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Executive Summary
As the population of the United States grows and ages, transportation options are becoming increasingly important to provide mobility options for those unable to, or uncomfortable with, driving themselves. Public transportation plays an essential role in that process. It provides citizens with transportation choices and benefits the entire community. The purpose of regionally coordinated transportation planning is to improve transportation services for everyone who uses it in the region—including, but not limited to, people with disabilities, seniors, and individuals with lower incomes. In addition, funding reductions have caused many people to take a renewed interest in the benefits that transportation coordination offers.

The Texoma region covers approximately 2,698 square miles and in 2014 had an estimated population of 194,308 according to the 2014 U.S. Census Bureau. Although the Texoma planning region is only three counties, it has a unique set of challenges. The most prominent transportation problem is not enough public transit. The amount of land with sparsely populated towns presents a challenge to efficiently providing public transportation coverage. Also, the number of people age 65 and older, the number of people with disabilities, and the number of veterans in the Texoma region is higher than the state average, which can present other issues with providing appropriate transportation services to meet the needs of the population.

The most common unmet needs were the ability to get to/from medical appointments and daily-life activities such as the grocery store, pharmacy, and social activities. Many viable solutions to meet these unmet transportation needs were discussed with stakeholders during the workshops; some will be more difficult to attain than others.

There are over 90 agencies providing transportation in some form in the Texoma region. Although the region lacks significant public transportation resources, there are ample opportunities for community-based organizations, churches, and school districts to utilize their excess capacity to provide additional transportation services in the region.

The vision for the plan is that all citizens in the Texoma region will have access to safe, affordable, and reliable transportation. The Region 22 Stakeholder Committee identified five primary goals for improving equal access to seamless public transportation in the region from 2017 to 2021:

- Improve coordination for transportation services.
- Improve public awareness and knowledge of transportation services.
- Increase access and connectivity both inside and outside of the region.
- Expand transportation services and schedules.
- Consider funding needs for transportation services.
Chapter 1. Introduction
As the population of the United States grows and ages, transportation options are becoming increasingly important to provide mobility for those who are unable to, or uncomfortable with, driving themselves. Persons with disabilities, the elderly, and those with low incomes can be particularly impacted by a lack of transportation options available to assist them, significantly impacting their mobility. This is especially true in the Texoma region, where accessing many basic services requires driving to a grocery store, office, or medical facility. Very few residents of the region can walk to these services due to distance and/or a lack of safe walkways, and many government, health, and medical services require a trip to an adjacent county or major metro area. Unfortunately, many of the clients who need transportation to access these services are unable to do so due to the lack of a vehicle, an inability to drive themselves, a lack of funds to be able to pay for transportation at market rates, or a lack of knowledge of available services.

The purpose of regionally coordinated transportation planning is to improve transportation services for everyone who uses it in the region—including, but not limited to, people with disabilities, seniors, and individuals with lower incomes. In addition, funding reductions have caused many people to take a renewed interest in the benefits that transportation coordination offers.

The 2017–2021 Regional Coordinated Transportation Plan outlined in this document is a step in creating a reliable, cost-effective, efficient transportation network in the Texoma region that utilizes the existing transportation resources throughout the region and outlines strategies for the future. The purpose of this plan is to provide a five-year, public transit-human services transportation plan for the Texoma region to help ensure a network of transportation services to effectively and efficiently get people to where they need to go.

The organization of Chapter 1 is as follows:

- History of regional coordination planning in Texas.
- The Texoma region.
- Citizen engagement for the five-year plan update.
- Plan structure and recommended use.

History of Regional Coordination Planning in Texas
The 2006 Regional Public Transportation Coordination Plan for the Coastal Bend responded to requirements of House Bill 3588 by the 78th Texas Legislature (2003), which required regional coordination of service planning to fill service gaps and eliminate overlaps in public transportation services. House Bill 3588 added Chapter 461 to the Texas Transportation Code, which requires the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) to accomplish the following:
• Identify overlaps and gaps in the provision of public transportation services, including services that could be more effectively provided by existing, privately funded transportation resources.
• Identify underused equipment owned by public transportation providers.
• Identify inefficiencies in the provision of public transportation services by any public transportation provider.
• Encourage public transportation providers to agree on the allocation of specific services and service areas among the providers.

In response to House Bill 3588, TxDOT required each region in the state to develop a coordinated plan for public transportation and human services transportation. TxDOT defined regions by the boundaries of the 24 councils of governments (COG) in Texas. Each region established a lead agency and designated a steering committee to guide regional coordination to improve public transportation in the region by enhancing service delivery, customer satisfaction, efficiency and effectiveness, and integration of systems-based and client-based approaches to transportation.

Regional public transportation coordination is also consistent with federal requirements. The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST) authorizes federal transportation programs for highways, highway safety, and public transportation. FAST requires a plan for regional coordination of public transportation and human services transportation as a precedent for a region to be eligible for several federal funding programs for public transportation.

**The Texoma Region**
Located in northeast Texas, the Texoma planning region consists of three counties: Cooke, Fannin, and Grayson, shown in Figure 1.
Figure 1. The Texoma Region—Cooke, Grayson, and Fannin Counties.

The Texoma region covers 2,698 square miles and in 2014 had an estimated population of 194,308 according to the 2014 U.S. Census Bureau. The Red River and state of Oklahoma form the northern boundary of the region. Adjacent counties are Montague (west), Wise (southwest), Denton (south), Collin (south), Hunt (south), Delta (southeast), and Lamar (east). The primary corridors in the region are as follows:

- Interstate 35/US 77 (Cooke).
- US 69 (Fannin, Grayson).
- US 75 (Grayson).
- US 82 (Cooke, Fannin, Grayson).
- US 377 (Grayson).
- SH 289 (Grayson).

Population and Demographics
Located in Grayson County, Sherman is the largest city in the region. Sherman has an estimated population of 38,500 and is one of the two principal cities in the Sherman-Denison metropolitan statistical area.

Table 1 shows the population change by county, from 2010 to 2014. Grayson County has a significantly larger population that Cooke or Fannin counties, but each of the counties had less than 1 percent growth from 2010 to 2014.
An analysis of population and demographic information from the Texoma region revealed that the population density, the number of people living below poverty level, and the number of people with limited English proficiency in the region are less than the state average. The analysis also revealed that the number of people age 65 and older, the number of people with disabilities, and the number of veterans in the Texoma region is higher than the state average. Table 2 compares the population and demographic characteristics of the Texoma planning region to the overall figures in the state of Texas.

### Table 1. Texoma Planning Region Population by County Comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooke County</td>
<td>38,437</td>
<td>38,558</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannin County</td>
<td>33,915</td>
<td>33,775</td>
<td>−140</td>
<td>−0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson County</td>
<td>120,877</td>
<td>121,975</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texoma Region</td>
<td>193,229</td>
<td>194,308</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>24,311,891</td>
<td>26,092,033</td>
<td>1,780,142</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Population and Demographic Characteristics of the Texoma Planning Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Cooke County, Texas</th>
<th>Fannin County, Texas</th>
<th>Grayson County, Texas</th>
<th>Texoma Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>26,092,033</td>
<td>38,558</td>
<td>33,775</td>
<td>121,975</td>
<td>194,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density (per Sq. Mile)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>130.8</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (Land)</td>
<td>261,231.70</td>
<td>874.76</td>
<td>890.84</td>
<td>932.80</td>
<td>2,698.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (0–19)</td>
<td>7,745,722</td>
<td>10,456</td>
<td>8,139</td>
<td>32,564</td>
<td>51,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and Over</td>
<td>2,849,757</td>
<td>6,348</td>
<td>6,007</td>
<td>19,845</td>
<td>32,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11,562,453</td>
<td>29,951</td>
<td>27,034</td>
<td>94,674</td>
<td>151,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>3,015,767</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>10,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1,053,474</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>1,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>9,962,643</td>
<td>6,319</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>14,560</td>
<td>24,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>497,696</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>4,562</td>
<td>6,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Population Age 25+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than High School</td>
<td>3,025,336</td>
<td>3,827</td>
<td>4,271</td>
<td>10,844</td>
<td>18,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate (Includes Equivalency)</td>
<td>4,145,289</td>
<td>8,012</td>
<td>8,179</td>
<td>25,524</td>
<td>41,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>4,806,501</td>
<td>8,535</td>
<td>7,448</td>
<td>28,742</td>
<td>44,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>2,948,330</td>
<td>3,829</td>
<td>2,416</td>
<td>10,821</td>
<td>17,066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Population and Demographic Characteristics of the Texoma Planning Region, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Median Household Income*</th>
<th>Per Capita Income*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>1,079,436</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>$52,576</td>
<td>$26,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional School Degree</td>
<td>249,356</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>$51,222</td>
<td>$25,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>172,482</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>$44,432</td>
<td>$20,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate, Age 16+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>11,809,010</td>
<td>18,017</td>
<td>13,197</td>
<td>53,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>982,580</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>5,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$52,576</td>
<td>$26,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$51,222</td>
<td>$25,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Poverty</td>
<td>4,500,034</td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>5,479</td>
<td>18,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At or above Poverty Level</td>
<td>20,978,942</td>
<td>32,364</td>
<td>25,464</td>
<td>100,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting to Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers, Age 16+</td>
<td>11,685,902</td>
<td>17,415</td>
<td>12,890</td>
<td>52,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, Truck, or Van</td>
<td>10,632,358</td>
<td>16,383</td>
<td>11,877</td>
<td>47,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drove Alone</td>
<td>9,351,857</td>
<td>13,617</td>
<td>10,392</td>
<td>41,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpoled</td>
<td>1,280,501</td>
<td>2,766</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>6,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation (Includes Taxicab)</td>
<td>188,330</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>25,520</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>31,871</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>188,810</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Means</td>
<td>144,719</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at Home</td>
<td>474,294</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>2,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Population Age 18+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>1,564,501</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>3,443</td>
<td>10,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>17,439,946</td>
<td>26,130</td>
<td>23,056</td>
<td>82,639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2014 inflation adjusted dollars.

Additional demographic and population characteristics of the Texoma region can be found in Appendix A.

Public Transportation

There is one public transportation provider in the Texoma region, the Texoma Area Paratransit System (TAPS), operating in partnership with Transdev. TAPS operates in the three-county Texoma planning region, as well as in Clay, Montague, and Wise Counties.

TAPS has six funding categories in which to apply for projects. Each year, Congress appropriates funds for each program and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) awards grants to eligible recipients to meet the goals of that program. The funding sections are as follows:

- FTA Section 5307—Mass transit apportionment to urbanized areas based on population and operating performance.
• FTA Section 5309—Mass transit discretionary funds for capital projects only.
• FTA Section 5310—Federal funds to private nonprofit entities for the transportation of elderly and/or disabled persons. Grants are for capital equipment only.
• FTA Section 5311—Rural Transit Program.

