIC COUNTIES

All of the counties selected using the developed criteria that do not have airports have reasonable access to airports in the state airport system. While the counties themselves meet the established criteria, they do not have airports of their own. However, their lack of airports shows the lack of redundancy in the system as these counties already have access to the system. Additional airports in these counties may prove difficult to support considering that airports are nearby and the counties all have populations below 10,000, some of them well below this figure. Adding airports in these counties would impact the current airports, thus making it difficult for all of the airports in the region to be economically viable.

After application of the system criteria, 17 counties were not selected. They are listed in Table 4. Of these 17 counties, nine currently have airports. These counties include Collingsworth, Cottle, Donley, Foard, La Salle, Menard, Presidio, Real, and Shackelford. The research team studied these counties to determine why they have airports despite not meeting the established criteria.

**TABLE 4**  
**Counties Not Included Using Developed Criteria**

<b>County</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Airport Currently Located in County</b>
Blanco	7,352	No
Briscoe	2,038	No
Collingsworth	3,657	Yes
Cottle	2,117	Yes
Delta	5,014	No
Donley	3,905	Yes
Foard	1,845	Yes
Jeff Davis	2,061	No
Kinney	3,389	No
La Salle	5,911	Yes
Menard	2,339	Yes
Mills	4,964	No (Proposed)
Motley	1,436	No

**TABLE 4**  
**Counties Not Included Using Developed Criteria (Continued)**

Presidio	7,285	Yes
Real	2,740	Yes
Shackelford	3,413	Yes
Somervell	5,961	No

Collingsworth, Cottle, Donley, and Foard counties are located in the Panhandle and have economies based on agribusiness with mineral production of oil and gas. Shackelford County in North Texas has an economy based on oil and ranching much like those in the Panhandle. La Salle County is in South Texas and its economy is based on agribusiness along with oil and gas production components. Menard and Real counties in central Texas have agribusiness and tourism, respectively as the foundation of their economies. Menard County has oil and gas production while Real County has no significant mineral values but does have beef cattle operations. Real County is also a recreational center for hunting, fishing, and camping.

Presidio County is located in West Texas with an economy based on ranching and tourism. Like the other counties, it has a diversified economy given its size. It contains an international border crossing and serves as a sector headquarters for the U.S. Border Patrol. It is home to the Big Bend Ranch State Natural Area as well as the mysterious Marfa Lights, that add to its tourism value. In addition, Presidio County is in a remote locale and a majority of its population is not afforded reasonable access to any surrounding counties' airport facilities.

These counties as a group have agribusiness-based economies with the additional elements of oil, gas, and/or tourism, which includes hunting and other recreational activities, to further diversify their economic base. This points to the significance of agriculture, minerals, and tourism as an important component of the state's economy and as an important consideration in the need and value of transportation systems including airports. Further, it points to the value of a diversified economy, especially in light of smaller populations. Despite not meeting the three established criteria, these counties have operating airports. In addition, it should be noted that two of the above-mentioned counties have populations that are included in the category where they may be able to support an airport based on the population criteria alone. Nevertheless, all of these counties have several factors that contribute to their ability to support an aviation facility.

#### **POPULATION SERVICE COVERAGE**

State aviation agencies often have goals or objectives of providing access to general aviation airports measured by driving time to the airport. Depending on the geological and geographic make-up of the state and the constraints present, this may or may not be possible.

Ideally, it is preferable to provide this type of access to the population, but it is not always possible or financially feasible.

In the identification of the “ideal” system in Texas, the population coverage areas were determined for all of the airports in the current system. This was accomplished by calculating the population within a 25-mile driving radius of the particular airport. Table 5 lists the coverage areas for the 27 MSAs/PMSAs located in the state. The research team determined these coverage areas and attempted not to double count the population in neighboring areas. Population coverage was calculated in a hierarchical fashion so the largest population centers were determined first, followed by the non-overlapping population of the next largest area.

For example, the Houston MSA population was calculated first because it was the largest area defined. When calculating the Beaumont-Port Arthur population service area, the area that overlapped between the two areas was subtracted from the Beaumont-Port Arthur population because it was already counted in the Houston population service area.

**TABLE 5**  
**Population Service Areas For MSAs/PMSAs**

<b>MSA/PMSA</b>	<b>Population Service Area</b>	<b>% of State Population (Cumulative)</b>
Houston	4,012,397	21%
Dallas	3,303,354	38%
Fort Worth- Arlington	1,349,155	45%
San Antonio	1,488,741	53%
Austin-San Marcos	984,726	58%
El Paso	669,129	62%
McAllen-Edinburgh- Mission	567,157	63%
Beaumont-Port Arthur	363,942	67%
Corpus Christi	375,817	69%
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito	248,235	70%
Killeen-Temple	321,577	72%
Galveston-Texas City	133,470	72%



**TABLE 5**  
**Population Service Areas For MSAs/PMSAs (continued)**

<b>MSA/PMSA</b>	<b>Population Service Area</b>	<b>% of State Population (Cumulative)</b>
Odessa-Midland	241,053	73%
Lubbock	235,243	75%
Brazoria	133,638	75%
Amarillo	207,985	77%
Longview-Marshall	272,531	78%
Waco	186,001	79%
Laredo	177,147	80%
Tyler	165,144	81%
Wichita Falls	143,334	82%
Bryan-College Station	162,401	82%
Abilene	136,883	83%
Texarkana	85,080	83%
San Angelo	105,826	84%
Sherman-Denison	101,644	85%
Victoria	88,435	85%
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,076,626</b>	<b>85%</b>

After exhausting the MSA/PMSA service areas, the state's counties were calculated. If a particular county had more than one airport, the population within a 25-mile area was calculated for all of the airports eliminating double counts or overstating the population. This was conducted similarly to the MSA/PMSA analysis to avoid a discussion concerning which airport in the area was more significant than the other(s). The populations listed in the table are the populations within a 25-mile driving radius and if the area overlaps a larger area, it is the additional population served. The percentages are the cumulative percent of state population served. It is evident that the majority of the population resides in the urban areas of the state.

When the research team built the “ideal” system by applying the criteria, the population coverage or service area increased. As the criteria were applied, the marginal increase in coverage area decreased. This was expected considering that 85% of the population is covered in the 27 largest urban areas in the state. The population criteria accounted for 97% of the state’s population. Adding the retail sales, oil and gas, and agriculture criteria increased the coverage to 98%. Table 6 shows the population coverage for all of the population categories as a percentage of the state’s total population. The population coverage areas are, again, the populations within a 25-mile radius of the airports in those respective counties whose populations are in the given category. The specific coverage populations, or percentages, for a particular county or airport are listed in the Appendices.

**TABLE 6  
State Population Coverage of Airports in Population Categories**

<b>MSA/PMSA/County Population</b>	<b>Population Coverage as a Percent of State Total</b>
27 MSAs/PMSAs	85%
50,000-100,000	86%
25,000-50,000	92%
10,000-25,000	97%
Below 10,000	98%

**ADDITIONAL INDICATORS**

To better illustrate the optimization of the airport system, it is advantageous to examine other resources and economic indicators that fall within the 25-mile service areas of the system’s airports. Further, it is important to examine aviation-related measures as well. The aviation measures analyzed were based aircraft and airport operations. The other economic and resource related elements include oil and gas property tax, total property tax, retail sales, employment, and agricultural net cash return. Some of these variables were used in the analysis above as criteria for developing an “ideal” airport system. Illustrating the magnitude of these factors present within the 25-mile service area of the state’s airports will clearly point out their significance to the state’s economy and future.

Table 7 shows the aviation measures for the 27 MSAs/PMSAs in the state. A total of 76% of the state’s based aircraft are based at airports in the 27 MSAs/PMSAs while 83% of the state’s aircraft operations occur at airports located in those same areas.

**TABLE 7**  
**Aviation Measures for the MSAs/PMSAs As a Cumulative Percent of State Totals**

<b>MSA/PMSA</b>	<b>Based Aircraft</b>	<b>Airport Operations</b>
Houston	13%	15%
Dallas	30%	27%
Fort Worth- Arlington	41%	48%
San Antonio	41%	52%
Austin-San Marcos	47%	57%
El Paso	51%	59%
McAllen-Edinburgh-Mission	52%	60%
Beaumont-Port Arthur	54%	61%
Corpus Christi	55%	63%
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito	56%	65%
Killeen-Temple	57%	66%
Galveston-Texas City	59%	67%
Odessa-Midland	62%	69%
Lubbock	63%	71%
Brazoria	65%	72%
Amarillo	66%	74%
Longview-Marshall	67%	75%
Waco	69%	77%
Laredo	69%	78%
Tyler	70%	78%
Bryan-College Station	71%	79%
Wichita Falls	72%	80%
Abilene	73%	81%

**TABLE 7**  
**Aviation Measures for the MSAs/PMSAs As a Cumulative Percent of State Totals**  
**(Continued)**

Texarkana	74%	82%
San Angelo	75%	83%
Sherman-Denison	76%	83%
Victoria	76%	83%
<b>Total</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>83%</b>

While it is clear that the majority of aviation activity occurs in the largest urban areas of the state, Table 8 provides an indication of the remaining aviation activity in the state with respect to the county population categories. Despite the heavy activity in the urban areas, there is no indication that the remaining aviation activities lack importance or significance to the state or its rural communities. Airports play a significant role in rural communities as well as regions outside of the 27 MSAs/PMSAs.

**TABLE 8**  
**State Aviation Activity with Respect to Population Categories**

<b>MSA/PMSA/County Population</b>	<b>Based Aircraft</b>	<b>Airport Operations</b>
27 MSAs/PMSAs	76%	83%
50,000-100,000	78%	84%
25,000-50,000	87%	91%
10,000-25,000	95%	96%
Below 10,000	100%	100%

Table 9 shows the additional economic/resource elements mentioned above while Table 10 shows the breakdown of these elements with respect to the population categories.

**TABLE 9**  
**Economic/Resource Measures for the MSAs/PMSAs**  
**As a Cumulative Percent of State Totals**

<b>MSA/PMSA</b>	<b>Oil &amp; Gas Property Tax</b>	<b>Property Tax</b>	<b>Retail Sales</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Agriculture Cash Return</b>
Houston	4%	23%	24%	24%	2%
Dallas	5%	43%	46%	46%	3%
Fort Worth- Arlington	5%	44%	48%	47%	4%
San Antonio	5%	50%	55%	55%	4%
Austin-San Marcos	6%	57%	61%	61%	5%
El Paso	6%	59%	64%	64%	6%
McAllen-Edinburgh- Mission	8%	60%	65%	66%	8%
Beaumont-Port Arthur	8%	63%	67%	67%	8%
Corpus Christi	10%	64%	68%	69%	9%
Brownsville- Harlingen-San Benito	10%	65%	69%	70%	9%
Killeen-Temple	10%	66%	71%	71%	10%
Galveston-Texas City	10%	67%	71%	72%	10%
Odessa-Midland	16%	68%	73%	73%	10%
Lubbock	17%	69%	74%	74%	11%
Brazoria	17%	69%	74%	75%	11%
Amarillo	17%	70%	75%	76%	13%
Longview-Marshall	22%	71%	76%	77%	14%
Waco	22%	71%	77%	78%	15%
Laredo	24%	72%	78%	78%	15%
Tyler	24%	73%	79%	79%	15%
Bryan-College Station	25%	74%	79%	80%	16%

**TABLE 9**  
**Economic/Resource Measures for the MSAs/PMSAs**  
**As a Cumulative Percent of State Totals (Continued)**

Wichita Falls	25%	74%	80%	81%	17%
Abilene	26%	75%	81%	81%	17%
Texarkana	26%	75%	81%	82%	18%
San Angelo	26%	75%	81%	82%	18%
Sherman-Denison	26%	76%	82%	83%	18%
Victoria	26%	76%	82%	83%	19%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>19%</b>

As shown in Table 9, the preponderance of property tax, retail sales, and employment in the state is found in the larger urban areas. The majority of the oil and gas and agricultural activity, however, is not found in these areas. Table 10 clearly articulates the parts of the state, with respect to size, where these activities are more prominent. This indicates the magnitude of these resources in rural parts of the state and stresses the importance of providing access to these areas through airports. Approximately 20% of oil and gas property tax and 30% of the agricultural net cash return emanate from counties with populations less than 10,000. This is illustrated by looking at the additional or incremental percentages in the cumulative table below for counties less than 10,000 in population. For example, oil and gas property tax for the counties of population 10,000 and larger comprises 71% of the state's total. By adding in counties with populations less than 10,000, the cumulative percentage jumps to 91% of the state total. Aside from the development and application of system optimization criteria, the activity shown here occurring in the state's smaller counties is a compelling argument for providing access to the rural parts of the state. Tables 9 and 10 show cumulative percentages and do not add to 100% because only those counties with airports are included. The remaining activity occurs in the counties where there are no airports which tend to be rural as well. Therefore, the economic impacts of rural communities are somewhat understated despite their already determined significance.

**TABLE 10**  
**State Economic/Resource Activity As a Cumulative Percent of State Totals for**  
**Population Categories**

<b>MSA/PMSA/ County Population</b>	<b>Oil &amp; Gas Property Tax</b>	<b>Property Tax</b>	<b>Retail Sales</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Agriculture Cash Return</b>
27 MSAs/PMSAs	26%	76%	82%	83%	19%
50,000-100,000	27%	77%	83%	84%	20%
25,000-50,000	36%	83%	89%	88%	37%
10,000-25,000	71%	89%	92%	91%	64%
Below 10,000	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%

**OPTIMIZATION**

The best method to view optimization of the current system is to examine it juxtaposed to the system developed here using the Texas Highway Trunk System methodology. That ideal system, presented in the appendices of this report, shows the ideal system and the criteria used to build it in a hierarchical manner. In addition to the MSA/PMSA/County, the airport name is presented along with its based aircraft and operations data. Further, additional resource/economic elements are included along with their values. These represent the resource/economic element's value within a 25-mile radius of particular airports. Table 11 presents a comparison between these two systems in terms of percentages of the state totals of these various aviation and economic/resource measures that are within the 25-mile service area of the airports. The systems are nearly identical except for some airports in counties with populations below 10,000.

**TABLE 11**  
**Comparison of Current and Ideal Systems As Percent of State Totals**

<b>System</b>	<b>Based Aircraft</b>	<b>Aircraft Operations</b>	<b>Oil &amp; Gas</b>	<b>Property Tax</b>	<b>Retail Sales</b>	<b>Employ- ment</b>	<b>Agriculture</b>
Current	100	100	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%
Ideal	99	100	91%	92%	93%	92%	92%

Both systems serve approximately 98% of the state's population. The current system serves just under 20,000 additional people with 10 additional airports than the ideal system identified above. The current system, in terms of the state as a whole, is similar to the "ideal" system. When special consideration is given on an individual basis for unique situations,

some of those counties and airports not included using the developed criteria may be capable of supporting an airport on their own merits.



## CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General aviation includes all the flying that is not conducted by the airlines or the military. While less visible than the commercial air carriers, it is no less important. The literature shows that the general aviation airport concept is not well understood simply because it is not marketed as widely as other products or services. General aviation airports are often overlooked and taken for granted despite playing vital roles in many communities.

These airports are important in several industries including agriculture, mining, fishing, emergency services, and oil and gas exploration and production. They also play a role in larger urban areas where they serve as economic hubs and relieve the larger air carrier airports of smaller traffic thus increasing system capacity. The users are not limited to recreational flyers and wealthy individuals, but include all industries both large and small, which often require adequate aviation facilities before making business location decisions.

Funding continues to be a problem as there simply is not enough money to operate and maintain these airports adequately. Airport managers are very concerned and some have turned to innovative financing methods. Consequently, these managers have become more attuned to public relations to develop support for their airports.

Access to rural communities is of particular concern. Small rural communities are often more dependent on these aviation facilities than other communities. They are essential in attracting and maintaining businesses so the community can remain competitive. They are also critical to certain industries such as agriculture that has special needs and contributes greatly to the economy. Agriculture is big business in Texas and other states and this industry relies on these facilities to operate.

Interviews with several state aviation offices revealed that none have taken steps to optimize their state airport systems. While several states have completed or are in the process of undertaking classification studies, none have sought to define an "ideal" airport system. Not all of the states interviewed are having difficulty funding their needs, but there does appear to be a consensus that it is becoming more difficult. It is expected that these functional classification studies will help states prioritize airports and specific projects for funding. However, they will not define an optimal or "ideal" system.