Citizen Engagement
This coordination plan update is based on several steps that result in an understanding of opportunities, needs, and strategies for human service and public transportation coordination. The stakeholder committee, made up of representatives of essential stakeholders and priority populations in the Texoma region, worked together to assess options and to identify specific coordination strategies for implementation. The methodology to develop this plan is centered on the following concepts:

• Conducting stakeholder involvement and public outreach.
• Preparing a demographic profile.
• Documenting existing transportation conditions.
• Conducting a needs assessment.
• Identifying and prioritizing strategies to address the unmet needs.

The stakeholder committee participated in the development, review, and approval of the transportation resources’ inventory in the region, the comprehensive needs assessment on unmet transportation needs in the region, the analysis of gaps in transportation services, and the final 2017–2021 Regional Coordinated Transportation Plan. Stakeholders developed and approved the region’s new vision and mission statements in January 2017:

• Vision: All citizens in the Texoma region will have access to safe, affordable, and reliable transportation.
• Mission: To better lives through access to transportation.

Priority Populations
For the purposes of developing and approving all deliverables, essential stakeholders and priority populations include the following groups:

• Representatives of public, private and nonprofit transportation providers, including recipients of:
  o Section 5307 funds (small urban transportation providers).
  o Section 5311 funds (rural transportation providers).
  o Section 5310 funds (enhanced mobility of seniors and individuals with disabilities).
• Representatives of metropolitan planning organizations.
• Representatives of human services providers.
• Representatives of workforce development agencies.
• Individuals or advocate organizations representing:
  o Individuals with disabilities.
  o Individuals 65 and older.
  o Individuals with low incomes.
  o Veterans.
  o Children.
  o Individuals who rely on public transportation to and from employment.
• Other members of the public.

**Stakeholder Workshops**
The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) facilitated six stakeholder workshops in the Texoma planning region in October 2016, focusing on the unmet transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, individuals age 65+, and other priority populations in the Texoma planning region. Three of the workshops focused on the unmet transportation needs and gaps in transportation services for individuals age 65 and older, two meetings focused on the unmet transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, and one meeting addressed the unmet transportation needs of the general public.

Workshops were held on the following dates:

• Tuesday, October 18, 2016:
  o 9:00–11:00 a.m.
    - Focus on Individuals Age 65+.
    - Texoma Council of Governments.
  o 3:00–5:00 p.m.
    - Focus on Individuals with Disabilities.
    - Texoma Council of Governments.
• Wednesday, October 19, 2016:
  o 10:00–12:00 p.m.
    - Focus on Individuals Age 65+.
    - Bonham TEAM Center.
  o 1:30–3:30 p.m.
    - Focus on Individuals with Disabilities.
    - Bonham TEAM Center.
  o 7:00–9:00 p.m.
    - Focus on General Public.
    - Austin College.
• Thursday, October 20, 2016:
  o 9:00–11:00 a.m.
    - Focus on Individuals Age 65+.
    - Pecan Creek Village.
Participants were asked to identify their unmet transportation needs (or those of their clients), gaps and overlaps in transportation services in the region, and their ideas for viable solutions to meet their unmet needs or to close the gaps in service. The most common unmet needs were the ability to get to/from medical appointments, as well as daily-life activities such as trips to the grocery store, the pharmacy, and to social activities.

Many viable solutions to meet these unmet transportation needs were discussed, including increased agency coordination and shared resources, creating a collaborative grant writing team to identify additional funding sources, and improving existing public transportation services in general.

TTI also had the opportunity to speak at the Grayson County Social Services Association meeting on October 19, 2016, and meet with clients at the Texoma Community Center Adult Day Habilitation Center (800 South Mirick Avenue, Denison, TX 75020) on October 27, 2016, to gain additional insight into unmet transportation needs in the region from social service agency leaders, their clients, and individuals with disabilities.

Mail-Out Survey
The research team mailed 3,000 surveys to Texoma region residents on October 11, 2016, and received 155 responses (response rate ~5 percent) as of November 18, 2016. The results of the survey revealed that the most prominent reasons for transit to exist in the Texoma region are as a travel option for seniors and persons with a disability, as an option for people who cannot afford to drive or who choose not to drive, and as a travel mode to assist individuals in reducing their energy consumption and protecting air quality. Many suggested that the most important problem affecting transportation in the Texoma region is a lack of adequate sidewalks or bike routes. The majority of all respondents agreed that it is important to continue transit service in the region; current transit riders unanimously agree it is important to continue service. One-third of current and former transit riders indicated that there are times they could not get to where they needed to go; one in 10 current riders rely on transit to access employment, and several respondents noted that inter-town travel was difficult.

Plan Structure and Recommended Use
The 2017–2021 Regional Coordinated Transportation Plan for the Texoma region begins with background information, provides detailed analysis of transportation resources and needs, identifies parallel planning processes, identifies methods for sustaining implementation, and concludes with an ongoing performance measurement.

The plan is relevant to typical transportation stakeholders, non-transportation focused stakeholders, and individual residents of the Texoma region.

- **Typical transportation stakeholders** include operators and advocates/organizations concerned about how to improve mobility for residents in the region. The plan provides
goals and objectives on which stakeholders may focus to ensure that gaps are filled and needs of all key populations are met or improved.

- **Non-transportation focused stakeholders** for public transportation may include organizations like large employers, healthcare facilities, and service agencies. The plan highlights the diverse characteristics of transit riders and a wide variety of services. Stakeholders can identify common ground in vision and mission; potential partnerships and mutual efficiencies may be possible.

- **Individual residents** of the Texoma region may study the plan to learn about current services available to them and how stakeholders are seeking to meet more of their own and other residents’ needs.

While primarily a planning policy document, this coordination plan will be used to identify opportunities to coordinate existing transportation resources, as an implementation tool, and as a framework for the prioritization and selection of projects to utilize federal funding assistance to guide funds that are acquired in the future. Coordinated transportation planning will reduce duplication of effort in the region, enhance services, and encourage cost-effective transportation for everyone in the region.

The plan also provides an opportunity for a diverse range of stakeholders with a common interest in human service and public transportation to convene and collaborate on how best to provide transportation services for these targeted populations. Specifically, the stakeholders are called upon to identify service gaps and/or barriers, identify the solutions most appropriate to meet these needs based on local circumstances, and prioritize these solutions for inclusion in the plan.
Chapter 2. Integrated Planning Process
This chapter provides an overview of the parallel planning processes occurring in the region and state. Together, the planning efforts from various municipal and regional entities provide a structure to build from and contain overlapping goals and objectives. Participation from stakeholders and reviewing current planning efforts assures a cooperative vision during the regional coordination process.

Chapter 2 is organized as follows:

- An overview of state-level planning.
- An overview of regional planning.
- Common goals and strategies.

State-Level Planning
There are several planning processes described in this section occurring at the state level:

- Texas Transportation Plan 2040.
- Transportation Works: The Blueprint for Connectivity.

Texas Transportation Plan 2040
The Texas Transportation Commission adopted the Texas Transportation Plan 2040 (TTP) on February 26, 2015. The TTP is the statewide long-range transportation planning document and follows a 25-year horizon. The plan provides an infrastructure inventory and identifies state needs for roadways, transit, freight and passenger rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, airports, waterways, pipelines, ports, and intelligent transportation systems. The TTP goals include the following:

- Safety—Improve multimodal transportation safety.
- Asset Management—Maintain and preserve multimodal assets using cost-beneficial treatments.
- Mobility and Reliability—Reduce congestion and improve system efficiency and performance.
- Multimodal Connectivity—Provide transportation choices and improve system connectivity for all passenger and freight modes.
- Stewardship—Manage resources responsibly and be accountable and transparent in decision making.
- Customer Service—Understand and incorporate customer desires in decision processes and be open and forthright in all agency communications.
- Sustainable Funding—Identify and sustain funding sources for all modes.1
Transportation Works: The Blueprint for Connectivity
The Texas State Center for Independent Living sponsored a report assessing the current state of transportation in Texas for persons with disabilities. The report set out a number of recommendations to improve transportation accessibility. The recommendations include leveraging resources from federal, state and other sources such as private-public partnerships; improving public rights-of-way to be more accessible and compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards; increasing awareness for individuals with disabilities; increased feedback to the transportation provider regarding any improvements or suggestions; and increasing outreach from transit agencies to work more closely with consumers and advocacy groups.

State Plan for Independent Living Fiscal Year (FY) 2017–2019
The State Plan for Independent Living went into effect on October 1, 2016, and addresses the goals, objectives, and activities for independent living centers throughout Texas. The three main goals include the following:

- “Advocacy: Texans with disabilities receive necessary supports and services to become more independent.
- Network Capacity and Sustainability: The Independent Living Network Operates effectively, is adequately funded, and has the capacity to expand.
- Community Integration: Individuals with disabilities receive the community integration and community-based living supports needed to be more independent.”

The plan addresses a number of objectives and activities related to these goals and includes a list of measurable indicators and performance targets for each fiscal year. The plan also includes financial forecasts through FY 2019.

Health and Human Services System—Strategic Plan 2015–2019
The State of Texas completed a Health and Human Services System Strategic Plan for 2015 through 2019. The Health and Human Services System comprises five state agencies: the Health and Human Services Commission, Department of Aging and Disability Services, Department of Assistive and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Family and Protective Services, and Department of State Health Services. This plan includes the individual plans for the five outlined agencies. The strategic plan is unified by goals and objectives outlined by the Office of the Governor.

Regional Planning
Several agencies within the Texoma region participate in regional planning efforts, described in this section:

- Texoma Council of Governments.
- Grayson County.
Sherman-Denison Metropolitan Planning Organization.
City of Sherman.
City of Denison.
Cooke County.
City of Gainesville.
Fannin County.

**Texoma Council of Governments (TCOG)**
TCOG is a voluntary association of local governments in Cooke, Fannin, and Grayson Counties that works directly with citizens and local jurisdictions to improve and advance economic vitality and quality of life in Texoma. TCOG has several planning documents that are discussed in the following sections.

**TCOG Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy—2013**
TCOG serves as the Economic Development District for Cooke, Fannin, and Grayson Counties, which comprise the Texoma region. The Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy is part of a local planning and implementation process designed to create jobs, foster more stable and diversified economies, improve living conditions, and provide a mechanism for guiding and coordinating the efforts of persons and organizations concerned with economic development.

**Regional Coordinated Transportation Plan—December 2011**
The 2011-2016 Regional Coordinated Transportation Plan provides a listing of transportation providers that currently offer service to the elderly, disabled, unemployed, low-income individuals, and children, as well as a listing of potential service providers that were not identified in the previous plan. TAPS is the sole service provider in the Texoma region for public transit, Medicaid, JARC (5316), New Freedom (5317), Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities (5310), Urban Formula (5307), and Non-Urbanized formula (5311) programs.

**Texoma Regional Consortium Plan—2007**
In 2007, The Texoma Workforce Development Board and the Southern Oklahoma Workforce Board joined forces to create the Texoma Regional Consortium (TRC) to define a common vision for the region’s future prosperity. The TRC Regional Consortium Plan frames key issues to support the development of a regional economic growth strategy by analyzing transportation assets in the region.

**Senior Source Book**
TCOG’s Area Agency on Aging (AAA) publishes the *Texoma Senior Sourcebook*, a directory of important services, programs, resources, and opportunities available to seniors, family caregivers, and persons with disabilities throughout the Texoma region. This is also a resource for health care and social service professionals.
Sherman-Denison Metropolitan Planning Organization

The Sherman-Denison Metropolitan Planning Organization (SDMPO) coordinates transportation planning within the 20-year urban boundary with the State of Texas, Grayson County, and the Cities of Denison, Dorchester, Gunter, Howe, Knollwood, Pottsboro, Sherman, Southmayd, and Van Alstyne. The planning area includes the portions of the region that are currently urbanized and are likely to be urbanized within the next 20 years, as well as non-urban areas that are logical extensions based on intercommunity travel patterns.

The primary goal of the SDMPO is to create an integrated, multimodal transportation network to better serve the citizens in the Sherman-Denison-Van Alstyne-Howe-Gunter-Pottsboro Metropolitan Area.

There are three primary products produced by the planning processes at the SDMPO:

- Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).
- Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

These three documents are interrelated, with each of the resulting products being a critical component of the other two products. The development of all three products is conducted in accordance with the SDMPO’s adopted Public Involvement Plan and approved by the SDMPO’s governing body, the Transportation Policy Board.

2040 MTP

Every four to five years, the SDMPO is required by federal law to update its MTP. The MTP provides the plan for the region’s transportation needs. Using $19.7 million in capital and operating funding over a 10-year period, the SDMPO has proposed eight projects in the 2040 MTP:

- 0729-01-039: FM 121 from Jim Jones Rd to FM 3356: Widen non-freeway.
- 0729-01-040: FM 121 from 3.03 mi east of SH 289 to 1.70 mi west of FM 3356: Improve alignment.
- 0047-03-067: US 75 at Post Oak Creek (SB): Replace bridge and approaches.
- 0047-03-068: US 75 at Post Oak Creek (NB): Replace bridge and approaches.
- 0202-08-054: FM 131 from Lamberth St to Taylor St: Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane.
- 0202-08-056: FM 131 from US 82 to Lamberth St: Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane.
- 0047-18-069: US 75 from Loy Lake Rd to FM 691: Build new ramps.

2017–2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

The TIP for the Sherman-Denison metropolitan area provides a priority list of projects to be carried out within a four-year period after the adoption of the TIP. The TIP implements the
projects and programs of the MTP. Priority projects over the next four years include the following:

- **0045-04-066**: Near US 75 and SH 11: Construct Shared Use Path and Streetscape.
- **0729-01-039**: FM 121 from Jim Jones Rd to FM 3356: Widen non-freeway.
- **2455-01-031**: FM 1417 from US 82 to Taylor St: Widen Non-Freeway.
- **0047-03-084**: Near FM 121: Construct Shared Use Path.
- **0901-19-187**: At Access Rd: Construct new FM 2-lane highway from Grayson County Line to FM 121.
- **0202-08-054**: FM 131 from Lamberth St to Taylor St: Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane.
- **0202-08-059**: FM 131 at US 82: Reconstruct Interchange.
- **0202-08-056**: FM 131 from US 82 to Lamberth St: Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane.

Unified Planning Work Program, FY 2016–2017

The UPWP outlines the tasks necessary for the development of the MTP and the TIP. The UPWP for the SDMPO is a two-year planning budget that outlines those planning activities to be undertaken by the MPO that are funded by federal, state, and local sources for the period of October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2017. Activities documented include administration/management, data development and maintenance, short-range planning, long-range planning, and special studies/efforts.

Sherman-Denison Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan—2014

The SDMPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan is focused within the core cities of Sherman and Denison and considers non-motorized alternative transportation connections throughout and between the two. As part of the plan, a potential intercity greenway trail was detailed connecting Denison with Sherman. This trail would be a central north/south route paralleling the Texoma Parkway and an active BNSF line just east of the highway. This line appears on an inventory map in a June 2013 TTI report on rural rail transportation districts (RRTD). The rail line is listed as inactive, and the report says the North Central RRTD was formed (but remains inactive) to address potential abandonment of a rail line owned by Union Pacific.

Public Participation Plan-2017

SDMPO has created a Public Participation Plan to ensure that every Sherman-Denison study area resident is given the opportunity to participate in the development of transportation policies, programs, and projects being proposed within the study area. TAPS relies on the public participation process of the SDMPO in order to satisfy grantor requirements under various programs, including but not limited to Section 5307.

Grayson County

Grayson County Thoroughfare Plan

The Grayson County Thoroughfare Plan focuses on the roadway system character throughout the entirety of Grayson County for the next 25 years. Presently, the thoroughfare plan depicts a
proposed tollway from FM 121 west of Gunter, Texas, to US 75 near Denison. This proposed alignment would extend the proposed tollway 33 miles and provide traffic relief to US 75. Presently, it is noted that FM 121 through southern Grayson County is slated in the TxDOT TIP to receive improvements that provide for a smoother alignment in order to improve throughput. The thoroughfare plan proposes two Grayson County tollway alignment alternatives for consideration going forward.

City of Sherman
The City of Sherman has three existing planning documents discussed in this section:

- 2040 Thoroughfare Plan.
- 2009 Comprehensive Plan.

Sherman 2040 Thoroughfare Plan—2015
The Sherman Thoroughfare Plan identifies key transportation issues and makes recommendations to improve mobility in the area and accommodate anticipated growth. It serves as the City of Sherman’s long-range plan to preserve future corridors for transportation system development as the need arises.

City of Sherman Capital Improvement Plan 2014–2019
The Capital Improvement Plan lists all intended infrastructure investments in utilities, streets, and buildings in the city limits of Sherman. Proposed transportation projects for FY 2017–2018 include the following:

- Loy Lake Road Construction (US Hwy 282 to Pecan Grove Rd.)—$700,000.
- Archer Drive Detention Pond Property Acquisition—$1,059,500.
- Bridge Erosion Repair (Hillcrest St. and N. Woods St.)—$64,000.
- Fallon Drive Construction—Preliminary Engineering and ROW—$200,000.
- Rex Cruse Drive Rebuild—Preliminary Engineering and ROW—$260,000.

City of Sherman Comprehensive Plan—2009
The comprehensive plan establishes overall policy for future land use, roads, utilities, and other aspects of community growth and enhancement. Transportation goals in the plan and potential projects include the following:

- GOAL 4.1: Coordinate with railroad companies to install pavement markings, signage, and railroad crossing arms at all road intersections with the railroad.
- GOAL 4.2: Install pedestrian improvements for intersections at Lamar/Travis, Lamar/Crockett, Houston/Crockett, Travis/Brockett, and Travis/Mulberry.
- GOAL 4.3: Reconstruct US 75 to upgrade various on and off ramps to contemporary design standards that improve traffic flow and safety.
• GOAL 4.4: Establish transit service options to Blalock Industrial Park and Grayson Community College given their relatively remote locations.

City of Denison
The city of Denison has three existing planning documents discussed in this section:

• 2015 Capital Improvement Program.
• 2013 Streetscape Improvements.
• 2002 Comprehensive Plan.

City of Denison Capital Improvement Program (CIP)—2015
The City of Denison 2015 CIP details planned construction of various city improvements:

• Rice Street Widening Project—$57,000.
• Flora Curb and Gutter Improvements—$110,000.

City of Denison Streetscape Improvements—2013
The Downtown Denison Streetscape Master Plan addresses the overall character of the city streetscape, public participation, and existing conditions. The streetscape master plan recommends a project which would redesign six blocks along downtown Main Street with pedestrian and safety improvements.

City of Denison Comprehensive Plan—2002
The comprehensive plan formulates goals, objectives, and recommendations pertaining to various aspects of the city of Denison. An updated plan is being developed as of 2017.

Cooke County
Cooke County Thoroughfare Plan—2016
To support long-range transportation improvements, Cooke County developed a thoroughfare plan as a guide for projected transportation and right-of-way needs. Cooke County plans to construct the Cooke County Loop, which will be a 40-mile loop located in central Cooke County around Gainesville. The eastern segment of the loop between FM 2896 and Spring Creek Road will be a 2-to-4 lane principal arterial within 120 feet of right-of-way. The western segment will run from FM 1202 to Spring Creek Road. CR 181, CR 2121, FM 3108, Spring Creek Road, New Street C, New Street D, and CR 208 will be linked to create the Cooke County Loop.

City of Gainesville
Gainesville Capital Improvement Plan—2013-2018
This five-year CIP uses the Gainesville master plans to establish a realistic financing mechanism. The CIP details steps involved in producing the CIP, which entails coordination and outreach between department heads, advisory boards, city council, and budget development activities.
**Fannin County**

**Fannin County’s Comprehensive Plan for the Lower Bois d’Arc Creek Reservoir**

Fannin County is presently planning to develop a reservoir centered on the Lower Bois d’Arc Reservoir (LBCR). This is a coordinated effort between the Fannin County Water Supply Agency and the North Texas Municipal Water District that enables Fannin County the authority to zone the area within 5,000 feet of where the shoreline of the reservoir will be. Three major highways run at a close proximity to the LBCR and play a key role in providing current and future mobility to the reservoir: SH 78, SH 56, and US 82. Of these three, US 82 will be a key to the growth and development of LBCR’s surrounding area. The county should ensure that it is aware of and greatly involved in any discussions or decisions related to US 82.

There are eight primary roadways with 120 feet of right-of-way shown on the Transportation Plan Map, which include the following:

- US 82.
- E. Sam Rayburn Drive.
- FM 897.
- FM 100.
- FM 409.
- FM 2029.
- FM 1396.
- SH 78.

These roadways are expected to be the main routes that travelers will use to access the different areas of the lake. These roads create a large loop around the lake, with one roadway, FM 897, bisecting the lake from north to south. Trails can be implemented on the shoulders of the roadways at a future date when trail connectivity exists. Planning for trails is currently based on whether specific census criteria are attained in the region.

**Common Goals and Strategies**

The statewide and regional plans contain several common goals and strategies, which include the following:

- Identifying cost-effective strategies to enhance public transportation.
- Improving coordination among providers in the region.
- Enhancing mobility for rural residents, seniors, and individuals with disabilities.
Chapter 3. Transportation Resources in the Region

This chapter provides an inventory of transportation providers in the Texoma region, including those offering public fixed-route and demand-responsive services and those offering services through private, nonprofit, and community- and client-based organizations; health and human services agencies; workforce agencies; and all agencies responsible for transportation planning in the region.

Chapter 3 is organized as follows:

- Overview of public sector funding, including historical trends in federal transit funding, federal funding programs, TxDOT, and the Texas Transit Funding Formula.
- Inventory of transportation providers in the Texoma region.
- Inventory of transportation planning agencies in the Texoma region.
- Observations and conclusions.

Overview of Public Sector Funding

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of how federal and state funds for public transportation are made available to providers in the Coastal Bend region.