To identify an "ideal" system, specific criteria were developed based on the methodology used to create the Texas Highway Trunk System. These criteria included population, retail sales, oil and gas property tax, and agricultural net cash return values. An "ideal" system was developed and it was similar in size and coverage as the current state airport system. Both systems were analyzed in terms of the amount of state economic and natural resources, as well as the aviation activity that occurred within a 25-mile driving radius of the state's airports. The service areas in the two systems are nearly identical.

This analysis strengthened what was already known and highlighted other important aspects of the airport system usually not considered. As expected, the analysis showed that most of the state's economic activity occurs in the larger urban areas while the state's mineral and agricultural production occurs largely in the more rural areas. The challenge in the study was to ascertain a county's or community's ability to support an airport where the population

totaled less than 10,000. While other criteria were established and applied to identify areas capable of supporting an airport, it is not always straightforward.

There is no magic number below the 10,000-population benchmark for airport support capability because communities and counties are unique. Some have small populations, and low economic activity, but survive or are capable of supporting an airport for a number of reasons. Some have large tourism industries, some have economies based on industrial or manufacturing whose activities have not been clearly captured here, while others benefit from their geographic proximity to other counties that do meet established criteria.

Nevertheless, determining the viability of smaller communities to support an airport is a challenge. Their capabilities do not emerge clear and convincingly from the established criteria, but they provide access to parts of the state that generate a tremendous amount of economic activity through mineral and agricultural activity. They often contribute in more ways not articulated in this analysis.

This research explored not only the economic, resource, and aviation characteristics of the state, but characteristics of the current airport system as well in an effort to identify an “ideal” system. This resulted in the following:

- The identified “ideal” airport system is nearly identical to the current airport system. The specific differences have been discussed in Chapter 5 (pages 23-27).
- Difficulty remains in clearly determining support capabilities among smaller communities whose economic profiles are not standard. This allows them to be overlooked when considering typical indicators or criteria.
- A focus is needed on understanding the needs and contributions of agricultural airports and those that serve the oil and gas industry in the rural parts of the state. The economic activity that they generate is significant, yet the importance of the facilities in rural, low-populated areas is not often realized when using typical socioeconomic criteria.
- A focus is also needed on understanding the role each airport plays in the system and in the community. This would clearly identify not only the benefits derived by the facility, but also the cost involved with providing the type of facility needed or required by the community regardless of population size. This would also help identify the special or unique situations in a particular region or community that are not readily apparent when reviewing standard socioeconomic criteria for the capability of supporting an airport. Often, the extent or magnitude of a unique factor such as tourism or oil and gas exploration and production is not sufficiently known and makes it difficult to determine whether it should be given special consideration.

In the final analysis, it is clear that the current airport system provides adequate airport access to the people of the state. Approximately 98% of the state’s population is located within a 25-mile driving radius of an aviation facility. More than 90% of the state’s

property tax, retail sales, employment, oil and gas, and agricultural activity occurs within a 25-mile radius of an airport. Access to the system is sufficient and the economic activity of the state, as measured in several ways, has ready access to the system.



## REFERENCES

1. Horton, Ann M., and George B. Dresser. *Texas Airport System Development Needs Assessment*. Prepared for the Texas Department of Transportation. College Station, TX: Texas Transportation Institute, The Texas A&M University System, December 1996.
2. Horton, Ann M., and George B. Dresser. "Without an Airport, You're Dead and Other General Aviation Stories." Prepared for the Transportation Committee, Texas House of Representatives. College Station, TX: Texas Transportation Institute, The Texas A&M University System, with assistance from Kathy Griffin, Texas Department of Transportation, Aviation, March 1997.
3. Freeman, Tom, and George B. Dresser. *Update: Implementation of the Micro PAVER Pavement Management System on TxDOT Aviation Division Airfields*. Prepared for the Aviation Division, Texas Department of Transportation. College Station, TX: Texas Transportation Institute, The Texas A&M University System, May 1997.
4. *Texas Aeronautical Facilities Plan Summary 1988-1993*. Texas Department of Transportation. 1994.
5. Weisbrod, Glen. *Economic Impacts of Improving General Aviation Airports*. Transportation Research Record 1274, 1990.
6. Ghobrial, Atef, and Kenneth Fleming. *A Normative Framework For Assessing the Economic Impacts of General Aviation Airports*. Journal of Advanced Transportation, vol. 24, no. 2 (1990).
7. Cook, Barbara. *The GA Airport Industry: Funding Issues Cloud the Horizon*. Airport Magazine (January/February 1996).
8. Cook, Barbara. *GA/Non-Hub Airports: Fields of Dreams*. Airport Magazine (March/April 1996).
9. Connin, Larry, and Keith Leggett. *Demand for Rural Airport Business Travel: Altoona-Blair County Airport*. Transportation Quarterly, vol. 46, no. 3 (July 1992).
10. Memmott, Jeffery L., Stephen Fuller, Melanie Gillis, George Dresser, and Patti Ellis. *The Rural Transportation Network in Texas*. College Station, TX: Texas Transportation Institute, The Texas A&M University System, February 1998.

11. Reeder, Richard J., and Cory Wanek. *The Importance of Local Airports to Rural Businesses*, ed. David W. Sears and J. Norman Reid. (Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers, 1995).
12. *Texas Agricultural Statistics 1996*. Texas Agricultural Statistics Service, 1996.
13. *Texas Almanac 1998-1999*. The Dallas Morning News, 1997.
14. Phillips, Edward H. *Clear Skies Ahead For Business Aviation*. Aviation Week and Space Technology (March 23, 1998).
15. Foster, Jack. *The Development of the Texas Highway Trunk System*. Third National Conference on Transportation Planning Applications. Dallas, TX April 22-26, 1991.
16. *Planning The State Aviation System*. Federal Aviation Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation. Advisory Circular 150/5050-3B. January 6, 1989.

**Appendix A**  
**Application of Ideal System Criteria**





Application of Ideal System Criteria

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Oil & Gas Property Tax	Property Tax (In Millions\$)	Retail Sales	Employment	Agriculture Net Cash Return
Population	1 Million +	HOUSTON	Harris	East Grand Parkway(New)	0	4,012,397	\$1,093,452,402	\$186,359	\$52,787,342,720	1,962,932	\$24,167,817
Population	1 Million +		Harris	David Wayne Hooks Memorial	407,543						
Population	1 Million +		Harris	Ellington Field	1,987,813						
Population	1 Million +		Harris	Houston Intercontinental	331,122						
Population	1 Million +		Harris	West Houston	1,351,756						
Population	1 Million +		Harris	Houston Westside(New)	0						
Population	1 Million +		Harris	William P. Hobby	2,549,833						
Population	1 Million +		Harris	La Porte Municipal	1,037,926						
Population	1 Million +		Chambers	Chambers County	28,814						
Population	1 Million +		Chambers	Chambers County-Winnie Stowell	22,092						
Population	1 Million +		Fort Bend	Sugar Land Municipal	1,516,110						
Population	1 Million +		Fort Bend	Houston-Southwest	1,384,887						
Population	1 Million +		Liberty	Cleveland Municipal	32,718						
Population	1 Million +		Liberty	Liberty Municipal	44,052						
Population	1 Million +		Montgomery	Montgomery County	230,012						
Population	1 Million +		Waller								
Population	1 Million +	DALLAS	Dallas	Addison	2,400,534	3,303,354	\$351,564,433	\$157,227	\$48,634,596,608	1,827,687	\$22,075,071
Population	1 Million +		Dallas	Dallas Love Field	1,950,172						
Population	1 Million +		Dallas	Redbird	2,755,405						
Population	1 Million +		Dallas	Lancaster	1,601,393						
Population	1 Million +		Dallas	Phil L Hudson Municipal	429,505						
Population	1 Million +		Collin	McKinney Municipal	412,101						
Population	1 Million +		Denton	Denton Municipal	372,824						
Population	1 Million +		Ellis	Ennis Municipal	78,483						
Population	1 Million +		Ellis	Midlothian/Waxahachie Municipal	264,124						
Population	1 Million +		Henderson	Athens Municipal	67,571						
Population	1 Million +		Hunt	Caddo Mills Municipal	56,893						
Population	1 Million +		Hunt	Commerce Municipal	55,624						
Population	1 Million +		Hunt	Majors	83,172						
Population	1 Million +		Kaufman	Terrell Municipal	72,728						
Population	1 Million +		Rockwall	Rockwall Municipal	485,211						
Population	1 Million +										
Population	1 Million +	FT. WORTH-ARLINGTON PMSA	Tarrant	Arlington Municipal	1,921,165	1,349,155	\$106,078,003	\$12,758	\$3,237,924,435	111,493	\$11,401,832
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Dallas-Fort Worth International	2,913,268						
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Fort Worth Alliance	1,547,966						
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Fort Worth Meacham	1,327,538						
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Fort Worth Spinks	1,072,228						
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Fort Worth Carswell	1,220,717						
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Grand Prairie Municipal	2,347,638						
Population	1 Million +		Hood	Granbury Municipal	38,911						
Population	1 Million +		Johnson	Cleburne Municipal	117,589						
Population	1 Million +		Parker	Mineral Wells	63,109						
Population	1 Million +		Parker	Weatherford (New)	0						
Population	1 Million +										
Population	1 Million +	SAN ANTONIO MSA	Bexar	San Antonio International	1,346,131	1,488,741	\$55,263,096	\$47,980	\$17,234,561,545	622,378	\$9,244,947
Population	1 Million +		Bexar	Stinson Municipal	1,301,291						
Population	1 Million +		Comal								
Population	1 Million +		Guadalupe	New Braunfels Municipal	166,752						
Population	1 Million +		Wilson								
Population	1 Million +										
Population	1 Million +	AUSTIN-SAN MARCOS MSA	Travis	Austin(New)	0	984,726	\$125,319,211	\$50,982	\$12,541,144,080	529,655	\$11,784,391
Population	1 Million +		Travis	Austin Executive Airpark	740,307						
Population	1 Million +		Travis	Robert Mueller	779,955						
Population	1 Million +		Bastrop	Smithville Municipal	51,946						
Population	1 Million +		Caldwell	Lockhart Municipal	31,266						

Application of Ideal System Criteria

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Oil & Gas Property Tax	Property Tax (In Million\$)	Retail Sales	Employment	Agriculture Net Cash Return
Population	1 Million +		Caldwell	The Carter Memorial	31,218						
Population	1 Million +		Caldwell	San Marcos Municipal	133,847						
Population	1 Million +		Hays								
Population	1 Million +		Williamson	Georgetown Municipal	159,106						
Population	1 Million +		Williamson	Taylor Municipal	105,313						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	EL PASO MSA	El Paso	El Paso International	661,477	669,129	\$172,118	\$17,818	\$5,170,417,469	230,189	\$11,464,501
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		El Paso	West Texas	654,553						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		El Paso	Fabens	363,497						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000										
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	MCALLEN-EDIN. MISSION MSA	Hidalgo	Edinburg Rio Grande Valley Regional	415,116	567,157	\$573,713,060	\$11,737	\$4,069,207,814	155,622	\$31,727,663
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Hidalgo	McAllen Miller International	417,675						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Hidalgo	Mid Valley	388,630						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000										
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	BEAUMONT-PT. ARTHUR MSA	Hardin	Hawthorne Field	154,918	363,942	\$259,451,893	\$17,612	\$3,153,825,492	145,182	\$2,432,986
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Jefferson	Beaumont Municipal	297,666						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Jefferson	Jefferson County	287,965						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Orange	Orange County	358,238						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000										
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	CORPUS CHRISTI MSA	Nueces	Bishop Municipal	55,716	375,817	\$423,352,248	\$14,217	\$3,520,455,859	148,016	\$3,444,657
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Nueces	Corpus Christi International	350,836						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Nueces	Mustang Beach	320,829						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Nueces	Nueces County	369,301						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		San Patricio	Aransas Pass	319,378						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		San Patricio	T.P. McCampbell	320,829						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		San Patricio	San Patricio County	37,693						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000										
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	BROWN.-HARL. SAN BEN. MSA	Cameron	Brownsville/South Padre Island Intl.	204,523	248,235	\$112,958,544	\$5,266	\$1,631,708,682	73,966	\$13,922,035
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Cameron	Rio Grande Valley International	248,235						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Cameron	Port Isabel-Cameron County	213,617						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Cameron	San Benito Municipal	315,289						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000										
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	KILLEEN-TEMPLE MSA	Bell	Killeen Municipal	185,761	321,577	\$109,400	\$7,785	\$3,611,126,155	97,091	\$3,972,683
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Bell	Draughan Miller Municipal	242,229						
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Coryell	Gatesville City-County	42,228						
Population	100,000 to 250,000	GALVESTON-TEXAS CITY PMSA	Galveston	Galveston Municipal/Scholes Field	241,981	133,470	\$26,163,746	\$6,385	\$960,817,088	47,057	\$186,576
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Galveston	Houston Gulf	550,489						
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	ODESSA-MIDLAND MSA	Ector	Odessa-Schlemeyer Field	225,565	241,053	\$1,884,410,078	\$8,590	\$2,827,316,279	101,317	\$10,247,473
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Midland	Midland Airpark	212,563						
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Midland	Midland International	216,481						
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	LUBBOCK MSA	Lubbock	Lubbock International	232,974	235,243	\$52,036,154	\$7,204	\$3,012,168,243	110,427	\$14,083,768
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Lubbock	Slaton Municipal	224,071						
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	BRAZORIA PMSA	Brazoria	Brazoria County	219,898	133,638	\$15,756,171	\$887	\$117,639,540	5,101	\$263,599
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Brazoria	Clover Field	2,436,823						
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	AMARILLO MSA	Potter	Amarillo International	202,834	207,985	\$219,557,178	\$7,852	\$2,476,339,130	89,587	\$26,588,091
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Randall	Tradewind	203,277						
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	LONGVIEW-MARSHALL MSA	Gregg	Gladewater Municipal	87,756	272,531	\$1,334,023,188	\$8,177	\$2,233,578,053	82,790	\$15,196,503
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Gregg	Gregg County	183,380						
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Harrison	Harrison County	60,249						
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Upshur	Gilmer-Upshur County	83,534						
Population	100,000 to 250,000										

Application of Ideal System Criteria

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Oil & Gas Property Tax	Property Tax (In Million\$)	Retail Sales	Employment	Agriculture Net Cash Return
Population	100,000 to 250,000	WACO MSA	McLennan	McGregor Municipal	190,258	186,001	\$8,913,292	\$5,348	\$1,903,841,734	80,079	\$10,131,579
Population	100,000 to 250,000		McLennan	TSTC Waco	197,106						
Population	100,000 to 250,000		McLennan	Waco Regional	205,081						
Population	100,000 to 250,000	LAREDO MSA	Webb	Laredo International	177,147	177,147	\$584,863,150	\$5,494	\$1,639,011,289	58,644	\$4,137,000
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	TYLER MSA	Smith	Tyler Pounds Field	186,153	165,144	\$100,125,174	\$6,372	\$1,943,602,229	74,901	\$4,327,553
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	BRYAN-COLLEGE STATION MSA	Brazos	Couiter Field	146,467	162,401	\$293,678,597	\$5,858	\$1,585,595,337	73,823	\$7,606,791
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Brazos	Easterwood Field	158,037						
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	WICHITA FALLS MSA	Archer			143,334	\$114,036,301	\$4,720	\$1,234,002,643	55,527	\$11,360,920
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Wichita	Kickapoo Downtown Airpark	140,076						
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Wichita	Sheppard AFB/Wichita Falls Municipal	141,976						
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	ABILENE MSA	Taylor	Abilene Regional	136,883	136,883	\$32,400,196	\$3,775	\$1,452,116,355	53,982	\$9,851,796
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	TEXARKANA MSA	Bowie	New Boston (New)		85,080	\$6,911,630	\$2,583	\$882,199,120	33,536	\$4,205,000
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Bowie	Texarkana Regional-Webb Field	85,080						
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Miller,Co,AK								
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	SAN ANGELO MSA	Tom Green	Mathis Field	105,826	105,826	\$106,547,899	\$3,236	\$995,559,180	41,744	\$4,175,100
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	SHERMAN-DEMISON MSA	Grayson	Sherman Municipal	95,307	101,644	\$68,066,156	\$3,568	\$1,062,524,575	42,237	\$3,466,668
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Grayson	Grayson County	100,611						
Population	50,000 to 100,000	VICTORIA MSA	Victoria	Victoria Regional	88,435	88,435	\$60,090,314	\$4,207	\$1,025,320,599	37,564	\$5,830,188
Population	50,000 to 100,000										
Population	50,000 to 100,000	Angelina	Angelina	Angelina County	75,924	75,924	\$1,182,177	\$1,220	\$392,200,932	17,721	\$732,589
Population	50,000 to 100,000										
Population	50,000 to 100,000	Nacogdoches	Nacogdoches	A.L Mangham Jr Regional	105,032	59,321	\$88,444,001	\$1,950	\$549,730,365	22,341	\$18,672,776
Population	50,000 to 100,000										
Population	50,000 to 100,000	Walker	Walker	Huntsville Municipal	56,253	55,211	\$1,976,943	\$1,214	\$405,353,595	21,510	\$3,164,004
Population	50,000 to 100,000										
Population	50,000 to 100,000	Anderson	Anderson	Palestine Municipal	50,833	44,522	\$63,067,777	\$1,450	\$3,367,428,027	14,861	\$1,079,416
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Starr	Starr	Starr County	46,527	43,610	\$295,921,103	\$1,101	\$188,978,839	7,325	\$15,271,096
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Lamar	Lamar	Cox Field	52,008	51,753	\$16,967,237	\$488	\$79,178,265	3,710	\$5,561,896
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Rusk	Rusk	Rusk County	68,038	20,507	\$82,467,791	\$790	\$132,999,777	6,672	\$4,718,902
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Maverick	Maverick	Eagle Pass (New)			\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Cherokee	Cherokee	Cherokee County	74,518	29,349	\$36,760,691	\$946	\$481,119,490	11,937	\$18,532,769
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Val Verde	Val Verde	Del Rio International	35,972	35,972	\$20,543,498	\$795	\$243,314,418	8,890	\$492,392
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Navarro	Navarro	C. David Campbell Field-Corsicana M	45,425	43,125	\$41,337,530	\$1,620	\$344,695,913	15,450	\$3,309,838
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Kerr	Kerr	Kerrville Municipal/Louis Schreiner Fld	38,636	38,636	\$19,636	\$1,930	\$418,112,687	12,704	\$522,913
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Van Zandt	Van Zandt	Wills Point Municipal	44,998	13,154	\$26,247,460	\$472	\$74,493,385	2,542	\$1,522,745
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Polk	Polk	Livingston Municipal	40,544	34,583	\$159,529,943	\$1,394	\$218,936,865	7,468	\$123,049
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wharton	Wharton	Wharton Municipal	51,616	50,427	\$183,201,611	\$2,248	\$397,566,422	16,359	\$19,216,744
Population	25,000 to 50,000										

Application of Ideal System Criteria

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Oil & Gas Property Tax	Property Tax (In Million\$)	Retail Sales	Employment	Agriculture Net Cash Return
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wise	Wise	Bridgeport Municipal	21,878	42,627	\$212,972,750	\$1,900	\$294,930,071	10,361	\$6,654,350
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wise	Wise	Decatur Municipal	39,462						
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Jim Wells	Jim Wells	Alice International	51,455	32,660	\$56,387,112	\$755	\$210,422,636	10,328	\$4,357,486
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Matagorda	Matagorda	Bay City Municipal	45,986	41,188	\$91,445,665	\$4,576	\$268,608,749	13,529	\$5,501,352
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Matagorda	Matagorda	Palacios Municipal	20,153						
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Brown	Brown	Brownwood Municipal	38,303	38,303	\$8,505,781	\$1,253	\$329,214,217	14,353	\$4,254,080
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hale	Hale	Abernathy Municipal	122,401	39,660	\$28,864,627	\$1,320	\$2,153,729,607	16,474	\$20,837,044
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hale	Hale	Hale County	34,267						
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Atascosa	Atascosa	Pleasanton Municipal	30,502	25,473	\$15,867,256	\$186	\$26,311,034	1,162	\$1,195,551
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Jasper	Jasper	Jasper County-Bell Field	34,684	48,035	\$103,303,724	\$2,478	\$401,971,182	12,637	\$1,420,354
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Jasper	Jasper	Kirbyville	23,132						
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Medina	Medina	Castroville Municipal	1,186,758	53,310	\$29,375,703	\$761	\$149,265,419	6,840	\$7,202,969
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Medina	Medina	Devine Municipal	23,242						
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Medina	Medina	Hondo Municipal	23,576						
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wood	Wood	Mineola-Quitman	59,165	50,104	\$298,120,850	\$2,183	\$353,005,759	13,087	\$23,283,848
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wood	Wood	Winnsboro Municipal	32,481						
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Howard	Howard	Big Spring McMahon-Wrinkle	37,401	34,834	\$392,701,956	\$1,505	\$274,917,373	11,790	\$6,612,780
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Cooke	Cooke	Gainesville Municipal	45,147	38,526	\$52,086,928	\$1,560	\$419,079,690	13,977	\$3,468,907
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Kleberg	Kleberg	Kleberg County	62,921	6,659	\$13,880,794	\$142	\$36,679,318	1,783	\$550,688
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hopkins	Hopkins	Sulphur Springs Municipal	42,975	3,618	\$2,053,335	\$142	\$44,840,705	1,287	\$3,196,089
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Erath	Erath	Dublin Municipal	37,236	40,515	\$9,526,491	\$2,943	\$350,981,477	15,207	\$45,598,690
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Erath	Erath	Clark Field Municipal	37,481						
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Cass	Cass	Atlanta Municipal	31,080	31,080	\$52,644,802	\$1,217	\$242,953,758	9,145	\$1,911,211
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hill	Hill	Hillsboro Municipal	34,152	19,131	\$42,744	\$715	\$189,522,713	5,248	\$3,526,416
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Burnet	Burnet	Burnet Municipal Kate Craddock Field	35,878	35,878	\$298,182	\$1,753	\$314,362,953	9,755	\$658,005
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Washington	Washington	Brenham Municipal	56,485	53,733	\$173,844,513	\$2,993	\$528,694,339	20,177	\$2,825,834
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Bee	Bee	Beeville Municipal	25,356	22,687	\$49,318,942	\$627	\$120,332,883	6,999	\$1,308,195
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Fannin	Fannin	Jones Field	31,760	24,462	\$1,893,794	\$776	\$154,819,366	6,782	\$1,329,974
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Palo Pinto	Palo Pinto	Possum Kingdom	6,308	3,098	\$7,397,911	\$119	\$25,982,234	965	\$80,379
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Titus	Titus	Mount Pleasant Municipal	60,777	46,208	\$56,029,171	\$2,414	\$416,038,931	21,420	\$11,142,071
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hutchinson	Hutchinson	Hutchinson County	30,365	30,365	\$302,900,958	\$1,802	\$180,812,938	11,961	\$17,519,216
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Uvalde	Uvalde	Garner Field	25,955	24,263	\$1,809,817	\$943	\$189,447,970	7,919	\$9,930,923
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gray	Gray	McLean / Gray County	6,746	28,184	\$270,698,177	\$1,337	\$266,858,032	10,050	\$18,391,725

Application of Ideal System Criteria

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Oil & Gas Property Tax	Property Tax (In Millions)	Retail Sales	Employment	Agriculture Net Cash Return
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gray	Gray	Perry Lefors Field	22,335						
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Milam	Milam	Cameron Municipal Airpark	29,008	21,443	\$33,745,489	\$859	\$114,208,977	4,937	\$4,245,129
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Milam	Milam	H.H. Coffield Regional	25,451						
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Hockley	Hockley	Leveland Municipal	33,467	31,095	\$1,122,052,704	\$2,341	\$199,768,992	10,771	\$24,232,148
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Austin	Austin	Sealy (new)			\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Shelby	Shelby	Center Municipal	22,857	22,857	\$22,050,460	\$727	\$158,924,021	7,085	\$15,872,000
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Panola	Panola	Panola County-Sharpe Field	25,664	15,871	\$658,232,067	\$1,322	\$86,230,051	4,486	\$1,926,348
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Fayette	Fayette	Fayette Regional Air Center	23,581	15,795	\$195,248,567	\$1,215	\$183,708,426	5,677	\$4,213,704
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Grimes	Grimes	Navasota Municipal	31,787	10,343	\$47,565,230	\$536	\$135,873,246	3084	\$1,308,662
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Houston	Houston	Houston County	21,734	21,734	\$32,380,045	\$1,031	\$120,668,548	6637	\$2,236,350
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Limestone	Limestone	Mexia-Limestone County	26,318	24,007	\$157,289,679	\$1,713	\$167,322,793	7536	\$2,245,557
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Aransas	Aransas	Aransas County	45,415	20,854	\$29,152,270	\$927	\$169,454,678	5128	\$57,000
Population	10,000 to 25,000	De Witt	De Witt	Cuero Municipal	14,296	13,695	\$27,815,436	\$572	\$86,238,348	4383	\$3,003,272
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Calhoun	Calhoun	Calhoun County	74,925	6,787	\$17,717,546	\$1,106	\$43,564,212	3280	\$437,251
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lavaca	Lavaca	Hallettsville Municipal	19,032	21,426	\$130,679,326	\$1,152	\$148,843,244	6012	\$4,941,335
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lavaca	Lavaca	Yoakum Municipal	28,187						
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Kendall	Kendall	Kendall Co-Boerne(new)			\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Moore	Moore	Moore County	18,176	18,176	\$378,088,368	\$1,275	\$108,257,851	7615	\$37,679,668
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Moore	Moore	Sunray(new)							
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gillespie	Gillespie	Gillespie County	48,032	16,052	\$30,234	\$1,274	\$166,007,960	5,627	\$1,163,151
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Tyler	Tyler	Tyler County	23,119	20,803	\$44,743,107	\$838	\$107,050,263	4,145	(\$955,379)
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Willacy	Willacy	Charles R. Johnson	3,608	3,608	\$28,854,363	\$121	\$11,355,812	701	\$1,567,312
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Colorado	Colorado	Robert R. Welis, JR	17,129	17,447	\$77,149,112	\$1,055	\$162,440,363	5,423	\$3,191,908
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Colorado	Colorado	Eagle Lake	16,089						
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Eastland	Eastland	Cisco Municipal	20,899	24,546	\$57,949,615	\$847	\$158,173,333	6,976	\$8,421,979
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Eastland	Eastland	Eastland Municipal	10,183						
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Deaf Smith	Deaf Smith	Hereford Municipal	20,202	20,202	\$3,294	\$860	\$160,268,932	7,945	\$65,904,302
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Scurry	Scurry	Winston Field	25,170	25,170	\$217,666,047	\$1,099	\$153,237,080	8,379	\$7,636,795
Population	10,000 to 25,000	San Jacinto	San Jacinto				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Falls	Falls	Marlin	27,540	27,540	\$17,629,257	\$946	\$217,747,494	9,711	\$3,694,172
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Jones	Jones	Hamlin Municipal	16,463	23,055	\$99,333,565	\$906	\$180,431,009	6,277	\$10,839,360
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Jones	Jones	Arledge Field	17,142						

Application of Ideal System Criteria

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Oil & Gas Property Tax	Property Tax (In Million\$)	Retail Sales	Employment	Agriculture Net Cash Return
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Montague	Montague	Bowie Municipal	19,692	24,091	\$30,046,175	\$467	\$83,942,811	2,858	\$2,748,818
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Montague	Montague	Nocona Municipal	15,546						
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Young	Young	Graham Municipal	12,903	20,698	\$70,162,316	\$792	\$143,036,630	6,538	\$5,862,965
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Young	Young	Olney Municipal	9,765						
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Freestone	Freestone	Teague Municipal	30,311	9,949	\$106,195,738	\$705	\$61,381,361	2,445	(\$191,743)
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gonzales	Gonzales	Gonzales Municipal	25,746	8,494	\$4,877,044	\$403	\$54,414,024	2,610	\$12,187,566
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Nolan	Nolan	Avenger Field	18,939	17,811	\$86,223,696	\$825	\$134,004,173	5,927	\$8,082,198
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lampasas	Lampasas	Lampasas	12,140	10,389	\$52,647	\$401	\$66,901,023	2,353	\$456,975
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Bosque	Bosque	Clifton Municipal/Isenhower	20,636	12,224	\$1,106	\$603	\$44,994,621	2,523	\$3,197,106
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Pecos	Pecos	Fort Stockton-Pecos County	16,515	16,515	\$2,030,373,350	\$2,598	\$98,944,717	5038	\$4,793,000
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Wilbarger	Wilbarger	Wilbarger County	16,815	16,815	\$34,125,219	\$889	\$97,935,125	6248	\$5,699,305
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Frio	Frio	Dilley Airpark	6,762	7,799	\$16,884,485	\$326	\$34,043,804	1,923	\$3,702,998
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Frio	Frio	McKinley Field	13,561						
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Robertson	Robertson	Hearne Municipal	91,921	13,515	\$89,591,498	\$1,170	\$50,907,413	3,034	\$3,046,560
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Reeves	Reeves	Pecos Municipal	15,474	15,474	\$153,115,930	\$486	\$76,073,405	5068	\$5,838,959
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Karnes	Karnes	Karnes County	21,139	19,465	\$84,430,374	\$1,155	\$176,558,757	10,599	\$3,262,715
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lamb	Lamb	Littlefield Municipal	13,099	3,787	\$3,467,060	\$252	\$19,072,219	1,224	\$4,071,000
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Burleson	Burleson	Caldwell Municipal	41,866	8,738	\$72,360,184	\$516	\$61,253,793	2,244	\$1,089,401
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Dawson	Dawson	Lamesa Municipal	14,486	14,486	\$222,616,448	\$647	\$113,073,525	5,150	\$13,777,305
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gaines	Gaines	Gaines County	24,303	24,303	\$2,395,039,110	\$3,398	\$167,964,062	7,907	\$27,290,934
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Red River	Red River	Clarksville-Red River County	13,208	10,968	\$11,551,469	\$378	\$56,362,840	2,714	\$3,306,160
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Andrews	Andrews	Andrews County	13,842	2,029	\$155,830,076	\$219	\$16,365,661	637	\$244,720
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Bandera	Bandera				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Jackson	Jackson	Jackson County	15,880	5,545	\$17,134,065	\$574	\$66,889,202	2,065	\$2,462,868
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Newton	Newton	Newton Municipal	23,115	3,686	\$10,275,219	\$191	\$18,996,388	574	(\$187,516)
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lee	Lee	Giddings-Lee County	30,081	11,991	\$66,102,111	\$611	\$110,417,612	3,780	\$1,671,026
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Comanche	Comanche	Comanche County-City	17,157	3,871	\$745,863	\$164	\$26,800,127	980	\$6,466,625
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Leon	Leon	Leon County(new)			\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Duval	Duval	Duval-Freer	5,356	5,356	\$95,068,658	\$370	\$13,617,764	1,338	\$1,118,696
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Morris	Morris	Greater Morris County	50,032	20,419	\$22,071	\$142	\$12,883,470	1,345	\$537,264