Historical Trends in Federal Transit Funding

Federal funding for transportation comes primarily through the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) and is administered by agencies according to mode of transportation. The agency responsible for transit funding is the FTA. The Federal Highway Administration also administers funding programs that can benefit transit.

Chapter 53 of Title 49 of the U.S. Code (USC) establishes the authority for FTA.23 Congress authorizes money to FTA in long- and short-term transportation legislation. The most recent legislation is the FAST Act in 2015. Each federal transportation bill amends Chapter 53 to modify or set up funding programs and laws for FTA to follow. The FTA provides financial and technical assistance to local public transportation systems, including buses, subways, light rail, commuter rail, trolleys, and ferries. FTA also oversees safety measures and helps develop next-generation technology research.

The umbrella legislation known as the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 established many of the current major USDOT funding programs. ISTEA authorized funding levels and programs for transit and highway projects and institutionalized the ability to shift funds from one program to another depending upon local priorities. ISTEA expired at the end of fiscal 1997 and was replaced by new legislation. The Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century (TEA-21) maintained the previously established programs, while generally raising the overall funding levels. TEA-21 was in effect for a six-year period, with specific spending levels established each year as part of the federal budgeting process.
In August 2005, President George W. Bush signed into law the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficiency Transportation Equity Act—A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) to fund federal surface transportation programs through fiscal 2009. The legislation authorized $286.4 billion in funding over six years (2004 through 2009), including $52.6 billion (18.6 percent) for federal transit programs. The funding authorization for transit under SAFETEA-LU represents a 46 percent increase over transit funding guaranteed in the previous TEA-21 authorization bill and more than double the funding provided in ISTEA. The original SAFETEA-LU legislation was a six-year bill, but Congress extended the authorization bill three additional years through 2012.

On July 6, 2012, President Barack Obama signed Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), reauthorizing surface transportation programs through fiscal year 2014. Each reauthorization amends the federal transit laws codified in 49 USC Chapter 53. MAP-21 took effect on October 1, 2012. When another transportation authorization had not been passed in time for fiscal year 2015, Congress extended MAP-21 for an additional (third) year.

On December 4, 2015, President Obama signed the FAST Act, reauthorizing surface transportation programs for five years through fiscal year 2020. The FAST Act applies new program rules to all fiscal year 2016 funds. Figure 2 illustrates federal funding for transit from 1992 to 2016 by federal authorization act.

![Figure 2. Annual FTA Apportionments by Federal Authorization Bill.](image)
FAST Act Federal Funding Programs
FTA provides annual formula grants to transit agencies nationwide as well as discretionary funding in competitive processes. Generally, FTA funds are available to designated recipients that must be public bodies (e.g., states, cities, towns, regional governments, transit authorities, etc.) with the legal authority to receive and dispense federal funds. The recipients of these grants are responsible for managing their projects in accordance with federal requirements.

Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program
The Urbanized Area Formula Funding program (49 USC 5307) makes federal resources available to urbanized areas and to governors for transit capital and operating assistance in urbanized areas and for transportation-related planning. An urbanized area is an incorporated area with a population of 50,000 or more that is designated as such by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Eligible Recipients.
Funding is made available to designated recipients that are public bodies with the legal authority to receive and dispense federal funds. Governors, responsible local officials, and publicly owned operators of transit services shall designate a recipient to apply for, receive, and dispense funds for urbanized areas. The governor or governor’s designee acts as the designated recipient for urbanized areas between 50,000 and 200,000.

For urbanized areas with 200,000 in population and over, funds are apportioned and flow directly to a designated local recipient selected to apply for and receive federal funds. For urbanized areas under 200,000 in population, the funds are apportioned to the governor of each state for distribution.

Eligible Activities.
Eligible activities include (a) planning, engineering, design, and evaluation of transit projects and other technical transportation-related studies; (b) capital investments in bus and bus-related activities such as replacement, overhaul, and rebuilding of buses, crime prevention and security equipment, and construction of maintenance and passenger facilities; and (c) capital investments in new and existing fixed guideway systems, including rolling stock, overhaul and rebuilding of vehicles, track, signals, communications, and computer hardware and software. In addition, associated transit improvements and certain expenses associated with mobility management programs are eligible under the program. All preventive maintenance and some ADA complementary paratransit service costs are considered capital costs.

For urbanized areas with populations less than 200,000, operating assistance is an eligible expense. Urbanized areas of 200,000 or more may not use funds for operating assistance unless identified by FTA as eligible under a special rule.

Allocation of Funding.
Funding is apportioned based on legislative formulas. For areas of 50,000 to 199,999 in population, the formula is based on population and population density. For areas with populations of 200,000 and more, the formula is based on a combination of bus revenue vehicle miles, bus passenger miles, fixed guideway revenue vehicle miles, fixed guideway route miles, and population and population density.

The distribution or sub-allocation of Sections 5307 (and Section 5340) funds within an urbanized area is a local responsibility. In those urbanized areas with more than one grantee or designated recipient, FTA expects local officials, operating through the MPO and the designated recipient, to determine the sub-allocation together. The sub-allocation should be determined fairly and rationally through a process agreeable to recipients.

**Match Requirement.**
The federal share is not to exceed 80 percent of the net project cost for capital expenditures. The federal share may be 90 percent for the cost of vehicle-related equipment attributable to compliance with the ADA and the Clean Air Act. The federal share may not exceed 50 percent of the net project cost of operating assistance.

**Section 5311 Formula Grants for Rural Areas**
The Formula Grants for Rural Areas Program (49 U.S.C. 5311) provides capital, planning, and operating assistance to states to support public transportation in rural areas with populations of less than 50,000, where many residents often rely on public transit to reach their destinations. The program also provides funding for state and national training and technical assistance through the Rural Transportation Assistance Program.

**Eligible Recipients.**
Eligible recipients include states and federally recognized Indian Tribes. Subrecipients may include state or local government authorities, nonprofit organizations, and operators of public transportation or intercity bus service.

**Eligible Activities.**
Eligible activities include planning, capital, operating, job access and reverse commute projects, and the acquisition of public transportation services.

**Allocation of Funding.**
Funds are apportioned to states based on a formula that includes land area, population, revenue vehicle miles, and low-income individuals in rural areas.

**Match Requirement.**
The federal share is 80 percent for capital projects, 50 percent for operating assistance, and 80 percent for ADA non-fixed-route paratransit service.

**Technical Assistance Resources.**
Training and technical assistance is available through the National Rural Transit Assistance Program.

**Intercity Bus Program.**
Each state must spend no less than 15 percent of its annual apportionment for the development and support of intercity bus transportation, unless it can certify, after consultation with intercity bus service providers, that the intercity bus needs of the state are being adequately met. Rural transit agencies and intercity bus carriers may have opportunities to coordinate service and leverage funding through the Section 5311(f) Intercity Bus Program. Section 5311(f) Intercity Bus Program supports the connection between rural areas and larger regional or national systems of intercity bus service. The Section 5311(f) Intercity Bus Program goals include the following:

- Implement meaningful, scheduled transport connections between rural and urban areas with the national intercity transportation network.
- Support operating services to meet the intercity travel needs of residents in rural and small urban areas.
- Sustain the infrastructure of the state’s intercity bus network through capital investments in facilities, vehicles, equipment, planning, and marketing.

FTA encourages the participation of private companies that provide public transportation to the maximum extent feasible in this and other FTA programs. Among the various types of projects in which private intercity bus operators may wish to participate are improvements to existing intercity terminal facilities for rural passengers; modifications to transit facilities to facilitate shared use by intercity bus, intercity rail, and rural transit operators; operating assistance to support specific intercity route segments; and applications of intelligent transportation system technology for coordinated information and scheduling.

**Section 5310: Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities**
The Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program (49 U.S.C. 5310) provides formula funding to states for the purpose of assisting private, nonprofit groups in meeting the transportation needs of older adults and people with disabilities when the transportation service provided is unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate to meeting these needs.

Funds are apportioned based on each state’s share of the population for these two groups. Formula funds are apportioned to direct recipients; for rural and small urban areas, this is the state DOT, while in large urban areas, a designated recipient is chosen by the governor. Direct recipients have flexibility in how they select subrecipient projects for funding, but their decision process must be clearly noted in a state/program management plan. The selection process may be formula-based, competitive or discretionary, and subrecipients can include state or local government authorities, private nonprofit organizations, and/or operators of public transportation.
The program aims to improve mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities by removing barriers to transportation service and expanding transportation mobility options. This program supports transportation services planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special transportation needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities in all areas—large urbanized (over 200,000), small urbanized (50,000–200,000), and rural (under 50,000). Eligible projects include both traditional capital investment and nontraditional investment beyond the ADA complementary paratransit services.

Section 3006(b) of the FAST Act created a discretionary pilot program for innovative coordinated access and mobility—open to 5310 recipients—to assist in financing innovative projects for the transportation-disadvantaged that improve the coordination of transportation services and non-emergency medical transportation (NEMT) services, such as the deployment of coordination technology, projects that create or increase access to community, and One-Call/One-Click Centers.

**Eligible Recipients.**
States and designated recipients are direct recipients; eligible subrecipients include private nonprofit organizations, state or local government authorities, or operators of public transportation.

**Eligible Activities.**
Traditional Section 5310 project examples include the following:

- Buses and vans.
- Wheelchair lifts, ramps, and securement devices.
- Transit-related information technology systems, including scheduling/routing/one-call.
- Acquisition of transportation services under a contract, lease, or other arrangement.

Nontraditional Section 5310 project examples include the following:

- Travel training.
- Volunteer driver programs.
- Construction of an accessible path to a bus stop, including curb cuts, sidewalks, accessible pedestrian signals or other accessible features.
- Improvement of signage or way-finding technology.
- Incremental cost of providing same day service or door-to-door service.
- Purchase of vehicles to support new, accessible taxi, ride sharing, and/or vanpooling programs.
- Mobility management programs.

Under MAP-21, the program was modified to include projects eligible under the former Section 5317 New Freedom Program; the modifications were described as capital and operating expenses.
for new public transportation services and alternatives beyond those required by the ADA and were designed to assist individuals with disabilities and seniors.

**Funding Availability.**
Section 5310 funds are available to the states during the fiscal year of apportionment plus two additional years (total of three years).

**Allocation of Funding.**
Section 5310 funds are apportioned among the states by a formula that is based on the number of seniors and people with disabilities in each state according to the latest U.S. Census data.

**Match Requirement.**
The federal share may not exceed 80 percent of eligible capital costs or 50 percent for operating assistance. The 10 percent that is eligible to fund program administrative costs including administration, planning, and technical assistance may be funded at 100 percent federal share.

**Texas Department of Transportation**
TxDOT was created by the Texas Legislature in 1917 (then known as the Texas Highway Department). Headquartered in Austin, TxDOT is organized into various divisions to provide statewide support in 25 districts around the state that are defined by geography. One of the divisions is focused on public transportation.