Application of Ideal System Criteria

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Oil & Gas Property Tax	Property Tax (in Millions\$)	Retail Sales	Employment	Agriculture Net Cash Return
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Terry	Terry	Terry County	16,518	16,688	\$158,135,455	\$723	\$110,389,779	5,084	\$17,108,660
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Ward	Ward	Roy Hurd Memorial	15,609	11,116	\$276,165,362	\$645	\$56,150,139	3,137	\$316,684
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Llano	Llano	Llano Municipal	11,493	11,493	\$214,232	\$1,247	\$78,285,216	3,232	\$1,157,730
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Trinity	Trinity	Groveton-Trinity County	18,935	12,539	\$25,262,165	\$558	\$72,775,493	2,487	\$278,064
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Callahan	Callahan				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Madison	Madison	Madisonville Municipal	20,388	10,354	\$42,986,646	\$548	\$58,484,192	3,209	\$3,154,655
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Zavala	Zavala	Crystal City Municipal	16,312	16,123	\$34,694,078	\$593	\$45,936,590	3,130	\$4,650,091
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Runnels	Runnels	Bruce Field	11,946	12,330	\$27,013,773	\$478	\$73,399,256	3,974	\$4,086,210
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Runnels	Runnels	Winters Municipal	11,519						
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Camp	Camp				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Sabine	Sabine	Pineland Municipal	13,231	2,802	\$9,917,803	\$337	\$49,527,823	1,965	\$238,098
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Dimmit	Dimmit	Dimmit County	18,858	3,678	\$6,179,698	\$107	\$9,968,904	526	(\$45,571)
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Zapata	Zapata	Zapata county	10,662	10,662	\$562,371,610	\$965	\$39,642,802	2,255	\$1,842,000
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Clay	Clay				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Live Oak	Live Oak	Live Oak County	9,911	9,911	\$94,921,517	\$885	\$79,975,879	2,329	(\$500,434)
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Marion	Marion	Cypress River	46,757	6,466	\$10,050,007	\$265	\$33,850,842	1,384	\$2,470,070
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Parmer	Parmer	Benger Airpark	24,322	7,604	\$0	\$350	\$34,801,053	3,510	\$29,260,468
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Brewster	Brewster	Alpine-Casparis Municipal	10,358	10,727	\$135,225	\$538	\$69,242,866	3,622	\$3,104,161
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Brewster	Brewster	Lajitas	369	369	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Ochiltree	Ochiltree	Perryton Ochiltree County	9,967	9,967	\$189,220,431	\$588	\$71,863,779	3,941	\$18,409,765
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Stephens	Stephens	Stephens County	10,341	9,102	\$127,106,999	\$483	\$62,047,352	2,998	\$1,661,061
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Haskell	Haskell	Haskell Municipal	11,109	2,364	\$10,218,984	\$136	\$23,021,188	612	\$2,767,090
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Hemphill	Hemphill	Hemphill County	4,156	4,013	\$386,912,902	\$701	\$60,933,735	1,411	\$13,652,034
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Childress	Childress	Childress Municipal	7,438	7,438	\$732,492	\$180	\$63,203,777	2,311	\$5,608,749
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Bailey	Bailey	Muleshoe Municipal	13,038	12,384	\$4,354,627	\$633	\$85,430,571	4,445	\$21,117,528
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Dallam	Dallam				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	McCulloch	McCulloch	Curtis Field	8,468	8,468	\$4,140,766	\$439	\$55,600,383	2,632	\$3,243,708
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Castro	Castro	Dimmit Municipal	8,835	6,988	\$0	\$408	\$48,280,695	2,749	\$51,788,672
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Coleman	Coleman	Coleman Municipal	9,112	9,112	\$13,923,749	\$396	\$53,214,306	2,489	\$3,121,892
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Crosby	Crosby	Crosbyton Municipal	12,864	2,963	\$6,972,144	\$111	\$22,842,825	949	\$2,098,728
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Yoakum	Yoakum	Denver City	11,519	11,206	\$1,215,632,234	\$1,775	\$68,913,967	3,835	\$13,164,749
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Yoakum	Yoakum	Yoakum County	9,843		\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Franklin	Franklin	Franklin County	19,518	4,823	\$11,130,212	\$196	\$35,972,847	1,384	\$2,936,810
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Swisher	Swisher	City of Tulia/Swisher County Municip	11,291	10,324	\$8,753	\$405	\$60,360,971	2,724	\$26,477,140
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Brooks	Brooks	Brookes County	13,787	7,578	\$108,026,655	\$492	\$42,544,970	1,675	\$1,661,660
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Refugio	Refugio	Rooke Field	24,907	4,292	\$37,827,588	\$134	\$9,377,859	425	\$673,208
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Kimble	Kimble	Kimble County	4,078	4,078	\$227,044	\$412	\$40,680,418	1,423	\$344,507
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Floyd	Floyd	Floydada Municipal	7,680	5,070	\$16,356	\$204	\$26,840,681	1,634	\$9,392,804
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Hamilton	Hamilton	Hamilton Municipal	12,512	7,844	\$409,135	\$429	\$43,197,893	2,221	\$11,873,127
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	San Augustine	San Augustine	San Augustine County	12,570	2,576	\$2,478,097	\$106	\$13,034,462	621	\$248,374

Application of Ideal System Criteria

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Oil & Gas Property Tax	Property Tax (in Million\$)	Retail Sales	Employment	Agriculture Net Cash Return
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Mitchell	Mitchell	Colorado City	25,660	7,046	\$72,986,867	\$392	\$32,641,419	1,839	\$3,827,925
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Culberson	Culberson	Culberson County	2,920	2,920	\$23,962,470	\$240	\$34,978,961	1038	\$220,880
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Martin	Martin	Stanton Municipal	66,815	1,245	\$156,117,427	\$288	\$3,275,086	313	\$5,445,418
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Winkler	Winkler	Winkler County	8,978	8,978	\$347,585,191	\$592	\$40,921,497	2,462	\$709,964
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Jim Hogg	Jim Hogg	Jim Hogg County	5,577	5,577	\$64,627,517	\$414	\$36,373,420	1,457	(\$195,750)
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Wheeler	Wheeler	Shamrock Municipal	4,862	4,231	\$124,515,469	\$310	\$31,091,532	1,420	\$7,253,871
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Wheeler	Wheeler	Wheeler Municipal	6,057		\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Crane	Crane	Crane county	6,781	6,781	\$853,701,341	\$1,161	\$34,904,505	2,417	\$1,183,615
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Kent	Kent	Kent County	1,088	1,088	\$506,146,325	\$693	\$11,603,788	531	\$1,526,952
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Upton	Upton	Upton County	7,353	92	\$10,283,879	\$15	\$396,899	28	\$35,134
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Crockett	Crockett	Ozona Municipal	3,984	3,984	\$334,052,334	\$686	\$27,881,260	1,327	\$951,545
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Carson	Carson	Panhandle-Carson County	22,390	301	\$10,323,540	\$28	\$1,102,493	194	\$352,636
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Reagan	Reagan	Reagan County	4,246	4,089	\$207,924,527	\$401	\$27,953,355	1,128	\$2,014,274
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Sutton	Sutton	Sonora Municipal	6,363	6,363	\$232,698,587	\$730	\$30,249,206	2,221	\$1,661,535
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Glasscock	Glasscock				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Garza	Garza	Post-Garza County Municipal	5,264	5,264	\$192,463,028	\$380	\$26,325,418	1,212	\$4,368,628
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Borden	Borden				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Cochran	Cochran	Cochran County	4,372	3,454	\$143,849,606	\$284	\$18,439,168	915	\$3,141,573
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Lipscomb	Lipscomb	Follett/Lipscomb County	2,240	1,227	\$65,569,028	\$133	\$3,994,119	371	\$1,121,170
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Lipscomb	Lipscomb	Higgins-Lipscomb County	1,183		\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Sherman	Sherman	Stratford Field(new)	2,941	2,941	\$157,878,866	\$398	\$12,746,978	869	\$34,049,295
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	McMullen	McMullen				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Terrell	Terrell	Terrell County	502	502	\$57,786,128	\$112	\$1,361,979	101	(\$90,800)
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Irlon	Irlon				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	King	King				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Hansford	Hansford	Gruver Municipal	5,146	3,981	\$133,582,655	\$530	\$48,104,401	2,675	\$30,773,394
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Hansford	Hansford	Spearman Municipal	5,960		\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Sterling	Sterling				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Roberts	Roberts	Miami-Roberts County	1,547	52	\$6,650,407	\$12	\$116,762	11	\$158,415
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Kenedy	Kenedy				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Hardeman	Hardeman	Quanah Municipal	5,133	5,133	\$24,059,204	\$70	\$4,788,211	337	\$272,108
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Loving	Loving				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Jack	Jack	Jacksboro Municipal	10,871	1,353	\$12,248,425	\$96	\$4,744,570	343	\$404,768
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Stonewall	Stonewall	Stonewall County	1,652	162	\$5,530,816	\$16	\$871,485	54	\$188,168
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Coke	Coke	Robert Lee	2,974	2,974	\$52,119,385	\$244	\$21,396,656	845	\$1,095,057
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Gollad	Gollad				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Schleicher	Schleicher	Eldorado	6,126	506	\$8,275,559	\$50	\$1,282,805	132	\$158,688
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Edwards	Edwards	Edwards County	2,503	2,503	\$41,569,328	\$341	\$8,366,653	370	(\$263,018)
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Throckmorton	Throckmorton				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Hartley	Hartley	Dalhart Municipal	10,660	9,967	\$29,474,158	\$734	\$77,790,091	4,005	\$93,367,516
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Lynn	Lynn	T bar	6,948	1,455	\$1,125,381	\$69	\$5,612,876	382	\$2,755,870
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Armstrong	Armstrong				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Fisher	Fisher	Fisher County	18,061	543	\$4,671,576	\$35	\$1,450,142	117	\$702,720
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Oldham	Oldham	Oldham County	3,089	2,097	\$2,961,347	\$123	\$9,871,876	784	\$5,149,108
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Hall	Hall	Memphis Municipal	4,568	3,314	\$259,799	\$128	\$13,944,553	771	\$3,837,933
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	San Saba	San Saba	San Saba County Municipal	8,900	7,228	\$1,499	\$582	\$33,959,035	2,263	\$3,663,231
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Hudspeth	Hudspeth	Dell City Municipal	995	2,333	\$1,111,247	\$206	\$5,875,521	487	\$3,318,904
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Hudspeth	Hudspeth	Mile High	1,338		\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Concho	Concho	Eden-Concho County(new)			\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Rains	Rains	Rains County	56,371	985	\$3,912,431	\$38	\$4,794,661	167	\$541,464
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Baylor	Baylor	Seymour Municipal	4,883	4,883	\$7,915,590	\$264	\$37,621,405	1,398	\$4,360,494
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Mason	Mason	Mason County	4,905	3,211	\$0	\$420	\$14,402,593	780	\$3,282,123
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Knox	Knox	Knox City Municipal	8,318	3,161	\$29,040,596	\$189	\$31,142,399	1,119	\$3,309,838
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Knox	Knox	Munday Municipal	8,697		\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Dickens	Dickens	Spur Municipal	2,678	1,651	\$28,586,468	\$120	\$7,461,530	467	\$2,345,583



Application of Ideal System Criteria

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Oil & Gas Property Tax	Property Tax (In Million\$)	Retail Sales	Employment	Agriculture Net Cash Return
	BELOW 10,000	Presidio	Presidio	Marfa Municipal	4,071	3,946	\$2,118	\$141	\$14,143,919	662	\$1,628,710
	BELOW 10,000	Presidio	Presidio	Presidio Lely International	3,766		\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
	BELOW 10,000	Donley	Donley	Clarendon Municipal	3,677	2,650	\$92,759	\$150	\$12,863,900	673	\$2,406,645
	BELOW 10,000	Briscoe	Briscoe				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
	BELOW 10,000	Shackelford	Shackelford	Albany Municipal	9,767	2,854	\$32,027,208	\$215	\$10,596,272	725	\$2,184,468
	BELOW 10,000	Cottle	Cottle	Dan E. Richards Municipal	2,242	2,153	\$6,012,591	\$63	\$5,591,556	252	\$1,196,628
	BELOW 10,000	Collingsworth	Collingsworth	Marian Airpark			\$2,324,357	\$47	\$4,901,394	359	\$952,661
	BELOW 10,000	Motley	Motley				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
	BELOW 10,000	Jeff Davis	Jeff Davis				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
	BELOW 10,000	Menard	Menard	Menard County	4,229	4,229	\$23,016,871	\$406	\$19,007,899	1,085	\$3,706,668
	BELOW 10,000	Blanco	Blanco				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
	BELOW 10,000	Foard	Foard	Foard County	5,669	1,595	\$4,693,827	\$83	\$4,712,232	375	\$762,048
	BELOW 10,000	Real	Real	Real County			\$135,749	\$381	\$23,051,945	1,029	\$898,370
	BELOW 10,000	Delta	Delta				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
	BELOW 10,000	La Salle	La Salle	Cotulla-La Salle County	7,658	1,548	\$6,173,760	\$99	\$6,306,748	313	\$122,878
	BELOW 10,000	Somervell	Somervell				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
	BELOW 10,000	Kinney	Kinney				\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
	BELOW 10,000	Mills	Mills	Mills County (New)			\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0
			TOTAL			18,815,666	\$27,807,774,689	\$738,597	\$203,539,253,409	7,657,717	\$1,391,729,651



**Appendix B**  
**Application of Ideal System Criteria - Cumulative**  
**Percentages of State totals**



Application of Ideal System Criteria - Cumulative Percentages of State Totals

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	Percent of State Oil & Gas Tax	Percent of State Prop. Tax	Percent of State Retail Sales	Percent of State Employment	Percent of State Agric. Net Cash Return
Population	1 Million +	HOUSTON	Harris	East Grand Parkway(New)	0	4,012,397	21%	4%	23%	24%	24%	2%
Population	1 Million +		Harris	David Wayne Hooks Memorial	407,543							
Population	1 Million +		Harris	Ellington Field	1,987,813							
Population	1 Million +		Harris	Houston Intercontinental	331,122							
Population	1 Million +		Harris	West Houston	1,351,756							
Population	1 Million +		Harris	Houston Westside(New)	0							
Population	1 Million +		Harris	William P. Hobby	2,549,833							
Population	1 Million +		Harris	La Porte Municipal	1,037,926							
Population	1 Million +		Chambers	Chambers County	28,814							
Population	1 Million +		Chambers	Chambers County-Winnie Stowell	22,092							
Population	1 Million +		Fort Bend	Sugar Land Municipal	1,516,110							
Population	1 Million +		Fort Bend	Houston-Southwest	1,384,887							
Population	1 Million +		Liberty	Cleveland Municipal	32,718							
Population	1 Million +		Liberty	Liberty Municipal	44,052							
Population	1 Million +		Montgomery	Montgomery County	230,012							
Population	1 Million +		Waller									
Population	1 Million +	DALLAS	Dallas	Addison	2,400,534	3,303,354	38%	5%	43%	46%	46%	3%
Population	1 Million +		Dallas	Dallas Love Field	1,950,172							
Population	1 Million +		Dallas	Redbird	2,755,405							
Population	1 Million +		Dallas	Lancaster	1,601,393							
Population	1 Million +		Dallas	Phil L. Hudson Municipal	429,505							
Population	1 Million +		Collin	McKinney Municipal	412,101							
Population	1 Million +		Denton	Denton Municipal	372,824							
Population	1 Million +		Ellis	Ennis Municipal	78,483							
Population	1 Million +		Ellis	Midlothian/Waxahachie Municipal	264,124							
Population	1 Million +		Henderson	Athens Municipal	67,571							
Population	1 Million +		Hunt	Caddo Mills Municipal	56,893							
Population	1 Million +		Hunt	Commerce Municipal	55,624							
Population	1 Million +		Hunt	Majors	83,172							
Population	1 Million +		Kaufman	Terrell Municipal	72,728							
Population	1 Million +		Rockwall	Rockwall Municipal	485,211							
Population	1 Million +											
Population	1 Million +	FT. WORTH-ARLINGTON PMSA	Tarrant	Arlington Municipal	1,921,165	1,349,155	45%	5%	44%	48%	47%	4%
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Dallas-Fort Worth International	2,913,268							
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Fort Worth Alliance	1,547,966							
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Fort Worth Meacham	1,327,538							
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Fort Worth Spinks	1,072,228							
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Fort Worth Carswell	1,220,717							
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Grand Prairie Municipal	2,347,638							
Population	1 Million +		Hood	Granbury Municipal	38,911							
Population	1 Million +		Johnson	Cleburne Municipal	117,589							
Population	1 Million +		Parker	Mineral Wells	63,109							
Population	1 Million +		Parker	Weatherford (New)	0							
Population	1 Million +											
Population	1 Million +	SAN ANTONIO MSA	Bexar	San Antonio International	1,346,131	1,488,741	53%	5%	50%	55%	55%	4%
Population	1 Million +		Bexar	Stinson Municipal	1,301,291							
Population	1 Million +		Comal									
Population	1 Million +		Guadalupe	New Braunfels Municipal	166,752							
Population	1 Million +		Wilson									
Population	1 Million +											
Population	1 Million +	AUSTIN-SAN MARCOS MSA	Travis	Austin(New)	0	984,726	58%	6%	57%	61%	61%	5%
Population	1 Million +		Travis	Austin Executive Airpark	740,307							
Population	1 Million +		Travis	Robert Mueller	779,955							
Population	1 Million +		Bastrop	Smithville Municipal	51,946							
Population	1 Million +		Caldwell	Lockhart Municipal	31,266							

Application of Ideal System Criteria - Cumulative Percentages of State Totals

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	Percent of State Oil & Gas Tax	Percent of State Prop. Tax	Percent of State Retail Sales	Percent of State Employment	Percent of State Agric. Net Cash Return
Population	1 Million +		Caldwell	The Carter Memorial	31,218							
Population	1 Million +		Caldwell	San Marcos Municipal	133,847							
Population	1 Million +		Hays									
Population	1 Million +		Williamson	Georgetown Municipal	159,106							
Population	1 Million +		Williamson	Taylor Municipal	105,313							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	EL PASO MSA	El Paso	El Paso International	661,477	669,129	62%	6%	59%	64%	64%	6%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		El Paso	West Texas	654,553							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		El Paso	Fabens	363,497							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000											
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	MCALLEN-EDIN.-MISSION MSA	Hidalgo	Edinburg Rio Grande Valley Regional	415,116	567,157	65%	8%	60%	65%	66%	8%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Hidalgo	McAllen Miller International	417,675							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Hidalgo	Mid Valley	388,630							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000											
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	BEAUMONT-PT. ARTHUR MSA	Hardin	Hawthorne Field	154,918	363,942	67%	8%	63%	67%	67%	8%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Jefferson	Beaumont Municipal	297,666							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Jefferson	Jefferson County	287,965							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Orange	Orange County	358,238							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000											
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	CORPUS CHRISTI MSA	Nueces	Bishop Municipal	55,716	375,817	69%	10%	64%	68%	69%	9%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Nueces	Corpus Christi International	350,836							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Nueces	Mustang Beach	320,829							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Nueces	Nueces County	369,301							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		San Patricio	Aransas Pass	319,378							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		San Patricio	T. P. McCampbell	320,829							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		San Patricio	San Patricio County	37,693							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000											
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	BROWN.-HARL.-SAN BEN. MSA	Cameron	Brownsville/South Padre Island Intl.	204,523	248,235	70%	10%	65%	69%	70%	9%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Cameron	Rio Grande Valley International	248,235							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Cameron	Port Isabel-Cameron County	213,617							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Cameron	San Benito Municipal	315,289							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000											
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	KILLEEN-TEMPLE MSA	Bell	Killeen Municipal	185,761	321,577	72%	10%	66%	71%	71%	10%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Bell	Draughan Miller Municipal	242,229							
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Coryell	Gatesville City-County	42,228							
Population	100,000 to 250,000	GALVESTON-TEXAS CITY PMSA	Galveston	Galveston Municipal/Scholes Field	241,981	133,470	72%	10%	67%	71%	72%	10%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Galveston	Houston Gulf	550,489							
Population	100,000 to 250,000											
Population	100,000 to 250,000	ODESSA-MIDLANO MSA	Ector	Odessa-Schlemeyer Field	225,565	241,053	73%	16%	68%	73%	73%	10%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Midland	Midland Airpark	212,563							
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Midland	Midland International	216,481							
Population	100,000 to 250,000											
Population	100,000 to 250,000	LUBBOCK MSA	Lubbock	Lubbock International	232,974	235,243	75%	17%	69%	74%	74%	11%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Lubbock	Slaton Municipal	224,071							
Population	100,000 to 250,000											
Population	100,000 to 250,000	BRAZORIA PMSA	Brazoria	Brazoria County	219,898	133,638	75%	17%	69%	74%	75%	11%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Brazoria	Clover Field	2,438,823							
Population	100,000 to 250,000											
Population	100,000 to 250,000	AMARILLO MSA	Potter	Amarillo International	202,834	207,985	77%	17%	70%	75%	76%	13%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Randall	Tradewind	203,277							
Population	100,000 to 250,000											
Population	100,000 to 250,000	LONGVIEW-MARSHALL MSA	Gregg	Gladewater Municipal	87,756	272,531	78%	22%	71%	76%	77%	14%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Gregg	Gregg County	183,380							
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Harrison	Harrison County	60,249							
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Upshur	Gilmer-Upshur County	83,534							
Population	100,000 to 250,000											

Application of Ideal System Criteria - Cumulative Percentages of State Totals

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	Percent of State Oil & Gas Tax	Percent of State Prop. Tax	Percent of State Retail Sales	Percent of State Employment	Percent of State Agric. Net Cash Return
Population	100,000 to 250,000	WACO MSA	McLennan	McGregor Municipal	190,258	186,001	79%	22%	71%	77%	78%	15%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		McLennan	TSTC Waco	197,106							
Population	100,000 to 250,000		McLennan	Waco Regional	205,081							
Population	100,000 to 250,000	LAREDO MSA	Webb	Laredo International	177,147	177,147	80%	24%	72%	78%	78%	15%
Population	100,000 to 250,000	TYLER MSA	Smith	Tyler Pounds Field	186,153	165,144	81%	24%	73%	79%	79%	15%
Population	100,000 to 250,000	BRYAN-COLLEGE STATION MSA	Brazos	Coulter Field	146,467	162,401	82%	25%	74%	79%	80%	16%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Brazos	Easterwood Field	158,037							
Population	100,000 to 250,000	WICHITA FALLS MSA	Archer			143,334	82%	25%	74%	80%	81%	17%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Wichita	Kickapoo Downtown Airpark	140,076							
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Wichita	Sheppard AFB/Wichita Falls Municipal	141,976							
Population	100,000 to 250,000	ABILENE MSA	Taylor	Abilene Regional	136,883	136,883	83%	26%	75%	81%	81%	17%
Population	100,000 to 250,000	TEXARKANA MSA	Bowie	New Boston (new)		85,080	83%	26%	75%	81%	82%	18%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Bowie	Texarkana Regional-Webb Field	85,080							
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Miller,Co,AK									
Population	100,000 to 250,000	SAN ANGELO MSA	Tom Green	Mathis Field	105,826	105,826	84%	26%	75%	81%	82%	18%
Population	100,000 to 250,000	SHERMAN-DENISON MSA	Grayson	Sherman Municipal	95,307	101,644	85%	26%	76%	82%	83%	18%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Grayson	Grayson County	100,611							
Population	50,000 to 100,000	VICTORIA MSA	Victoria	Victoria Regional	88,435	88,435	85%	26%	76%	82%	83%	19%
Population	50,000 to 100,000	Angelina	Angelina	Angelina County	75,924	75,924	85%	26%	77%	83%	84%	19%
Population	50,000 to 100,000	Nacogdoches	Nacogdoches	A.L.Mangham Jr. Regional	105,032	59,321	86%	27%	77%	83%	84%	20%
Population	50,000 to 100,000	Walker	Walker	Huntsville Municipal	56,253	55,211	86%	27%	77%	83%	84%	20%
Population	50,000 to 100,000	Anderson	Anderson	Palestine Municipal	50,833	44,522	86%	27%	77%	85%	84%	20%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Starr	Starr	Starr County	46,527	43,610	86%	28%	77%	85%	84%	21%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Lamar	Lamar	Cox Field	52,008	51,753	87%	28%	77%	85%	84%	22%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Rusk	Rusk	Rusk County	68,038	20,507	87%	28%	77%	85%	84%	22%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Maverick	Maverick	Eagle Pass (New)				28%	77%	85%	84%	22%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Cherokee	Cherokee	Cherokee County	74,518	29,349	87%	28%	78%	85%	85%	23%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Val Verde	Val Verde	Del Rio International	35,972	35,972	87%	28%	78%	85%	85%	23%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Navarro	Navarro	C. David Campbell Field-Corsicana M	45,425	43,125	87%	28%	78%	85%	85%	23%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Kerr	Kerr	Kerrville Municipal/Louis Schreiner Fld	38,636	38,636	88%	28%	78%	85%	85%	23%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Van Zandt	Van Zandt	Wills Point Municipal	44,998	13,154	88%	29%	78%	85%	85%	23%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Polk	Polk	Livingston Municipal	40,544	34,583	88%	29%	78%	86%	85%	23%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wharton	Wharton	Wharton Municipal	51,616	50,427	88%	30%	79%	86%	85%	25%

Application of Ideal System Criteria - Cumulative Percentages of State Totals

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	Percent of State Oil & Gas Tax	Percent of State Prop. Tax	Percent of State Retail Sales	Percent of State Employment	Percent of State Agric. Net Cash Return
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wise	Wise	Bridgeport Municipal	21,878	42,627	88%	30%	79%	86%	85%	25%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wise	Wise	Decatur Municipal	39,462							
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Jim Wells	Jim Wells	Alice International	51,455	32,660	89%	31%	79%	86%	86%	25%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Matagorda	Matagorda	Bay City Municipal	45,986	41,188	89%	31%	80%	86%	86%	26%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Matagorda	Matagorda	Palacios Municipal	20,153							
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Brown	Brown	Brownwood Municipal	38,303	38,303	89%	31%	80%	86%	86%	26%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hale	Hale	Abernathy Municipal	122,401	39,660	89%	31%	80%	87%	86%	27%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hale	Hale	Hale County	34,267							
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Atascosa	Atascosa	Pleasanton Municipal	30,502	25,473	89%	31%	80%	87%	86%	28%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Jasper	Jasper	Jasper County-Bell Field	34,684	48,035	90%	31%	80%	87%	86%	27%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Jasper	Jasper	Kirbyville	23,132							
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Medina	Medina	Castroville Municipal	1,186,758	53,310	90%	31%	80%	87%	86%	28%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Medina	Medina	Devine Municipal	23,242							
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Medina	Medina	Hondo Municipal	23,576							
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wood	Wood	Mineola-Quitman	59,165	50,104	90%	32%	81%	88%	87%	29%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wood	Wood	Winnsboro Municipal	32,481							
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Howard	Howard	Big Spring McMahon-Wrinkle	37,401	34,834	90%	34%	81%	88%	87%	30%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Cooke	Cooke	Gainesville Municipal	45,147	38,526	90%	34%	81%	88%	87%	30%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Kleberg	Kleberg	Kleberg County	62,921	5,659	90%	34%	81%	88%	87%	30%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hopkins	Hopkins	Sulphur Springs Municipal	42,975	3,618	90%	34%	81%	88%	87%	30%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Erath	Erath	Dublin Municipal	37,236	40,515	91%	34%	81%	88%	87%	33%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Erath	Erath	Clark Field Municipal	37,481							
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Cass	Cass	Atlanta Municipal	31,080	31,080	91%	34%	81%	88%	87%	34%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hill	Hill	Hillsboro Municipal	34,152	19,131	91%	34%	82%	88%	87%	34%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Burnet	Burnet	Burnet Municipal Kate Craddock Field	35,878	35,878	91%	34%	82%	88%	87%	34%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Washington	Washington	Brenham Municipal	56,485	53,733	91%	35%	82%	89%	88%	34%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Bee	Bee	Beeville Municipal	25,356	22,687	92%	35%	82%	89%	88%	34%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Fannin	Fannin	Jones Field	31,760	24,462	92%	35%	82%	89%	88%	34%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Palo Pinto	Palo Pinto	Poosum Kingdom	6,308	3,098	92%	35%	82%	89%	88%	34%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Titus	Titus	Mount Pleasant Municipal	60,777	46,208	92%	35%	83%	89%	88%	35%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hutchinson	Hutchinson	Hutchinson County	30,365	30,365	92%	36%	83%	89%	88%	36%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Uvalde	Uvalde	Garner Field	25,955	24,263	92%	36%	83%	89%	88%	37%
Population	25,000 to 50,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gray	Gray	Mclean / Gray County	6,746	28,184	92%	37%	83%	89%	88%	38%



Application of Ideal System Criteria - Cumulative Percentages of State Totals

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	Percent of State Oil & Gas Tax	Percent of State Prop. Tax	Percent of State Retail Sales	Percent of State Employment	Percent of State Agric. Net Cash Return
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gray	Gray	Perry Lefors Field	22,335							
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Milam	Milam	Cameron Municipal Airpark	29,008	21,443	92%	37%	83%	89%	88%	38%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Milam	Milam	H.H. Coffield Regional	25,451							
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Hockley	Hockley	Levelland Municipal	33,467	31,095	93%	41%	84%	89%	89%	40%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Austin	Austin	Sealy (new)			93%	41%	84%	89%	89%	40%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Shelby	Shelby	Center Municipal	22,857	22,857	93%	41%	84%	90%	89%	41%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Panola	Panola	Panola County-Sharpe Field	25,664	15,671	93%	43%	84%	90%	89%	41%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Fayette	Fayette	Fayette Regional Air Center	23,581	15,795	93%	44%	84%	90%	89%	41%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Grimes	Grimes	Navasota Municipal	31,787	10,343	93%	44%	84%	90%	89%	42%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Houston	Houston	Houston County	21,734	21,734	93%	44%	84%	90%	89%	42%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Limestone	Limestone	Mexia-Limestone County	26,318	24,007	93%	45%	84%	90%	89%	42%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Aransas	Aransas	Aransas County	45,415	20,854	93%	45%	84%	90%	89%	42%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	De Witt	De Witt	Cuero Municipal	14,296	13,695	93%	45%	85%	90%	89%	42%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Calhoun	Calhoun	Calhoun County	74,925	6,787	93%	45%	85%	90%	89%	42%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lavaca	Lavaca	Hallettsville Municipal	19,032	21,426	94%	45%	85%	90%	89%	42%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lavaca	Lavaca	Yoakum Municipal	28,187							
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Kendall	Kendall	Kendall Co-Boerne(new)			94%	45%	85%	90%	89%	42%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Moore	Moore	Moore County	18,176	18,176	94%	46%	85%	90%	89%	45%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Moore	Moore	Sunray(new)								
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gillespie	Gillespie	Gillespie County	48,032	16,052	94%	46%	85%	90%	89%	45%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Tyler	Tyler	Tyler County	23,119	20,803	94%	47%	85%	90%	89%	45%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Willacy	Willacy	Charles R. Johnson	3,608	3,608	94%	47%	85%	90%	89%	45%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Colorado	Colorado	Robert R. Wells, JR	17,129	17,447	94%	47%	85%	90%	90%	45%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Colorado	Colorado	Eagle Lake	16,089		94%					
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Eastland	Eastland	Cisco Municipal	20,899	24,546	94%	47%	86%	90%	90%	46%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Eastland	Eastland	Eastland Municipal	10,183		94%					
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Deaf Smith	Deaf Smith	Hereford Municipal	20,202	20,202	94%	47%	86%	90%	90%	50%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Scurry	Scurry	Winston Field	25,170	25,170	94%	48%	86%	91%	90%	51%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	San Jacinto	San Jacinto				94%	48%	86%	91%	90%	51%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Falls	Falls	Marlin	27,540	27,540	94%	48%	86%	91%	90%	51%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Jones	Jones	Hamlin Municipal	16,463	23,055	95%	48%	86%	91%	90%	52%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Jones	Jones	Arledge Field	17,142		95%					