TxDOT’s Public Transportation Division (PTN) focuses on collaborative work to provide a network of mobility options for people who use alternatives to driving alone. PTN distributes grant funds and ensures compliance with program requirements and promotes safety, coordination, partnerships, and best practices. PTN works with individuals and agencies around the state to facilitate mobility through the administration of state and federal grant programs, technical assistance, and support for regional public transportation coordination efforts.

PTN administers federal and state grant programs, including FTA grants. Grants are for specific purposes and have separate eligibility and funding requirements. PTN requests applications for specific grant funding sources through calls for projects.

PTN is the designated recipient for rural and small urban areas in Texas for the following funding programs:

- FTA Section 5311: Formula Grant for Rural Areas.
- FTA Section 5339: Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Program.
- FTA Section 5310: Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities.

PTN also manages and awards state funds for public transit. PTN collects and reports annual transit data to the FTA for the Rural National Transit Database. PTN provides the FTA with an annual State Management Plan for the state’s rural transit services. PTN represents public transit
in the planning and programming process and prepares funding needs’ projections for Texas rural transit districts.

**Texas Transit Funding Formula**

Authority for the Texas Transportation Commission to allocate state and federal funds is defined in the *Texas Transportation Code*’s Chapter 456, “State Financing of Public Transportation.” Eligible recipients for Texas state transit funds are rural and urban transit districts, as provided in the *Texas Transportation Code*’s Chapter 458, “Rural and Urban Transit Districts.” The administrative procedures for the allocation of funds are described in the *Texas Administrative Code*’s Title 43—“Transportation” (see “Part 1, Texas Department of Transportation,” Chapter 31—“Public Transportation”).

The Texas Legislature appropriates state funding levels each biennium. TxDOT allocates the funds according to the Texas transit funding formula, illustrated in Figure 3. The amount to which the funding formula applies is $57,482,135 per biennium, or less as appropriated by the legislature ($28,741,068 per fiscal year). State funding is split 65 percent to rural transit districts ($18,681,694) and 35 percent to state-funded urban transit districts ($10,059,373). Federal Section 5311 funds are distributed to rural transit districts using the same formula.


**Figure 3. Texas Transit Funding Formula.**
If the biennium appropriation exceeds $57,482,135, TxDOT has the discretionary authority to award the remaining funds to mitigate the impacts of the 2010 Census on the allocation of formula funds to urban and rural transit districts. This provision expires August 31, 2017.

Transportation Planning Agencies in the Texoma Region
This section outlines the agencies that participate in coordination of regional public transportation services in the Texoma region.

Grayson County Regional Mobility Authority
A regional mobility authority (RMA) is a political subdivision formed by one or more counties to finance, acquire, design, construct, operate, maintain, expand, or extend transportation projects. These projects may be tolled or non-tolled. The Grayson County RMA (GCRMA) primarily receives funding from Grayson County. GCRMA evaluates projects that will bring economic development, job growth, and increased quality of life to the residents of Grayson County through efficient mobility. GCRMA identifies and prioritizes long-term transportation needs, such as the connection of Grayson County transportation infrastructure to the North Dallas Tollway near Gunter and the North Texas Regional Airport. The GCRMA is located at:

100 W. Houston
Sherman, Texas 75090
(903) 813-4200

Sherman-Denison Metropolitan Planning Organization
The SDMPO serves as the MPO for Grayson County. The purpose of the SDMPO is to coordinate transportation planning within the 20-year urban boundary. This includes coordination with the State of Texas, Grayson County, and the Cities of Denison, Dorchester, Gunter, Howe, Knollwood, Pottsboro, Sherman, Southmayd, and Van Alstyne. The Transportation Policy Committee has five voting members, and in 2016, the MPO employed one full-time employee. The SDMPO is located at:

100 W. Houston, Room 22
Sherman, TX 75090
903-813-5275

Texoma Council of Governments
The TCOG is a voluntary association of the local governments in Cooke, Fannin, and Grayson Counties. TCOG promotes economy and efficiency in the coordinated planning and development of the Texoma region through community and economic development activities. TCOG provides housing, utility assistance, and weatherization services for low-income citizens in the region, assists the elderly and disabled through a variety of AAA programs, and facilitates emergency management planning in the region. TCOG also facilitates the delivery of grant funding for homeland security and criminal justice. TCOG has three locations in the Texoma area:
Transportation Providers in the Texoma Region

This section is an inventory of transportation providers within the Texoma region—including private facilities that provide services to members or clients, school districts, community-based organizations, medical transportation, and the public service provider. Table 4 is an alphabetical list of transportation providers in the region and notes the county in which service is provided, the type of provider, the service mode, and the rider profile.

**Table 4. Texoma Region Transportation Providers, 2016.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Type of Agency</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Rider Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Hill</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bells Independent School District</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Fixed route</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonham ISD</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Fixed route</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd Baptist Church</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callisburg ISD</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Fixed route</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gainesville Courtesy Car</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Cosper Veteran’s Home</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>Elderly/ADA/veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinsville Independent School District</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Fixed route</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denison Independent School District</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Fixed route</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodd City Independent School District</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Fixed route</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ector ISD</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Fixed route</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Era Independent School District</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Fixed route</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannin County Children’s Center</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>Children, families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannindel Independent School District</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Fixed route</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Baptist Church, Denison</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Baptist Church, Howe</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Methodist, Sherman</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First United Methodist Church, Bonham</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends in Action—AAA (TCOG)</td>
<td>Tri-county</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Personal vehicle</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville Independent School District</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Fixed route</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson College</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>Personal vehicle</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyhound</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Long distance/motorcoach</td>
<td>General public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5. Texoma Region Transportation Providers, 2016, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Type of Agency</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Rider Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heartland Flyer (Amtrak)</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Fixed route/rail</td>
<td>General public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest Church of Christ, Gainesville</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry Van Lines</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>ADA, general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist Church, Howe</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist Church, Van Alstyne</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist Church, Whitewright</td>
<td>Fannin, Grayson</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside Church of Christ, Bonham</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtime Transportation</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>NEMT</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>Medicaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeway Transportation</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>Casino patrons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Rayburn ISD</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Fixed route</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sellers Tours Calvary Baptist Church, Denison</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman Independent School District</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Fixed route</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood Shores Chapel</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Catholic Church, Gainesville</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCB Cab Company</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>General public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Baptist Church, Gainesville</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texoma Area Paratransit Service (TAPS)</td>
<td>Tri-county</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>General public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texoma Community Center</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Renaissance Assisted Living</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Willows</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Woodmoore Assisted Living</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Baptist Church</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Baptist Church, Bonham</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Lighthouse Church</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Shuttle from Sam Rayburn Memorial Veteran Center to Dallas VA Medical Center</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Fixed route</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waples Methodist Church</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whaley Methodist Church</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Demand Response</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Village</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Cab</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td>General public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Transportation

There is one public transportation provider in the Texoma region, the Texoma Area Paratransit System (TAPS), operating demand responsive transportation in partnership with Transdev. TAPS operates in the three-county Texoma planning region, as well as in Clay, Montague, and Wise counties. Service is offered Monday through Friday from 6:00 AM until 5:30 PM. To get a ride with TAPS, customers must schedule their ride 48 hours in advance. Customers can schedule a ride via phone Monday through Friday, from 7:00 am to 3:00 p.m. If a customer is denied a trip due to capacity, they are encouraged to call after noon the day before to check for cancellations. TAPS works customers to coordinate trip days to less frequented destinations, as well as with other health and human service providers in the area, to ensure service availability.

TAPS Public Transit Main Office
3400 Texoma Pkwy
Sherman TX 75090
(844) 603-6048 Main Office

TAPS is the designated recipient for Section 5307 and 5311 federal funding.

TAPS was not awarded 5307 funds in FY 2016. TAPS was not awarded Section 5310 funding in FY 2016, but was awarded $220,000 in FY 2015 and $475,000 in FY 2014. In FY 2016, TAPS was awarded a total of $3.22 million in funding and 260,260 development credits from previously withheld state and federal funds:

- $1.1 million in federal 5311 funds for formula grants for rural areas.
- $1.1 million for fleet replacement (Federal Transportation Investment Generating, Economic Recovery, Surface Transportation Program, statewide funds flex to Section 5311, and state funds).
- $47,316 for Federal 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities in rural areas.
- $224,581 for Federal 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities in urbanized areas.
- $505,186 in state funds for rural areas.
- $251,382 in state funds from urbanized areas.

Stakeholder Agencies

The region has many other agencies providing various forms of transportation to clients. Most of the additional providers represent health and human services agencies. These agencies provide a variety of client-based transportation resources, such as the following:

- Fund transportation or provide mobility management assistance for clients.
- Deliver transportation services to clients directly using agency vehicles and drivers.
- Purchase transportation services for clients by contract.
- Pay for client public transportation fare or reimbursement for personal transportation.
Table 6 lists stakeholder organizations and the role the organization may take in regards to transportation.