Application of Ideal System Criteria - Cumulative Percentages of State Totals

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	Percent of State Oil & Gas Tax	Percent of State Prop. Tax	Percent of State Retail Sales	Percent of State Employment	Percent of State Agric. Net Cash Return
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Montague	Montague	Bowie Municipal	19,692	24,091	95%	48%	86%	91%	90%	52%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Montague	Montague	Nocona Municipal	15,546		95%					
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Young	Young	Graham Municipal	12,903	20,698	95%	49%	86%	91%	90%	52%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Young	Young	Olney Municipal	9,785		95%					
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Freestone	Freestone	Teague Municipal	30,311	9,949	95%	49%	86%	91%	90%	52%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gonzales	Gonzales	Gonzales Municipal	25,746	8,494	95%	49%	86%	91%	90%	53%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Nolan	Nolan	Avenger Field	18,939	17,811	95%	49%	86%	91%	90%	54%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lampasas	Lampasas	Lampasas	12,140	10,389	95%	49%	86%	91%	90%	54%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Bosque	Bosque	Clifton Municipal/Isenhower	20,636	12,224	95%	49%	87%	91%	90%	54%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Pecos	Pecos	Fort Stockton-Pecos County	16,515	16,515	95%	56%	87%	91%	90%	54%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Wilbarger	Wilbarger	Wilbarger County	16,815	16,815	95%	56%	87%	91%	90%	55%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Frio	Frio	Ditley Airpark	6,762	7,799	95%	56%	87%	91%	90%	55%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Frio	Frio	McKinley Field	13,561		95%					
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Robertson	Robertson	Hearne Municipal	91,921	13,515	95%	56%	87%	91%	91%	55%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Reeves	Reeves	Pecos Municipal	15,474	15,474	95%	57%	87%	91%	91%	55%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Karnes	Karnes	Karnes County	21,139	19,465	96%	57%	87%	91%	91%	56%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lamb	Lamb	Littlefield Municipal	13,099	3,787	96%	57%	87%	91%	91%	56%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Burleson	Burleson	Caldwell Municipal	41,866	8,738	96%	57%	87%	91%	91%	56%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Dawson	Dawson	Lamesa Municipal	14,486	14,486	96%	58%	88%	91%	91%	57%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gaines	Gaines	Gaines County	24,303	24,303	96%	66%	88%	91%	91%	59%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Red River	Red River	Clarksville-Red River County	13,208	10,968	96%	66%	88%	91%	91%	59%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Andrews	Andrews	Andrews County	13,842	2,029	96%	67%	88%	91%	91%	59%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Bandera	Bandera				96%	67%	88%	91%	91%	59%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Jackson	Jackson	Jackson County	15,880	5,545	96%	67%	88%	91%	91%	59%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Newton	Newton	Newton Municipal	23,115	3,686	96%	67%	88%	91%	91%	59%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lee	Lee	Giddings-Lee County	30,081	11,991	96%	67%	88%	91%	91%	59%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Comanche	Comanche	Comanche County-City	17,157	3,871	96%	67%	88%	92%	91%	60%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Leon	Leon	Leon County(new)			96%	67%	88%	92%	91%	60%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Duval	Duval	Duval-Freer	5,356	5,356	96%	67%	88%	92%	91%	60%
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Morris	Morris	Greater Morris County	50,032	20,419	96%	67%	88%	92%	91%	60%

Application of Ideal System Criteria - Cumulative Percentages of State Totals

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/MSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	Percent of State Oil & Gas Tax	Percent of State Prop. Tax	Percent of State Retail Sales	Percent of State Employment	Percent of State Agric. Net Cash Return
Population	10,000 to 25,000											
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Terry	Terry	Terry County	16,518	15,688	96%	68%	88%	92%	91%	61%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Ward	Ward	Roy Hurd Memorial	15,609	11,116	96%	69%	88%	92%	91%	61%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Llano	Llano	Llano Municipal	11,493	11,493	96%	69%	89%	92%	91%	61%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Trinity	Trinity	Groveton-Trinity County	18,935	12,539	96%	69%	89%	92%	91%	61%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Callahan	Callahan				96%	69%	89%	92%	91%	61%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Madison	Madison	Madisonville Municipal	20,388	10,354	97%	69%	89%	92%	91%	61%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Zavala	Zavala	Crystal City Municipal	16,312	16,123	97%	69%	89%	92%	91%	62%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Runnels	Runnels	Bruce Field	11,946	12,330	97%	69%	89%	92%	91%	62%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Runnels	Runnels	Winters Municipal	11,519		97%					
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Camp	Camp				97%	69%	89%	92%	91%	62%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Sabine	Sabine	Pineland Municipal	13,231	2,802	97%	69%	89%	92%	91%	62%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Dimmit	Dimmit	Dimmit County	18,858	3,678	97%	69%	89%	92%	91%	62%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Zapata	Zapata	Zapata county	10,662	10,662	97%	71%	89%	92%	91%	62%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Clay	Clay				97%	71%	89%	92%	91%	62%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Live Oak	Live Oak	Live Oak County	9,911	9,911	97%	71%	89%	92%	91%	62%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Marion	Marion	Cypress River	46,757	6,466	97%	71%	89%	92%	91%	62%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Parmer	Parmer	Benger Airpark	24,322	7,604	97%	71%	89%	92%	91%	64%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Brewster	Brewster	Alpine-Casparis Municipal	10,358	10,727	97%	71%	89%	92%	92%	64%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Brewster	Brewster	Lajitas	369	369	97%	71%	89%	92%	92%	64%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Ochiltree	Ochiltree	Perryton Ochiltree County	9,967	9,967	97%	72%	89%	92%	92%	65%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Stephens	Stephens	Stephens County	10,341	9,102	97%	72%	89%	92%	92%	66%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Haskell	Haskell	Haskell Municipal	11,109	2,364	97%	72%	89%	92%	92%	66%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Hemphill	Hemphill	Hemphill County	4,156	4,013	97%	74%	90%	92%	92%	67%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Childress	Childress	Childress Municipal	7,438	7,438	97%	74%	90%	92%	92%	67%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Bailey	Bailey	Muleshoe Municipal	13,038	12,384	97%	74%	90%	92%	92%	68%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Dallam	Dallam				97%	74%	90%	92%	92%	68%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	McCulloch	McCulloch	Curtis Field	8,468	8,468	97%	74%	90%	92%	92%	69%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Castro	Castro	Dimmit Municipal	8,835	6,988	97%	74%	90%	92%	92%	72%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Coleman	Coleman	Coleman Municipal	9,112	9,112	97%	74%	90%	92%	92%	72%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Crosby	Crosby	Crosbyton Municipal	12,864	2,963	97%	74%	90%	92%	92%	73%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Yoakum	Yoakum	Denver City	11,519	11,206	97%	78%	90%	92%	92%	73%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Yoakum	Yoakum	Yoakum County	9,843		97%	78%	90%	92%	92%	73%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Franklin	Franklin	Franklin County	19,518	4,823	97%	78%	90%	92%	92%	74%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Swisher	Swisher	City of Tulsa/Swisher County Municip	11,291	10,324	97%	78%	90%	92%	92%	75%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Brooks	Brooks	Brookes County	13,787	7,578	97%	78%	90%	92%	92%	75%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Refugio	Refugio	Rooke Field	24,907	4,292	98%	78%	90%	92%	92%	76%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Kimble	Kimble	Kimble County	4,078	4,078	98%	78%	90%	92%	92%	76%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Floyd	Floyd	Floydada Municipal	7,680	5,070	98%	78%	90%	92%	92%	76%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Hamilton	Hamilton	Hamilton Municipal	12,512	7,844	98%	78%	90%	92%	92%	77%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	San Augustine	San Augustine	San Augustine County	12,570	2,576	98%	78%	90%	92%	92%	77%

Application of Ideal System Criteria - Cumulative Percentages of State Totals

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	Percent of State Oil & Gas Tax	Percent of State Prop. Tax	Percent of State Retail Sales	Percent of State Employment	Percent of State Agric. Net Cash Return
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Mitchell	Mitchell	Colorado City	25,660	7,048	98%	78%	90%	92%	92%	77%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Culberson	Culberson	Culberson County	2,920	2,920	98%	79%	90%	92%	92%	77%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Martin	Martin	Stanton Municipal	66,815	1,245	98%	79%	90%	92%	92%	78%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Winkler	Winkler	Winkler County	8,978	8,978	98%	80%	91%	92%	92%	78%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Jim Hogg	Jim Hogg	Jim Hogg County	5,577	5,577	98%	80%	91%	92%	92%	78%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Wheeler	Wheeler	Shamrock Municipal	4,862	4,231	98%	81%	91%	92%	92%	78%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Wheeler	Wheeler	Wheeler Municipal	6,057		98%	81%	91%	92%	92%	78%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Crane	Crane	Crane county	6,781	6,781	98%	84%	91%	92%	92%	78%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Kent	Kent	Kent County	1,088	1,088	98%	85%	91%	92%	92%	78%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Upton	Upton	Upton County	7,353	92	98%	85%	91%	92%	92%	78%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Crockett	Crockett	Ozona Municipal	3,984	3,984	98%	86%	91%	92%	92%	78%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Carson	Carson	Panhandle-Carson County	22,390	301	98%	86%	91%	92%	92%	78%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Reagan	Reagan	Reagan County	4,246	4,089	98%	87%	91%	92%	92%	79%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Sutton	Sutton	Sonora Municipal	6,363	6,363	98%	88%	91%	92%	92%	79%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Glasscock	Glasscock				98%	88%	91%	92%	92%	79%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Garza	Garza	Post-Garza County Municipal	5,264	5,264	98%	89%	91%	92%	92%	79%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Borden	Borden				98%	89%	91%	92%	92%	79%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Cochran	Cochran	Cochran County	4,372	3,454	98%	89%	91%	92%	92%	79%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Lipscomb	Lipscomb	Follet/Lipscomb County	2,240	1,227	98%	89%	91%	92%	92%	79%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Lipscomb	Lipscomb	Higgins-Lipscomb County	1,183		98%	89%	91%	92%	92%	79%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Sherman	Sherman	Stratford Field(new)	2,941	2,941	98%	90%	91%	92%	92%	82%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	McMullen	McMullen				98%	90%	91%	92%	92%	82%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Terrell	Terrell	Terrell County	502	502	98%	90%	91%	92%	92%	81%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Irion	Irion				98%	90%	91%	92%	92%	81%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	King	King				98%	90%	91%	92%	92%	81%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Hansford	Hansford	Gruver Municipal	5,146	3,981	98%	90%	91%	92%	92%	84%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Hansford	Hansford	Spearman Municipal	5,960		98%	90%	91%	92%	92%	84%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Sterling	Sterling				98%	90%	91%	92%	92%	84%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Roberts	Roberts	Miami-Roberts County	1,547	52	98%	90%	91%	92%	92%	84%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Kenedy	Kenedy				98%	90%	91%	92%	92%	84%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Hardeman	Hardeman	Quanah Municipal	5,133	5,133	98%	90%	91%	92%	92%	84%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Loving	Loving				98%	90%	91%	92%	92%	84%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Jack	Jack	Jacksboro Municipal	10,871	1,353	98%	91%	91%	92%	92%	84%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Stonewall	Stonewall	Stonewall County	1,652	162	98%	91%	91%	92%	92%	84%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Coke	Coke	Robert Lee	2,974	2,974	98%	91%	91%	92%	92%	84%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Gollad	Gollad				98%	91%	91%	92%	92%	84%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Schleicher	Schleicher	Eldorado	6,126	506	98%	91%	91%	92%	92%	84%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Edwards	Edwards	Edwards County	2,503	2,503	98%	91%	91%	92%	92%	84%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Throckmorton	Throckmorton				98%	91%	91%	92%	92%	84%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Hartley	Hartley	Dalhart Municipal	10,660	9,967	98%	91%	91%	93%	92%	90%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Lynn	Lynn	T-bar	6,948	1,455	98%	91%	91%	93%	92%	90%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Armstrong	Armstrong				98%	91%	91%	93%	92%	90%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Fisher	Fisher	Fisher County	18,061	543	98%	91%	91%	93%	92%	90%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Oldham	Oldham	Oldham County	3,089	2,097	98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	91%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Hall	Hall	Memphis Municipal	4,568	3,314	98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	91%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	San Saba	San Saba	San Saba County Municipal	8,900	7,228	98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	91%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Hudspeth	Hudspeth	Dell City Municipal	995	2,333	98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	91%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Hudspeth	Hudspeth	Mile High	1,338		98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	91%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Concho	Concho	Eden-Concho County(new)			98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	91%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Rains	Rains	Rains County	56,371	985	98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	91%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Baylor	Baylor	Seymour Municipal	4,883	4,883	98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	92%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Mason	Mason	Mason County	4,905	3,211	98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	92%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Knox	Knox	Knox City Municipal	8,318	3,161	98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	92%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Knox	Knox	Munday Municipal	8,697		98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	92%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Dickens	Dickens	Spur Municipal	2,678	1,651	98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	92%

Application of Ideal System Criteria - Cumulative Percentages of State Totals

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	Percent of State Oil & Gas Tax	Percent of State Prop. Tax	Percent of State Retail Sales	Percent of State Employment	Percent of State Agric. Net Cash Return
	BELOW 10,000	Presidio	Presidio	Marfa Municipal	4,071	3,946	98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	92%
	BELOW 10,000	Presidio	Presidio	Presidio Lely International	3,766		98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	92%
	BELOW 10,000	Donley	Donley	Clarendon Municipal	3,677	2,650	98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	92%
	BELOW 10,000	Briscoe	Briscoe				98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	92%
	BELOW 10,000	Shackelford	Shackelford	Albany Municipal	9,767	2,854	98%	91%	92%	93%	92%	93%
	BELOW 10,000	Cottle	Cottle	Dan E. Richards Municipal	2,242	2,153	98%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%
	BELOW 10,000	Collingsworth	Collingsworth	Marian Airpark			98%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%
	BELOW 10,000	Motley	Motley				98%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%
	BELOW 10,000	Jeff Davis	Jeff Davis				98%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%
	BELOW 10,000	Menard	Menard	Menard County	4,229	4,229	98%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%
	BELOW 10,000	Blanco	Blanco				98%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%
	BELOW 10,000	Foard	Foard	Foard County	5,669	1,595	98%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%
	BELOW 10,000	Real	Real	Real County			98%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%
	BELOW 10,000	Delta	Delta				98%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%
	BELOW 10,000	La Salle	La Salle	Cotulla-La Salle County	7,658	1,548	98%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%
	BELOW 10,000	Somervell	Somervell				98%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%
	BELOW 10,000	Kinney	Kinney				98%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%
	BELOW 10,000	Mills	Mills	Mills County (New)			98%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%
			TOTAL			18,815,666	98%	91%	92%	93%	93%	93%



**Appendix C**  
**Application of Ideal System Criteria - Aviation Activity Measures**





Application of Ideal System Criteria - Aviation Activity Measures

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population within 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	1996 Based Aircraft	Percent of State Based Aircraft	1996 Aircraft Operations	Percent of State Operations
Population	1 Million +	HOUSTON	Harris	David Wayne Hooks Memorial	407,543	4,012,397	21%	285	2%	146,870	2%
Population	1 Million +		Harris	Ellington Field	1,987,813			120	3%	94,495	3%
Population	1 Million +		Harris	Houston Intercontinental	331,122			48	4%	313,753	7%
Population	1 Million +		Harris	West Houston	1,351,756			207	6%	81,000	8%
Population	1 Million +		Harris	Houston Westside(New)	0			0	6%	0	8%
Population	1 Million +		Harris	William P. Hobby	2,549,833			210	7%	240,606	11%
Population	1 Million +		Harris	La Porte Municipal	1,037,926			146	9%	116,549	12%
Population	1 Million +		Chambers	Chambers County	28,814			16	9%	6,900	12%
Population	1 Million +		Chambers	Chambers County-Winnie Stowell	22,092			6	9%	1,800	12%
Population	1 Million +		Fort Bend	Sugar Land Municipal	1,516,110			135	10%	75,041	13%
Population	1 Million +		Fort Bend	Houston-Southwest	1,384,887			178	11%	53,500	14%
Population	1 Million +		Liberty	Cleveland Municipal	32,718			35	12%	10,600	14%
Population	1 Million +		Liberty	Liberty Municipal	44,052			22	12%	10,025	14%
Population	1 Million +		Montgomery	Montgomery County	230,012			111	13%	57,560	15%
Population	1 Million +		Waller						13%		15%
Population	1 Million +	DALLAS	Dallas	Addison	2,400,534	3,303,354	38%	794	19%	284,680	18%
Population	1 Million +		Dallas	Dallas Love Field	1,950,172			294	22%	213,522	21%
Population	1 Million +		Dallas	Redbird	2,755,405			136	23%	85,808	22%
Population	1 Million +		Dallas	Lancaster	1,601,393			125	24%	40,500	22%
Population	1 Million +		Dallas	Phil L. Hudson Municipal	429,505			207	26%	80,000	23%
Population	1 Million +		Collin	McKinney Municipal	412,101			143	27%	100,000	24%
Population	1 Million +		Denton	Denton Municipal	372,824			114	28%	134,000	26%
Population	1 Million +		Ellis	Ennis Municipal	78,483			29	28%	13,546	26%
Population	1 Million +		Ellis	Midlothian/Waxahachie Municipal	264,124			27	29%	1,100	26%
Population	1 Million +		Henderson	Athens Municipal	67,571			16	29%	4,800	26%
Population	1 Million +		Hunt	Caddo Mills Municipal	56,893			15	29%	12,388	26%
Population	1 Million +		Hunt	Commerce Municipal	55,624			4	29%	2,100	26%
Population	1 Million +		Hunt	Majors	83,172			27	29%	10,200	26%
Population	1 Million +		Kaufman	Terrell Municipal	72,728			76	30%	18,350	27%
Population	1 Million +		Rockwall	Rockwall Municipal	485,211			80	30%	38,020	27%
Population	1 Million +	FT. WORTH-ARLINGTON PMSA	Tarrant	Arlington Municipal	1,921,165	1,349,155	45%	290	33%	148,000	29%
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Dallas-Fort Worth International	2,913,268			0	33%	851,185	39%
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Fort Worth Alliance	1,547,966			0	33%	140,655	41%
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Fort Worth Meacham	1,327,538			382	36%	319,993	45%
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Fort Worth Spinks	1,072,228			88	37%	55,300	45%
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Fort Worth Carswell	1,220,717				37%		45%
Population	1 Million +		Tarrant	Grand Prairie Municipal	2,347,638			253	39%	150,000	47%
Population	1 Million +		Hood	Granbury Municipal	38,911			29	39%	8,000	47%
Population	1 Million +		Johnson	Cleburne Municipal	117,589			103	40%	29,804	48%
Population	1 Million +		Parker	Mineral Wells	63,109			68	41%	22,216	48%
Population	1 Million +		Parker	Weatherford (New)	0			0	41%	0	48%
Population	1 Million +	SAN ANTONIO MSA	Bexar	San Antonio International	1,346,131	1,488,741	53%	0	41%	215,155	51%
Population	1 Million +		Bexar	Stinson Municipal	1,301,291			53	41%	49,248	51%
Population	1 Million +		Comal						41%		51%
Population	1 Million +		Guadalupe	New Braunfels Municipal	166,752			58	41%	24,000	52%
Population	1 Million +		Willson						41%		52%
Population	1 Million +	AUSTIN-SAN MARCOS MSA	Travis	Austin(New)	0	984,726	58%	0	41%	0	52%
Population	1 Million +		Travis	Austin Executive Airpark	740,307			100	42%	94,080	53%
Population	1 Million +		Travis	Robert Mueller	779,955			266	45%	186,962	55%
Population	1 Million +		Bastrop	Smithville Municipal	51,946			21	45%	6,050	55%
Population	1 Million +		Caldwell	Lockhart Municipal	31,266			39	45%	11,950	55%

Application of Ideal System Criteria - Aviation Activity Measures

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population within 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	1996 Based Aircraft	Percent of State Based Aircraft	1996 Aircraft Operations	Percent of State Operations
Population	1 Million +		Caldwell	The Carter Memorial	31,218			7	45%	2,100	55%
Population	1 Million +		Caldwell	San Marcos Municipal	133,847			100	46%	50,000	56%
Population	1 Million +		Hays						46%		
Population	1 Million +		Williamson	Georgetown Municipal	159,106			133	47%	87,062	57%
Population	1 Million +		Williamson	Taylor Municipal	105,313			30	47%	9,000	57%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	EL PASO MSA	El Paso	El Paso International	661,477	669,129	62%	329	50%	148,374	59%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		El Paso	West Texas	654,553			70	51%	18,600	59%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		El Paso	Fabens	363,497			20	51%	13,000	59%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	MCALLEN-EDIN. MISSION MSA	Hidalgo	Edinburg Rio Grande Valley Regional Frt	415,116	567,157	65%	0	51%	600	59%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Hidalgo	McAllen Miller International	417,675			92	52%	61,297	60%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Hidalgo	Mid Valley	388,630			80	52%	24,200	60%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	BEAUMONT-PT. ARTHUR MSA	Hardin	Hawthorne Field	154,918	363,942	67%	12	52%	4,206	60%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Jefferson	Beaumont Municipal	297,666			61	53%	18,800	60%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Jefferson	Jefferson County	287,965			76	54%	45,406	61%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Orange	Orange County	358,238			30	54%	9,532	61%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	CORPUS CHRISTI MSA	Nueces	Bishop Municipal	55,716	375,817	69%	17	54%	5,600	61%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Nueces	Corpus Christi International	350,836			69	55%	136,507	63%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Nueces	Mustang Beach	320,829			0	55%	7,000	63%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Nueces	Nueces County	369,301			23	55%	8,700	63%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		San Patricio	Aransas Pass	319,378			2	55%	6,100	63%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		San Patricio	T.P. McCampbell	320,829			5	55%	1,200	63%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		San Patricio	San Patricio County	37,693			39	55%	10,300	63%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	BROWN-HARL.-SAN BEN. MSA	Cameron	Brownsville/South Padre Island Intl.	204,523	248,235	70%	65	56%	68,905	64%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Cameron	Rio Grande Valley International	248,235			31	56%	54,914	65%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Cameron	Port Isabel-Cameron County	213,617			20	56%	8,000	65%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Cameron	San Benito Municipal	315,289			18	56%	5,400	65%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000	KILLEEN-TEMPLE MSA	Bell	Killeen Municipal	185,761	321,577	72%	62	57%	42,500	65%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Bell	Draughan Miller Municipal	242,229			57	57%	47,531	66%
Population	250,000 to 1,000,000		Coryell	Gatesville City-County	42,228			12	57%	3,600	66%
Population	100,000 to 250,000	GALVESTON-TEXAS CITY PMSA	Galveston	Galveston Municipal/Scholes Field	241,981	133,470	72%	102	58%	62,639	67%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Galveston	Houston Gulf	550,489			82	59%	24,300	67%
Population	100,000 to 250,000	ODESSA-MIDLAND MSA	Ector	Odessa-Schlemeyer Field	225,565	241,053	73%	170	60%	45,360	68%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Midland	Midland Airpark	212,563			83	61%	31,700	68%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Midland	Midland International	216,481			83	62%	108,782	69%
Population	100,000 to 250,000	LUBBOCK MSA	Lubbock	Lubbock International	232,974	235,243	75%	124	63%	104,574	71%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Lubbock	Slaton Municipal	224,071			12	63%	9,700	71%
Population	100,000 to 250,000	BRAZORIA PMSA	Brazoria	Brazoria County	219,898	133,638	75%	76	64%	60,000	71%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Brazoria	Clover Field	2,436,823			146	65%	75,280	72%
Population	100,000 to 250,000	AMARILLO MSA	Potter	Amarillo International	202,834	207,985	77%	36	65%	88,989	73%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Randall	Tradewind	203,277			84	66%	32,925	74%
Population	100,000 to 250,000	LONGVIEW-MARSHALL MSA	Gregg	Gladewater Municipal	87,756	272,531	78%	55	66%	16,600	74%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Gregg	Gregg County	183,380			84	67%	88,688	75%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Harrison	Harrison County	60,249			38	67%	11,400	75%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Upshur	Gilmer-Upshur County	83,534			21	67%	6,300	75%
Population	100,000 to 250,000										

Application of Ideal System Criteria - Aviation Activity Measures

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population within 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	1996 Based Aircraft	Percent of State Based Aircraft	1996 Aircraft Operations	Percent of State Operations
Population	100,000 to 250,000	WACO MSA	McLennan	McGregor Municipal	190,258	186,001	79%	65	68%	33,750	76%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		McLennan	TSTC Waco	197,106			19	68%	51,680	76%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		McLennan	Waco Regional	205,081			55	69%	60,769	77%
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	LAREDO MSA	Webb	Laredo International	177,147	177,147	80%	89	69%	54,861	78%
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	TYLER MSA	Smith	Tyler Pounds Field	186,153	165,144	81%	121	70%	10,442	78%
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	BRYAN-COLLEGE STATION MSA	Brazos	Coultter Field	146,467	162,401	82%	50	71%	14,100	78%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Brazos	Easterwood Field	158,037			49	71%	62,762	79%
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	WICHITA FALLS MSA	Archer			143,334	82%	0	71%	0	79%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Wichita	Kickapoo Downtown Airpark	140,076			76	72%	25,350	79%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Wichita	Sheppard AFB/Wichita Falls Municipal	141,976				72%	53,829	80%
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	ABILENE MSA	Taylor	Abilene Regional	136,883	136,883	83%	160	73%	102,212	81%
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	TEXARKANA MSA	Bowie	New Boston (new)		85,080	83%	0	73%	0	81%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Bowie	Texarkana Regional-Webb Field	85,080			76	74%	58,246	82%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Miller, Co, AK						74%		82%
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	SAN ANGELO MSA	Tom Green	Mathis Field	105,826	105,826	84%	135	75%	70,134	83%
Population	100,000 to 250,000										
Population	100,000 to 250,000	SHERMAN-DENISON MSA	Grayson	Sherman Municipal	95,307	101,644	85%	27	75%	6,000	83%
Population	100,000 to 250,000		Grayson	Grayson County	100,611			74	76%	27,600	83%
Population	50,000 to 100,000	VICTORIA MSA	Victoria	Victoria Regional	88,435	88,435	85%	61	76%	24,018	83%
Population	50,000 to 100,000								76%		83%
Population	50,000 to 100,000	Angelina	Angelina	Angelina County	75,924	75,924	85%	51	77%	37,250	84%
Population	50,000 to 100,000										
Population	50,000 to 100,000	Nacogdoches	Nacogdoches	A.L.Mangham Jr. Regional	105,032	59,321	86%	47	77%	18,200	84%
Population	50,000 to 100,000										
Population	50,000 to 100,000	Walker	Walker	Huntsville Municipal	56,253	56,211	86%	36	77%	34,650	84%
Population	50,000 to 100,000										
Population	50,000 to 100,000	Anderson	Anderson	Palestine Municipal	50,833	44,522	86%	33	78%	9,750	84%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Starr	Starr	Starr County	46,527	43,610	86%	2	78%	900	84%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Lamar	Lamar	Cox Field	52,008	51,753	87%	27	78%	10,924	85%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Rusk	Rusk	Rusk County	68,038	20,507	87%	20	78%	9,400	85%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Maverick	Maverick	Eagle Pass (New)				0	78%	0	85%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Cherokee	Cherokee	Cherokee County	74,518	29,349	87%	28	78%	8,450	85%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Val Verde	Val Verde	Del Rio International	35,972	35,972	87%	35	79%	26,380	85%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Navarro	Navarro	C. David Campbell Field-Corsicana Muni	45,425	43,125	87%	42	79%	12,420	85%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Kerr	Kerr	Kerrville Municipal/Louis Schreiner Fid.	38,636	38,636	88%	57	80%	34,100	86%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Van Zandt	Van Zandt	Willis Point Municipal	44,998	13,154	88%	4	80%	1,200	86%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Polk	Polk	Livingston Municipal	40,544	34,583	88%	10	80%	4,800	86%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wharton	Wharton	Wharton Municipal	51,616	50,427	88%	28	80%	9,100	86%

Application of Ideal System Criteria - Aviation Activity Measures

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population within 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	1996 Based Aircraft	Percent of State Based Aircraft	1996 Aircraft Operations	Percent of State Operations
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wise	Wise	Bridgeport Municipal	21,878	42,627	88%	45	80%	9,200	86%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wise	Wise	Decatur Municipal	39,462			20	80%	6,000	86%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Jim Wells	Jim Wells	Alice International	51,455	32,660	89%	30	81%	24,490	86%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Matagorda	Matagorda	Bay City Municipal	45,986	41,188	89%	55	81%	16,000	87%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Matagorda	Matagorda	Palacios Municipal	20,153			8	81%	4,460	87%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Brown	Brown	Brownwood Municipal	38,303	38,303	89%	31	81%	12,990	87%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hale	Hale	Abernathy Municipal	122,401	39,660	89%	1	81%	4,000	87%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hale	Hale	Hale County	34,267			99	82%	35,748	87%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Atascosa	Atascosa	Pleasanton Municipal	30,502	25,473	89%	16	82%	4,060	87%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Jasper	Jasper	Jasper County-Bell Field	34,684	48,035	90%	12	83%	5,000	87%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Jasper	Jasper	Kirbyville	23,132			3	83%	900	87%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Medina	Medina	Castroville Municipal	1,186,758	53,310	90%	56	83%	25,000	88%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Medina	Medina	Devine Municipal	23,242			21	83%	5,600	88%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Medina	Medina	Hondo Municipal	23,576			36	84%	161,370	90%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wood	Wood	Mineral-Quitman	59,165	50,104	90%	9	84%	2,700	90%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Wood	Wood	Winnboro Municipal	32,481			9	84%	3,000	90%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Howard	Howard	Big Spring McMahon-Wrinkle	37,401	34,834	90%	43	84%	14,750	90%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Cooke	Cooke	Gainesville Municipal	45,147	38,526	90%	49	84%	10,300	90%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Kleberg	Kleberg	Kleberg County	62,921	5,659	90%	17	85%	9,420	90%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hopkins	Hopkins	Sulphur Springs Municipal	42,975	3,618	90%	28	85%	8,890	90%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Erath	Erath	Dublin Municipal	37,236	40,515	91%	7	85%	2,550	90%
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Erath	Erath	Clark Field Municipal	37,481			21	85%	7,500	90%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Cass	Cass	Atlanta Municipal	31,080	31,080	91%	27	85%	8,200	90%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hill	Hill	Hillsboro Municipal	34,152	19,131	91%	4	85%	1,200	90%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Burnet	Burnet	Burnet Municipal Kate Craddock Field	35,878	35,878	91%	33	86%	13,900	91%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Washington	Washington	Brenham Municipal	56,485	53,733	91%	27	86%	9,650	91%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Bee	Bee	Beeville Municipal	25,356	22,687	92%	15	86%	6,000	91%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Fannin	Fannin	Jones Field	31,760	24,462	92%	28	86%	5,700	91%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Palo Pinto	Palo Pinto	Possum Kingdom	6,308	3,098	92%	3	86%	2,300	91%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Titus	Titus	Mount Pleasant Municipal	60,777	46,208	92%	26	86%	7,850	91%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Hutchinson	Hutchinson	Hutchinson County	30,365	30,365	92%	21	87%	7,016	91%
Population	25,000 to 50,000										
Population	25,000 to 50,000	Uvalde	Uvalde	Garner Field	25,955	24,263	92%	37	87%	19,750	91%

Application of Ideal System Criteria - Aviation Activity Measures

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population within 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	1996 Based Aircraft	Percent of State Based Aircraft	1996 Aircraft Operations	Percent of State Operations
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gray	Gray	Mclean / Gray County	6,746	28,184	92%	1	87%	500	91%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gray	Gray	Perry Lefors Field	22,335			30	87%	9,520	91%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Milam	Milam	Cameron Municipal Airpark	29,008	21,443	92%	8	87%	2,400	91%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Milam	Milam	H.H. Coffield Regional	25,451			6	87%	1,800	92%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Hockley	Hockley	Levelland Municipal	33,467	31,095	93%	42	88%	15,525	92%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Austin	Austin	Sealy (new)			93%	0	88%	0	92%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Shelby	Shelby	Center Municipal	22,857	22,857	93%	23	88%	6,630	92%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Panola	Panola	Panola County-Sharpe Field	25,664	15,871	93%	16	88%	22,000	92%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Fayette	Fayette	Fayette Regional Air Center	23,581	15,795	93%	6	88%	2,700	92%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Grimes	Grimes	Navasota Municipal	31,787	10,343	93%	5	88%	1,500	92%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Houston	Houston	Houston County	21,734	21,734	93%	20	88%	6,000	92%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Limestone	Limestone	Mexia-Limestone County	26,318	24,007	93%	20	88%	5,700	92%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Aransas	Aransas	Aransas County	45,415	20,854	93%	57	89%	68,720	93%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	De Witt	De Witt	Cuero Municipal	14,296	13,695	93%	3	89%	1,200	93%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Calhoun	Calhoun	Calhoun County	74,925	6,787	93%	18	89%	3,000	93%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lavaca	Lavaca	Hallettsville Municipal	19,032	21,426	94%	2	89%	300	93%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lavaca	Lavaca	Yoakum Municipal	28,187			7	89%	1,580	93%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Kendall	Kendall	Kendall Co-Boerne(new)			94%	0	89%	0	93%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Moore	Moore	Moore County	18,176	18,176	94%	11	89%	5,080	93%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Moore	Moore	Sunray(new)				0	89%	4,000	93%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gillespie	Gillespie	Gillespie County	48,032	16,052	94%	25	89%	8,875	93%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Tyler	Tyler	Tyler County	23,119	20,803	94%	2	89%	600	93%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Willacy	Willacy	Charles R. Johnson	3,608	3,608	94%	0	89%	1,100	93%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Colorado	Colorado	Robert R. Wells, JR	17,129	17,447	94%	12	90%	2,800	93%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Colorado	Colorado	Eagle Lake	16,089			11	90%	3,600	93%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Eastland	Eastland	Cisco Municipal	20,899	24,546	94%	6	90%	1,800	93%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Eastland	Eastland	Eastland Municipal	10,183			15	90%	5,600	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Deaf Smith	Deaf Smith	Hereford Municipal	20,202	20,202	94%	22	90%	6,690	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Scurry	Scurry	Winston Field	25,170	25,170	94%	27	90%	8,100	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	San Jacinto	San Jacinto				94%	0	90%	0	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Falls	Falls	Marlin	27,540	27,540	94%	6	90%	2,400	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										