**Table 6. Stakeholder Agencies in the Texoma Region.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AAA of Texoma and Aging and Disability Resource Center—TCOG                   | • Responsible for development and administration of a comprehensive and coordinated network of support services for older persons to assist and help make informed decisions about their options for long-term services.  
  • Utilize a donated 19-passenger mobile services bus to help serve the region. The bus provides client services, including energy assistance for the low-income, underserved population of Cooke, Fannin, and Grayson Counties. |
| 1117 Gallagher Drive                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Sherman, TX 75090                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 903-893-2161                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Department of State Health Services—Grayson County Health Department        | • Improves the health, safety, and well-being of Texans through good stewardship of public resources and a focus on core public health functions.  
  • Provides financial support to mental health agencies, alcohol and drug abuse organizations, and other organizations. |
| 515 North Walnut Street                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Sherman, TX 75090                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 903-893-0131                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Cooke County Environmental Health Department                                | • Promotes safety and improves the lives of abused and neglected children.                                                                                                                                 |
| 101 S Dixon, Rm 118                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Gainesville, TX 76240                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 940-668-5454                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Fannin County Children’s Center                                             | • Provides employment and training services to individuals who have a disability or are disadvantaged, such as work adjustment, work experience, job coaching, placement services, and supported employment. |
| 112 West Fifth Street                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Bonham, TX 75418                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 903-583-4339                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Goodwill Industries of Northeast Texas                                      | • Provides information to bridge the gap between governmental agencies, non-profits, case managers, and social workers.                                                                                     |
| 2206 East Lamar Street                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Sherman, TX 75090                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 903-893-3145                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Grayson County Social Services Association                                  | • Provides meals to homebound, needy, and disabled individuals who are challenged to the point that meal preparation is difficult or impossible.                                                             |
| 5700 Texoma Parkway                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Sherman, TX 75090                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 903-818-3982                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Meals on Wheels Texoma                                                      | • Provides life-long support for those facing poverty and hardship. Offers year-round emergency assistance, summer youth camps, veteran programs, substance abuse and domestic violence programs, housing programs, etc. |
| 4114 Airport Drive                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Denison, TX 75020                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 903-786-3351                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Salvation Army                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 5700 Texoma Pkwy                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Sherman, TX 75090                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 903-868-9602                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| **Texoma Community Center** | • Promotes accessibility to services that improve quality of life and support self-determination for persons with mental and developmental disorders.  
**Intellectual/Learning Disabilities**  
IDD Services: 800 South Mirick Avenue  
Denison, TX 75020; 903-957-4795  
**Mental Health and Early Childhood Intervention**  
Cooke County: 319 North Dixon, Gainesville, TX 76240; 940-665-3962  
Fannin County: 1221 East 6th Street, Bonham, TX 75418; 903-957-4720 |
| 315 W. McLain Dr.  
Sherman, TX 75092  
Main Phone: 903-957-4700  
Website: http://www.mhmrst.org/  
Counties Served: Cooke, Fannin and Grayson |
| **Texoma Health** | • Provides grants, as a public health foundation, to area non-profits serving Grayson, Fannin, Bryan, and Marshall Counties. |
| 5036 Reba Drive  
Denison, TX 75020  
903-337-0755 |
| **United Way** | • Ensures that basic needs for food, transportation, housing, literacy, adult/elderly care, crisis response and emergency management for all residents in the Texoma region are met. |
| 713 E. Brockett  
Sherman, TX 75090  
903-893-1920  
unitedwaygrayson.org |
| Cooke County  
P.O. Box 208  
Gainesville, TX 76241  
940-665-1793  
cookeuw.org |
| **Veteran Services** |  
**Military Veteran Peer Network** | • Provide services to active-duty, reserve, and guard members—as well as veterans and their family members who suffer from the effects of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, Traumatic Brain Injury, or Military Sexual Assault—to connect them with support available for them and help them establish the benefits they have earned. |
| Coordinator Office:  
315 W. McLain Street  
Sherman, TX 75092  
903-267-0166  
info@vva973.org |
| **Sam Rayburn Memorial Veterans Center** | • Provides full range of primary and geriatric care and outpatient mental health services to veterans in North Texas and Southern Oklahoma.  
• Provides free shuttle bus service between the Dallas VA Medical Center and Sam Rayburn Memorial Veteran Center in Bonham. Monday–Friday, 7 a.m. and 11 a.m. and returns to Bonham at approximately 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. Veterans with appointments in Dallas are given priority seating. Reservations: 800-924-8387, ext. 36345 or 903-583-6345. |
| 1201 E. 9th St.  
Bonham, TX 75418  
800-924-8387 |
| **Sherman Community-Based Outpatient Clinic (Veterans)** | • Serves veterans living in Grayson and Bryan Counties. |
| 3811 US 75 N  
Sherman, TX 75090  
903-487-0477 |
Veterans’ Services Offices

- **100 W. Houston**
  Sherman, TX 75090
  903-813-4254
- **301 South Chestnut**
  Gainesville, TX 76240
  940-668-5436
- **1201 East 9th Street**
  Building 3, Room 135
  Bonham, TX 75418
  903-583-6390 (Office)
  vso@fanninco.net

Serve as a resource for veterans and veteran families.

---

Workforce Agencies

**Workforce Solutions—Texoma**

- **Cooke County**
  900 North Grand Ave
  Suite 103
  Gainesville, TX 76240
  940-665-1121
- **Fannin County**
  1205 East Sam Rayburn Drive
  Bonham, TX 75418
  903-640-0222
- **Grayson County**
  2415 S. Austin Ave
  Suite 105
  Denison, TX 75020
  903-463-9997

Provides employment-related services to companies and job-seekers in Cooke, Fannin, and Grayson Counties, including veterans, individuals with low incomes, and individuals with disabilities. Workforce Solutions Texoma offers child care assistance to help low-income families pay for child care so that they can go to work or attend an educational or vocational training program.

---

**Texas Workforce Solutions—Vocational Rehabilitation**

1800 Teague Street, Suite 404
Sherman, TX 75090
877-340-3368

Provides services for individuals with physical or cognitive disabilities, including blindness or visual impairment.

---

**Observations**

There are over 90 agencies providing transportation in some form in the Texoma region. Although the region lacks significant public transportation resources, there are ample opportunities for community-based organizations, churches, and school districts to utilize their excess capacity to provide additional transportation services in the region. However, almost all the providers in the region are dedicated to a single purpose, and most have restrictions on serving the clients of other organizations. Transportation services run by the public and private schools, churches, and senior living facilities comprise the majority of the area providers, and these are designed to serve only the clients of a particular facility.

There are still gaps in the region. The reduction in public transportation services provided by TAPS has impacted many residents in the Texoma region, especially those who depend on public transportation to and from their place of employment. Weekend service is not available.
Early morning and night services are also not available. Taxicab services are not typically available outside the urban area of the region to provide trips when public or nonprofit services are not operational. Few private carriers have accessible vehicle fleets and therefore may not be able to complement public sector services.
Chapter 4. Comprehensive Assessment of Transportation Needs and Gaps

Information in this chapter describes the comprehensive regional needs assessment and gap analysis outlining the unmet transportation needs and inefficiencies in the Texoma region.

Chapter 4 is organized as follows:

- Comprehensive Needs Assessment:
  - Research Methodology.
  - Population and Demographic Characteristics Indicating Need.
  - Stakeholder Workshops.
  - Stakeholder Survey.
- Gap Analysis:
  - Research Methodology.
  - Transit Need Index.
- Unmet Transportation Needs of the Texoma region.
- Observations.
- Research Instruments.

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

The most common unmet needs were the ability to get to and from medical appointments, as well as to and from daily-life activities such as the grocery store, pharmacy, and social activities. Many viable solutions to meet these unmet transportation needs were discussed, including increased agency coordination and shared resources, creating a collaborative grant writing team to identify additional funding sources, and improving existing public transportation services in general.

Research Methodology

The needs assessment included a multi-pronged approach, each of which is described in a separate part of this report:

1. Population and Demographics. The latest U.S. Census Bureau data used to investigate needs identifiable in publicly available data.
2. Stakeholder Workshops.
3. Stakeholder Survey Findings. Stakeholders responded to a mail-out questionnaire distributed by TTI to hundreds of stakeholder contacts that posed key questions about transportation challenges and needs in the Texoma region.

Population and Demographic Characteristics Indicating Need

Six population and demographic variables were selected to be analyzed based on their tendency to indicate facets of need for public transportation. The variables are as follows:

- Population Density: Areas with high population density tend to have a higher need for public transportation due to high concentrations of people in small areas. Population
density is also a formula factor in the determination of federal funding for urban public transportation (Section 5307).

- **Elderly Population**: Defined as people age 65 and older, the elderly population has a higher need for public transportation due to an increasing inability to operate an automobile without the assistance of others.

- **Youth Population**: Defined as people age 19 and younger, the youth population has a higher need for public transportation due to an inability to operate an automobile without the assistance of others.

- **People with a Disability**: The non-institutionalized population with a disability has a higher need for public transportation due to an inability to operate or ride an automobile without the assistance of others. In addition, people with a disability tend to need trips more frequently for medical purposes.

- **Population below Poverty Level**: Individuals below the poverty level have a higher need for public transportation due to not having the financial means of owning and maintaining an automobile.

- **No Vehicle Available**: Occupied housing units with no vehicle available have a higher need for public transportation because the household is occupied, but the residents of the household do not have a vehicle available for means of transportation. As a result, public transportation becomes a more likely option.

In addition to these characteristics, the veteran population was analyzed for the Texoma region based on anecdotal evidence of unmet needs. Table 7 provides a snapshot of population and demographic characteristics demonstrating transportation need. Additional data and graphics are available in Appendix A on page 62.

**Table 7. Snapshot of Population and Demographic Characteristics Demonstrating Transportation Need.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Texoma vs. State</th>
<th>Largest Concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>Below State Average</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly (Age 65 and older)</td>
<td>Above State Average</td>
<td>Fannin, but similar in all three counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth (Age 19 and younger)</td>
<td>Below State Average</td>
<td>Cooke, but similar in all three counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities</td>
<td>Above State Average</td>
<td>Fannin, but similar in all three counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>Below State Average</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vehicle Available</td>
<td>Slightly Below State Average</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Population</td>
<td>Above State Average</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Stakeholder Workshops**
TTI facilitated six stakeholder workshops in the Texoma planning region in October 2016, focusing on the unmet transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, individuals age 65+, and other priority populations in the Texoma planning region. Participants were asked to identify their unmet transportation needs (or those of their clients), gaps and overlaps in transportation services in the region, and their ideas for viable solutions to meet their unmet needs or to close the gaps in service.

At each meeting, participants received background information about the project, learned how information provided during the workshop would be used to inform the 2017–2021 Regional Coordinated Transportation Plan, and told the next steps for the project.

At each workshop, participants were asked to identify their unmet transportation needs (or those of their clients), gaps and overlaps in transportation services in the region, and their ideas for viable solutions to meet their unmet needs or to close the gaps in service. The following is a summary of the discussions from the six workshops.

The most common unmet needs were the ability to get to and from medical appointments, as well as to and from daily-life activities such as the grocery store, pharmacy, and social activities. Many viable solutions to meet these unmet transportation needs were discussed, including increased agency coordination and shared resources, creating a collaborative grant writing team to identify additional funding sources, and improving existing public transportation services in general.

**Stakeholder Survey**
TTI mailed 3,000 surveys to Texoma region residents on October 11, 2016, and received 155 responses (response rate ~5 percent) on November 18, 2016. The results of the survey revealed that the most prominent reasons for transit to exist in the Texoma region are as a travel option for seniors and persons with a disability, as an option for people who cannot afford to drive or who choose not to drive, and as a travel mode to assist individuals in reducing their energy consumption and protecting air quality. Many suggested that the most important problem affecting transportation in the Texoma region is a lack of adequate sidewalks or bike routes. The majority of all respondents agreed that it is important to continue transit service in the region; current transit riders unanimously agreed that it is important to continue service. One-third of current and former transit riders indicated that there are times they cannot get to where they need to go; one in 10 current riders rely on transit to access employment, and several respondents noted that inter-town travel is difficult.

The full results of the survey are located in Appendix B.

**Gap Analysis**
The Gap Analysis for the Texoma region compares key socioeconomic factors in the area. This involves mapping five key demographics:
• Population, Age 65 and over.
• Individuals with a disability.
• Veterans.
• Households below the poverty level.
• Households with no vehicle access.

Research Methodology
TTI produced five maps to isolate and display these populations in the Texoma region (see Appendix C on page 103). The five key demographics were then combined to produce a transit needs index (TNI) map. The TNI highlights areas in the Texoma region that have a significant amount of people from all five analyzed demographics. These highlighted areas indicate a greater need for transportation.

TTI utilized the most recently available data to produce a transit needs index—the American Community Survey Five-Year Estimates from 2011 to 2015. These data are displayed at the census tract level for the Texoma region. The following sections describe each of the five characteristics researchers analyzed.

Along with the five demographic maps and the TNI map, TTI reviewed the available public transportation services to produce a set of recommendations and observations for the region. The following section details this analysis.