Application of Ideal System Criteria - Aviation Activity Measures

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population within 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	1996 Based Aircraft	Percent of State Based Aircraft	1996 Aircraft Operations	Percent of State Operations
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Jones	Jones	Hamlin Municipal	16,463	23,055	95%	4	90%	3,000	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Jones	Jones	Arledge Field	17,142		95%	15	90%	11,200	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Montague	Montague	Bowie Municipal	19,692	24,091	95%	15	91%	5,580	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Montague	Montague	Nocona Municipal	15,546		95%	0	91%	500	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Young	Young	Graham Municipal	12,903	20,698	95%	31	91%	9,300	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Young	Young	Olney Municipal	9,765		95%	8	91%	15,500	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Freestone	Freestone	Teague Municipal	30,311	9,949	95%	5	91%	1,000	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gonzales	Gonzales	Gonzales Municipal	25,746	8,494	95%	7	91%	1,500	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Nolan	Nolan	Avenger Field	18,939	17,811	95%	22	91%	2,100	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lampasas	Lampasas	Lampasas	12,140	10,389	95%	16	91%	4,600	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Bosque	Bosque	Clifton Municipal/Isenhower	20,636	12,224	95%	22	92%	6,600	94%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Pecos	Pecos	Fort Stockton-Pecos County	16,515	16,515	95%	27	92%	8,350	95%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Wilbarger	Wilbarger	Wilbarger County	16,815	16,815	95%	25	92%	11,600	95%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Frio	Frio	Dilley Airpark	6,762	7,799	95%	4	92%	300	95%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Frio	Frio	McKinley Field	13,561		95%	10	92%	2,000	95%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Robertson	Robertson	Hearne Municipal	91,921	13,515	95%	18	92%	5,400	95%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Reeves	Reeves	Pecos Municipal	15,474	15,474	95%	19	92%	7,800	95%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Karnes	Karnes	Karnes County	21,139	19,465	96%	11	92%	11,524	95%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lamb	Lamb	Littlefield Municipal	13,099	3,787	96%	15	93%	7,100	95%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Burleson	Burleson	Caldwell Municipal	41,866	8,738	96%	11	93%	3,300	95%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Dawson	Dawson	Lamesa Municipal	14,486	14,486	96%	26	93%	12,600	95%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Gaines	Gaines	Gaines County	24,303	24,303	96%	23	93%	12,250	95%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Red River	Red River	Clarksville-Red River County	13,208	10,968	96%	12	93%	3,300	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Andrews	Andrews	Andrews County	13,842	2,029	96%	20	93%	6,000	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Bandera	Bandera				96%	0	93%	0	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Jackson	Jackson	Jackson County	15,880	5,545	96%	23	94%	8,420	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Newton	Newton	Newton Municipal	23,115	3,686	96%	6	94%	1,500	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Lee	Lee	Giddings-Lee County	30,081	11,991	96%	8	94%	2,920	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Comanche	Comanche	Comanche County-City	17,157	3,871	96%	15	94%	5,400	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Leon	Leon	Leon County(new)			96%	0	94%	0	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										

Application of Ideal System Criteria - Aviation Activity Measures

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population within 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	1996 Based Aircraft	Percent of State Based Aircraft	1996 Aircraft Operations	Percent of State Operations
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Duval	Duval	Duval-Freer	5,356	5,356	96%	0	94%	1,400	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Morris	Morris	Greater Morris County	50,032	20,419	96%	0	94%	300	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Terry	Terry	Terry County	16,518	16,688	96%	17	94%	11,000	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Ward	Ward	Roy Hurd Memorial	15,609	11,116	96%	9	94%	2,700	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Llano	Llano	Llano Municipal	11,493	11,493	96%	24	94%	7,200	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Trinity	Trinity	Groveton-Trinity County	18,935	12,539	96%	0	94%	100	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Callahan	Callahan				96%		94%		96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Madison	Madison	Madisonville Municipal	20,388	10,354	97%	3	94%	900	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Zavala	Zavala	Crystal City Municipal	16,312	16,123	97%	2	94%	200	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Runnels	Runnels	Bruce Field	11,946	12,330	97%	3	94%	7,250	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Runnels	Runnels	Winters Municipal	11,519		97%	8	94%	2,400	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Camp	Camp				97%		94%		96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Sabine	Sabine	Pineland Municipal	13,231	2,802	97%	2	94%	1,100	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Dimmit	Dimmit	Dimmit County	18,858	3,678	97%	6	94%	3,000	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Zapata	Zapata	Zapata county	10,662	10,662	97%	8	95%	2,676	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Clay	Clay				97%		95%		96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Live Oak	Live Oak	Live Oak County	9,911	9,911	97%	2	95%	830	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Marion	Marion	Cypress River	46,757	6,466	97%	0	95%	300	96%
Population	10,000 to 25,000										
Population	10,000 to 25,000	Parmer	Parmer	Benger Airpark	24,322	7,604	97%	5	95%	7,900	96%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Brewster	Brewster	Alpine-Casparis Municipal	10,358	10,727	97%	30	95%	6,350	96%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Brewster	Brewster	Lajitas	369	369	97%	0	95%	100	96%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Ochiltree	Ochiltree	Perryton Ochiltree County	9,967	9,967	97%	22	95%	6,600	97%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Stephens	Stephens	Stephens County	10,341	9,102	97%	53	95%	15,800	97%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Haskell	Haskell	Haskell Municipal	11,109	2,364	97%	7	96%	7,800	97%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Hemphill	Hemphill	Hemphill County	4,156	4,013	97%	9	96%	7,800	97%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Childress	Childress	Childress Municipal	7,438	7,438	97%	8	96%	3,892	97%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Bailey	Bailey	Muleshoe Municipal	13,038	12,384	97%	8	96%	2,700	97%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Dallam	Dallam				97%		96%		97%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	McCulloch	McCulloch	Curtis Field	8,468	8,468	97%	9	96%	3,900	97%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Castro	Castro	Dimmit Municipal	8,835	6,988	97%	8	96%	11,200	97%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Coleman	Coleman	Coleman Municipal	9,112	9,112	97%	26	96%	7,800	97%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Crosby	Crosby	Crosbyton Municipal	12,864	2,963	97%	6	96%	4,700	97%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Yoakum	Yoakum	Denver City	11,519	11,206	97%	9	96%	4,500	97%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Yoakum	Yoakum	Yoakum County	9,843		97%	11	96%	6,700	97%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Franklin	Franklin	Franklin County	19,518	4,823	97%	16	96%	5,700	98%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Swisher	Swisher	City of Tulia/Swisher County Municipal	11,291	10,324	97%	19	97%	18,500	98%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Brooks	Brooks	Brookes County	13,787	7,578	97%	3	97%	4,100	98%
Ret. Sales	BELOW 10,000	Refugio	Refugio	Rooke Field	24,907	4,292	98%	16	97%	4,500	98%

Application of Ideal System Criteria - Aviation Activity Measures

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/FMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population within 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	1996 Based Aircraft	Percent of State Based Aircraft	1996 Aircraft Operations	Percent of State Operations
Ret Sales	BELOW 10,000	Kimble	Kimble	Kimble County	4,078	4,078	98%	12	97%	5,800	98%
Ret Sales	BELOW 10,000	Floyd	Floyd	Floydsada Municipal	7,680	5,070	98%	23	97%	10,800	98%
Ret Sales	BELOW 10,000	Hamilton	Hamilton	Hamilton Municipal	12,512	7,844	98%	16	97%	4,038	98%
Ret Sales	BELOW 10,000	San Augustine	San Augustine	San Augustine County	12,570	2,576	98%	0	97%	200	98%
Ret Sales	BELOW 10,000	Mitchell	Mitchell	Colorado City	25,660	7,046	98%	5	97%	3,500	98%
Ret Sales	BELOW 10,000	Culberson	Culberson	Culberson County	2,920	2,920	98%	1	97%	2,500	98%
Ret Sales	BELOW 10,000	Martin	Martin	Stanton Municipal	66,815	1,245	98%	5	97%	2,000	98%
Ret Sales	BELOW 10,000	Winkler	Winkler	Winkler County	8,978	8,978	98%	7	97%	6,000	98%
Ret Sales	BELOW 10,000	Jim Hogg	Jim Hogg	Jim Hogg County	5,577	5,577	98%	0	97%	3,170	98%
Ret Sales	BELOW 10,000	Wheeler	Wheeler	Shamrock Municipal	4,862	4,231	98%	1	97%	480	98%
Ret Sales	BELOW 10,000	Wheeler	Wheeler	Wheeler Municipal	6,057	6,057	98%	2	97%	500	98%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Crane	Crane	Crane county	6,781	6,781	98%	3	97%	1,200	98%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Kent	Kent	Kent County	1,088	1,088	98%	2	97%	600	98%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Upton	Upton	Upton County	7,353	92	98%	5	97%	2,000	98%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Crockett	Crockett	Ozona Municipal	3,984	3,984	98%	25	98%	7,575	98%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Carson	Carson	Panhandle-Carson County	22,390	301	98%	5	98%	2,500	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Reagan	Reagan	Reagan County	4,246	4,089	98%	7	98%	2,200	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Sutton	Sutton	Sonora Municipal	6,363	6,363	98%	3	98%	1,800	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Glasscock	Glasscock	Glasscock	5,264	5,264	98%	13	98%	3,000	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Borden	Borden	Post-Garza County Municipal	4,372	3,454	98%	12	98%	5,500	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Cochran	Cochran	Cochran County	2,240	1,227	98%	1	98%	100	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Lipscomb	Lipscomb	Follet/Lipscomb County	1,183	1,183	98%	1	98%	100	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Sherman	Sherman	Higgins-Lipscomb County	2,941	2,941	98%	5	98%	5,000	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	McMullen	McMullen	Stratford Field(new)	502	502	98%	0	98%	1,150	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Terrell	Terrell	Terrell County	502	502	98%	0	98%	1,150	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Irion	Irion	Irion	5,146	3,981	98%	7	98%	2,100	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	King	King	Gruver Municipal	5,960	5,960	98%	9	98%	2,800	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Hansford	Hansford	Spearman Municipal	1,547	52	98%	1	98%	1,000	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Sterling	Sterling	Miami-Roberts County	5,133	5,133	98%	28	98%	9,300	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Roberts	Roberts	Quannah Municipal	10,871	1,353	98%	5	98%	1,000	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Kenedy	Kenedy	Jacksboro Municipal	1,662	162	98%	0	98%	400	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Hardeman	Hardeman	Stonewall County	2,974	2,974	98%	4	99%	1,200	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Loving	Loving	Robert Lee	6,126	506	98%	3	99%	900	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Jack	Jack	Eldorado	2,503	2,503	98%	2	99%	2,270	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Stonewall	Stonewall	Edwards County	9,967	9,967	98%	41	99%	20,150	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Coke	Coke	Dalhart Municipal	6,948	1,455	98%	3	99%	1,500	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Goliad	Goliad	T-bar	18,061	543	98%	11	99%	6,700	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Schleicher	Schleicher	Fisher County	3,089	2,097	98%	9	99%	4,500	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Edwards	Edwards	Oldham County	4,568	3,314	98%	8	99%	2,900	99%
Oil & Gas	BELOW 10,000	Throckmorton	Throckmorton	Memphis Municipal	8,900	7,228	98%	5	99%	1,200	99%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Hartley	Hartley	San Saba County Municipal	995	2,333	98%	4	99%	5,500	100%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Lynn	Lynn	Del City Municipal	1,338	1,338	98%	0	99%	0	100%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Armstrong	Armstrong	Eden-Concho County(new)	56,371	985	98%	0	99%	0	100%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Fisher	Fisher	Rains County	985	985	98%	0	99%	0	100%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Oldham	Oldham								
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Hall	Hall								
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	San Saba	San Saba								
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Hudspeth	Hudspeth								
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Hudspeth	Hudspeth								
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Concho	Concho								
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Rains	Rains								



Application of Ideal System Criteria - Aviation Activity Measures

Criteria Used	Population Category	MSA/PMSA/COUNTY	NAME	Airport	Population within 25-Mile Radius	Cumulative Population Coverage	Percent of State Population	1996 Based Aircraft	Percent of State Based Aircraft	1996 Aircraft Operations	Percent of State Operations
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Baylor	Baylor	Seymour Municipal	4,883	4,883	98%	11	99%	9,000	100%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Mason	Mason	Mason County	4,905	3,211	98%	3	99%	1,200	100%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Knox	Knox	Knox City Municipal	8,318	3,161	98%	9	99%	500	100%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Knox	Knox	Munday Municipal	8,697		98%	5	99%	2,000	100%
Agriculture	BELOW 10,000	Dickens	Dickens	Spur Municipal	2,878	1,651	98%	1	99%	300	100%
	BELOW 10,000	Presidio	Presidio	Marfa Municipal	4,071	3,948	98%	19	100%	6,000	100%
	BELOW 10,000	Presidio	Presidio	Presidio Lely International	3,766		98%	3	100%	1,200	100%
	BELOW 10,000	Donley	Donley	Clarendon Municipal	3,677	2,650	98%	8	100%	2,400	100%
	BELOW 10,000	Briscoe	Briscoe				98%		100%		100%
	BELOW 10,000	Shackelford	Shackelford	Albany Municipal	9,767	2,854	98%	6	100%	2,200	100%
	BELOW 10,000	Cottle	Cottle	Dan E. Richards Municipal	2,242	2,153	98%	5	100%	1,500	100%
	BELOW 10,000	Collingsworth	Collingsworth	Marian Airpark			98%	10	100%	3,060	100%
	BELOW 10,000	Motley	Motley				98%		100%		100%
	BELOW 10,000	Jeff Davis	Jeff Davis				98%		100%		100%
	BELOW 10,000	Menard	Menard	Menard County	4,229	4,229	98%	1	100%	900	100%
	BELOW 10,000	Blanco	Blanco				98%		100%		100%
	BELOW 10,000	Foard	Foard	Foard County	5,669	1,595	98%	0	100%	500	100%
	BELOW 10,000	Real	Real	Real County			98%	2	100%	800	100%
	BELOW 10,000	Delta	Delta				98%		100%		100%
	BELOW 10,000	La Salle	La Salle	Cotulla-La Salle County	7,658	1,548	98%	9	100%	7,900	100%
	BELOW 10,000	Somervell	Somervell				98%		100%		100%
	BELOW 10,000	Kinney	Kinney				98%		100%		100%
	BELOW 10,000	Mills	Mills	Mills County (New)			98%	0	100%	0	100%
			TOTAL			18,815,666	98%	11,880	100%	8,271,458	100%



**Appendix D**  
**Data Sources for Criteria Used in the Optimization Analysis**



### **Data Sources for Criteria Used in the Optimization Analysis**

Based aircraft 1996	Based on data collected by FAA on individual state (FAA Form 5010)
Total number of operations 1996	Based on data collected by FAA on individual state (FAA Form 5010)
Population served by the airport	Estimate based on incorporated cities within 25 miles of an Airport and percentage of the unincorporated area within this radius
County assessed property value	Annual Property Tax Report , Tax Year 1996, John Sharp, Comptroller of Public Accounts
County Population July 1, 1996	Most current population data from the Texas State Data Center
Agricultural Net Cash Return	U.S. Department of Commerce, Census of Agriculture, 1992. (Latest available)
Minerals-Oil & Gas Property Tax By County	Comptroller of Public Accounts, 1996
Retail Sales by County	Comptroller of Public Accounts, 1997
Total Employment by County	Texas Workforce Commission, 1997