Transit Need Index (TNI)
The purpose of producing a TNI map is to highlight areas in the Texoma region that may have a greater need for public transportation access based on the demographic analysis. The map is based on a number system from 1 to 10, with 1 indicating the lowest level of transit need and 10 indicating the highest level of transit need. The five demographic characteristics used to create the TNI are as follows:

• **Elderly Population:** Defined as people age 65 and older, the elderly population has a higher need for public transportation due to an increasing inability to operate an automobile without the assistance of others.
• **People with a Disability:** The non-institutionalized population with a disability has a higher need for public transportation due to an inability to operate or ride an automobile without the assistance of others. In addition, people with a disability tend to need trips more frequently for medical purposes.
• **Veteran Population:** These are individuals designated as veterans in the armed forces. Specific funding may be available for transportation and accessibility.
• **Population below Poverty Level:** Individuals below the poverty level have a higher need for public transportation due to not having the financial means of owning and maintaining an automobile.
• **No Vehicle Available:** Occupied housing units with no vehicle available have a higher need for public transportation because the household is occupied, but the residents of the household do not have a vehicle available for means of transportation. As a result, public transportation becomes a more likely option.

Figure 4 shows the TNI map. The map shows that most of Fannin County has a transportation need of 6.1–7.8, out of 10. There is a large concentration of individuals age 65 and older in Fannin County and a large concentration of veterans in Bonham. The cities have a higher need, with Denison at 6.1–7.8 as well. The population living below poverty level is concentrated in cities in the Texoma region. In Grayson County, along Lake Texoma on the northern border of the Texoma planning region, there is a large concentration of individuals age 65 and older and individuals with disabilities, which explains the transit need of 5.1–6.0. There is a lower need for transit in the southern portions of each county.
Figure 4. Transit Need Index.
Unmet Transportation Needs and Gaps in Transportation Services

The following list is a summary of unmet transportation needs and gaps in transportation services identified by participants at the stakeholder workshops and mail-out survey responses:

- **Access to/from:**
  - Medical appointments.
  - Daily-life activities such as the grocery store, pharmacy, social activities, cultural events, support groups, shopping, social service organizations, banks, and church.
  - Urbanized areas (Dallas, Fort Worth, etc.); lack of connectivity (to/from rural areas to urbanized areas).
  - Place of employment.
  - College campuses.

- **Transportation service type/schedule:**
  - Timely, dependable, and reliable transportation options.
  - Affordable transportation options, especially when traveling outside of the region.
  - Flexibility in public transportation scheduling.
  - Availability of transportation on nights and weekends.
  - Availability of fixed-route transportation service.
  - Services for special populations (limited English proficiency, elderly, disabled).
  - Transportation for veterans to/from Bonham (to the VA facility or to catch the shuttle to the VA hospital in Dallas) and to/from the VA hospital in Dallas.
  - Non-school related transportation for children.
  - Door-to-door transportation service (as opposed to curb-to-curb service) for both disabled and non-disabled individuals.
  - Wheelchair-accessible buses; vehicles specifically designed for elderly and individuals with disabilities.
  - Mobility Assistants.

- **Alternative Modes/Amenities:**
  - No sidewalks or bicycle routes (or existing sidewalks in poor condition).
  - No safe area to cross busy roads (e.g., Highway 82).
  - Waiting areas for public transportation pick-up/drop-off locations.

- **Knowledge of existing/available transportation services:**
  - Communication about existing transportation services, especially for those without access to the Internet.
  - Confusion about call-in windows/process to schedule a ride with the public transportation provider.
  - Coordination among agencies in the region that provide transportation or have available capacity/unused vehicles.
  - Understanding of federal regulations to share resources/underutilized vehicles.
  - Private partnerships.
  - Insurance costs to transport clients.

**Observations**

Although the Texoma planning region is only three counties, it has a unique set of challenges. The most prominent transportation problem is not enough public transit. Transit-dependent...
populations are spread throughout the three-county area. The amount of land with sparsely populated towns presents a challenge to efficiently providing public transportation coverage. Also, the number of people age 65 and older, the number of people with disabilities, and the number of veterans in the Texoma region are higher than the state averages, which can present other issues with providing appropriate transportation services to meet the needs of the population.

The most common unmet needs were (a) the ability to get to and from medical appointments and to and from daily-life activities such as the grocery store, pharmacy, and social activities; (b) additional transportation services and schedules; (c) alternative modes and amenities; and (d) knowledge of existing/available transportation services. Many viable solutions to meet these unmet transportation needs were discussed with stakeholders during the workshops; some will be more difficult to attain than others. Goals and objectives for addressing these unmet needs are discussed in Chapter 5.

Based on the five demographic characteristics, the TNI map shows that a high level of transit need lies in the Denison-Sherman area and the eastern portion of Fannin County. Here are some other observations about the gap analysis:

- A larger percentage of persons over 65 live in the rural parts of the county rather than in the urban areas. The need for transportation for older individuals is especially important considering a growing number of health and immobility concerns as the population ages.
- Each county has a close to proportionate amount of the population with a disability. Although it appears that a higher percentage of persons with disabilities lie in the rural parts of the region, the data do not account for the raw number of persons with disabilities who may lie within the urban areas and urban clusters.
- Veteran populations are significant in each of the Texoma region counties. Access to the VA North Texas Healthcare centers in Sherman, Denison, Bonham, and Dallas become especially important.
- A significant percentage of the population below poverty is located around incorporated areas. People below poverty are more likely to have no access to a vehicle and more likely to rely on public transportation to access jobs and daily medical needs. Additionally, Fannin County contains high percentages of people below poverty in the rural areas outside of Bonham.
- Households with no vehicle are mostly concentrated around incorporated areas. It is especially important for public transportation to address the needs and improve accessibility for this demographic.

Research Instruments
The outreach flyer used for the stakeholder workshops and questionnaire used for the mail-out survey are located in Appendix B.
Chapter 5. Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives

The mission and vision statements offer the context in which coordinated human service public transportation service strategies are developed and implemented in the Texoma region. These statements are based on the input and discussion received during meetings with stakeholders and comments received during the stakeholder survey process. The stakeholder committee approved the mission and vision statements at the January 2017 meeting. Goals and objectives identified in this plan aim to address the needs and gaps identified by stakeholders and the public.

Vision Statement
All citizens in the Texoma region will have access to safe, affordable, and reliable transportation.

Mission Statement
To better lives through access to transportation

Goals and Objectives
The goals and objectives of this plan are built upon three comprehensive strategies: enhance communication, establish connectivity, and coordinate resources. The Region 22 Stakeholder Committee identified five primary goals for improving equal access to seamless public transportation in the region from 2017 to 2021:

- Improve coordination for transportation services.
- Improve public awareness and knowledge of transportation services.
- Increase access and connectivity both inside and outside of the region.
- Expand transportation services and schedule.
- Consider funding needs for transportation services.

The following tables highlight specific objectives for each goal. Objectives are focused and brief by design. The priority, timeframe, potential resources, and assumed overall feasibility for each objective are noted.
Table 8. Objectives for Improving Coordination for Transportation Services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate transportation schedules with medical schedulers and transportation providers, considering specific needs of individuals over 65, individuals with a disability, and veterans.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify underutilized transportation resources available for public/shared use.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Planning, staff time</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore how coordination can be improved across planning regions, TxDOT Districts, and service areas.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Planning, Staff time</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify frequent transit destinations (health care facilities, activity centers, large employment centers, etc.) and work together to coordinate services to meet needs of customers, considering specific needs of individuals over 65.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Planning, staff time</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify opportunities for partnerships to provide transportation and related services (public-private partnerships, local colleges, etc.).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Planning, Staff</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify opportunities to centralize services or pool resources.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate emergency management strategies across the region.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a regional coordination working group/council.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore opportunities to purchase transportation vouchers in advance.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve maintenance for accessible vehicles (e.g., public and private, including intercity bus).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Operating Funds</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore creating a regional mobility coordinator position.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Planning, operating funds</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9. Objectives for Improving Public Awareness and Knowledge of Public Transportation Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve public information availability and clarity with consideration of specific needs of individuals over 65 and individuals with a disability.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time, planning</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a centralized information hub for transportation resources in the region.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time, funding</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase outreach to priority populations identified in the plan, with targeted outreach to individuals over 65 and individuals with a disability.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain current schedule and service information on websites and in printed materials.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute information using a variety of communication media (including non-Internet/electronic methods; visually impaired methods; methods for individuals who cannot read).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Planning, staff time</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide rider travel training to help current and potential riders schedule and complete trips, with specific training concerning the needs of individuals over 65 and individuals with a disability.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host transportation information meetings around the region, with specific meetings targeted to individuals over 65, individuals with a disability, and other priority populations identified in the plan.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time, planning</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve understanding of rules and regulations tied to the needs of particular clients, funding streams, and/or the need for client privacy and confidentiality.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help customers to be stronger advocates for themselves and others, such as by expressing needs to local, regional, or state officials.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide familiarization training to customer service and dispatching staff about services by other providers.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Short-term, periodic</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
including training specific to the needs of individuals over 65 and individuals with a disability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilize personal resources to increase public outreach opportunities (mailing lists from other organizations, social networking, etc.).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use local events to increase awareness and understanding of public transportation services, especially at events targeted for individuals over 65 and individuals with a disability.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Short-term, periodic</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a public information campaign to highlight who uses transit in the region to correct public perception of riders and increase awareness, with campaigns targeted to individuals over 65.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Staff time, operating funds</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10. Objectives to Increase Access and Connectivity both Inside and Outside of the Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve connectivity between population centers and rural areas, with consideration of specific needs of individuals over 65 and individuals with a disability.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist veterans in the region to access Veteran's Administration facilities inside and outside of the region.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time, planning, funding</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve sidewalk conditions, in particular for individuals with a disability or impaired mobility.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Planning, funding</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore opportunities for other transportation option/modes (ridesourcing, bikeshare, autonomous vehicles, etc.), with consideration for specific needs of individuals over 65 and individuals with a disability</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to community events, especially for individuals over 65.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate service schedules at shared stops or transfer points (e.g., between regional providers), with consideration for the specific needs of individuals over age 65 and</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide safe crossings at major intersections for pedestrians, with consideration for specific needs of individuals over 65 and individuals with a disability. | Medium | Long-term | Planning | Moderate
---|---|---|---|---
Explore expansion of greenways and pedestrian/bicycle pathways, with consideration of specific needs of individuals over 65 and individuals with a disability. | Medium | Long-term | Planning | Moderate
Build strategic partnerships between traditional and nontraditional stakeholders to improve mobility for residents, with consideration for specific needs of individuals over 65 and individuals with a disability | Low | Long-term, continuous | Staff Time | Moderate
Table 11. Objectives for Expanding Transportation Services and Schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify key trip purposes or rider characteristics to first support with extended hours or days services, with consideration for the specific needs of individuals over 65 and individuals with a disability.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Staff time, planning</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and evaluate opportunities to provide fixed-route, circulator, and round-trip services.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Operating funds</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively engage in Texas Health and Human Services dialogue regarding Medical Transportation Program policies and practices.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek to enhance reliability of services, regardless of mode, in terms of on-time performance (e.g., fixed-route stops or demand-response time window).</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time, planning</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore opportunities for mobility assistants to provide door-to-door service, with consideration for the specific needs of individuals over 65 and individuals with a disability.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Planning, operating funds</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore opportunities to provide additional veteran transportation to VA in Bonham, Sherman, and Dallas (for example: minivans for direct service).</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time, funding</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify opportunities to begin operating some or all services earlier in the day.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Operating funds, planning</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify opportunities to begin operating some or all services later in the day.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Operating funds, planning</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify opportunities to begin operating more services on weekends (Saturdays and/or Sundays).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Operating funds, planning</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find ways to improve mobility options through innovative service models, considering the specific needs of individuals over 65 and individuals with a disability.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time, planning</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore opportunities to provide more reduced fare opportunities to match income capability of riders.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Planning, operating funds</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more shelters at fixed-route</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Capital funds</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stops for transfers between transportation providers, considering the specific needs of individuals over 65 and individuals with a disability.

Table 12. Objectives for Considering Funding Needs for Transportation Services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and develop a dedicated funding source for transportation services, including nongovernmental sources.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Staff time, funding</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a collaborative grant writing team for the region.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore opportunities to increase local investment in transportation services.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Short-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of grant applications submitted for transportation funding.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore opportunities to share resources among state agencies.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Long-term, continuous</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6. Planning for Comprehensive Services

Chapter 6 briefly describes how the 2017–2021 Plan relates to various providers in their pursuit of organizational and regional goals for seamless, equal-access transportation services for Texoma residents. The Regional Coordinated Transportation Plan supports the integration of existing services by identifying the resources within each agency that can be used to provide assistance with transportation needs in the Texoma region.

The Texoma region has actively coordinated a regional dialogue for more than a decade. In 2006, the TCOG produced the Regional Public Transportation Coordination Plan. The 2006 planning process included active participation by Section 5310, HHS, workforce, and several other organizations. A similar inclusive process was used in 2011 to update the regional coordinated transportation plan.

The 2017–2021 planning process was a comprehensive process open to all transportation providers in the region, other key stakeholders, and the general public. The vision, mission, goals, and objectives all pertain equally to all stakeholders. Stakeholder meetings, a mail-out survey, and workshops ensured individuals and stakeholders from all priority populations and stakeholders of all types had the opportunity to participate in the planning process and this plan.

The Region 22 Stakeholder Committee of Planning consisted of individuals representing a wide variety of stakeholders. The roster included the following organizations:

- Aging and Disability Resource Center.
- Austin College.
- Bonham ISD.
- City of Honey Grove.
- Cooke County.
- Department of State Health Services.
- Fannin County Children’s Center.
- Goodwill Industries.
- Grayson County.
- Grayson County Health Department.
- Grayson County Veterans Services.
- Meals on Wheels Texoma.
- Merry Van Lines.
- Military Veteran Peer Network.
- Pottsboro Library.
- Salvation Army.
- Sherman ISD.
- Sherman-Denison MPO.
- St. Mary’s School.
Throughout the coordinated planning process, it was clear that many community groups and stakeholders are concerned about transportation issues in the Texoma region. This planning process continued to bring them together to discuss needs and solutions, and coordination between human service agencies and transportation providers needs to continue beyond this plan. By continuing these efforts, the region will continue to understand regional transportation needs, determine strategies, and effectively implement solutions. Coordinated transportation planning can enhance mobility, making it easier for people to reach employment opportunities and medical appointments; increase efficiency of transportation, reducing the costs of travel for both riders and providers; and increase funding available for transportation projects in the region. Coordinated transportation planning also increases the independence of riders by giving easier access to work, medical needs, shopping, education, social events, and religious services for those who cannot drive or do not have access to personal vehicles.

There are a variety of ways to integrate transportation services within the Texoma region, but the core components of successful service delivery and integration revolve around coordination, communication, and knowledge of the services offered by regional transportation providers. A single source information point would best suit the unmet needs of the traveling public in the Texoma region for their transportation needs, including health and human service programs; workforce programs; regional air, bus, and rail services; federally funded services; and privately operated or member-based systems such as churches, civic organizations, and senior/assisted living facilities. It is important to manage the flow of information and make it available to those who may benefit. The public, as well as health and human service agencies, workforce programs, and local leaders, should be educated on the services available and have a direct connection to current information.
Chapter 7. Sustain Planning and Implement Plan

Chapter 7 describes the Texoma region’s capacity to sustain regional transportation planning activities and implement this plan. As discussed in other sections, the coordination plan not only addresses the immediate needs for transportation but also defines a framework for ensuring continual evaluation and development of coordination initiatives. To accomplish this, a lead agency will be established to perform key activities that move coordination efforts forward into implementation and successful outcomes.

Texoma stakeholders are committed advocates of regional dialogue and collaboration. Regional stakeholders will identify one or more agencies capable of filling the role of lead agency. The region understands limited funds are available to support regional coordination. Therefore, the ongoing role of the lead agency actor is assumed to primarily consist of coordinating periodic regional meetings, maintaining and utilizing stakeholder contacts’ lists to promote stakeholders’ pursuit of funding/operating opportunities, and periodic performance measurement as required by TxDOT.

Meetings will continue to be open to all stakeholders and the public. Regular meetings are the primary method by which this plan will be implemented. It is during those meetings when stakeholders collaboratively and competitively (sometimes necessitated by funding sources, grant programs, calls for projects) work together. The lead agency will coordinate the activities of the steering committee. The lead agency will ensure the steering committee roster is representative and all priority populations receive meeting notices. These priority members include the following stakeholders:

- Representatives of public, private and nonprofit transportation providers, including recipients of:
  - Section 5307 funds (small urban transportation providers).
  - Section 5311 funds (rural transportation providers).
  - Section 5310 funds (enhanced mobility of seniors and individuals with disabilities).
- Representatives of MPOs.
- Representatives of human services providers.
- Representatives of workforce development agencies.
- Individuals or advocate organizations representing:
  - Individuals with disabilities.
  - Individuals 65 and older.
  - Individuals with low incomes.
  - Veterans.
  - Children.
  - Individuals who rely on public transportation to and from employment.
- Other members of the public.
Chapter 8. Performance Measures to Evaluate Effectiveness

Chapter 8 provides performance measures to gauge progress on meeting the needs and gaps identified in this plan, using both statewide-required measures and focused measures of local interest to stakeholders in the Texoma region. The purpose of performance measures is to periodically remind stakeholders the plan exists to guide initiatives and help prioritizing the determined goals and objectives of the plan.

TxDOT Required Statewide Measures

The three categories of required measures to be tracked by the lead agency in each planning region, including the Texoma Planning Region 22, are collaboration, identification of gaps and inefficiencies, and resolution of gaps and inefficiencies. The following sections outline performance measures for each required measure:

Collaboration

- Number of active, formal partnerships that were in place during the reporting period to:
  - Conduct regional transportation planning activities.
  - Implement objectives or strategies called for in the coordinated plan.

- Number of stakeholder organizations, including but not limited to ones representing (a) individuals 65 and older, (b) individuals with disabilities, (c) individuals with low incomes, (d) people seeking employment, (e) children, and (f) veterans, that:
  - Received information during the reporting period on how to participate in regional transportation planning activities.
  - Actively participated in regional transportation planning activities during the reporting period.

- Number of individuals who:
  - Received information during the reporting period on how to participate in regional transportation planning activities.
  - Actively participated in regional transportation planning activities during the reporting period.

Identification of Gaps and Inefficiencies

- Number of gaps and inefficiencies identified in the coordinated plan, including but not limited to gaps and inefficiencies concerning (a) individuals 65 and older, (b) individuals with disabilities, (c) individuals with low incomes, (d) people seeking employment, (e) children, and (f) veterans.

- Number of identified gaps and inefficiencies for which there are recommended objectives or strategies in the coordinated plan for resolving these gaps and inefficiencies.
Resolution of Gaps and Inefficiencies

- Number of objectives or strategies identified in the coordinated plan that have moved from a planning phase to an implementation phase (this may be due to actions taken by any entity or combination of entities, not necessarily the lead agency).
- Number of objectives or strategies in the coordinated plan that have been fully achieved (due to actions taken by any entity or combination of entities, not necessarily the lead agency).

Texoma Focused Measures
The following performance measures were selected to focus on monitoring the region’s progress to address gaps identified in Chapter 4:

- **Regional coordinated services gaps**—There is an ongoing challenge to integrate and coordinate services between multiple providers across all counties and multiple TxDOT Districts. Progress will be measured using one or more of the following:
  - Number of stakeholder public meetings held by the Region 22 Texoma Stakeholder Committee.
  - Number of one-way passenger trips provided whose destination was in another provider’s service area.

- **Education and mobility management gaps**—Public awareness of services is low, and understanding how to utilize present services varies; current mobility management (e.g., travel training, outreach, awareness) of resources and practices can be improved to ensure residents across the region understand their mobility options. Progress will be measured using one or more of the following:
  - Number of civic events used for public outreach by stakeholders.
  - Number of residents provided with information about services, including through outreach campaigns, travel training, and customer service interactions.

- **Funding and affordability gaps**—Providing adequate resources for transportation services are needed, and residents in the Texoma region need affordable mobility options. Progress will be measured using one or more of the following:
  - Number of grant applications or funding proposals submitted to funding agencies by stakeholders.
  - Number of individuals using transit who utilize a reduced fare option.

Methodology and Data Management
This chapter describes each measure in enough detail to enable both the acting lead agency and providers to understand the information necessary to calculate measures. The acting lead agency will periodically monitor progress on the listed performance measures in the Texoma area. The lead agency will collect the necessary information from each provider. Providers must provide information in a timely manner as requested by the lead agency. The lead agency will report to TxDOT PTN as per their future direction.
Appendix A. Population and Demographic Characteristics Indicating Need

This section includes an analysis of six population and demographic variables selected for their tendency to indicate facets of need for public transportation. The variables are as follows:

- **Population Density**: Areas with high population density tend to have a higher need for public transportation due to high concentrations of people in small areas. Population density is also a formula factor in the determination of federal funding for urban public transportation (Section 5307).

- **Elderly Population**: Defined as people age 65 and older, the elderly population has a higher need for public transportation due to an increasing inability to operate an automobile without the assistance of others.

- **Youth Population**: Defined as people age 19 and younger, the youth population has a higher need for public transportation due to an inability to operate an automobile without the assistance of others.

- **People with a Disability**: The non-institutionalized population with a disability has a higher need for public transportation due to an inability to operate or ride an automobile without the assistance of others. In addition, people with a disability tend to need trips more frequently for medical purposes.

- **Population below Poverty Level**: Individuals below the poverty level have a higher need for public transportation due to not having the financial means of owning and maintaining an automobile.

- **No Vehicle Available**: Occupied housing units with no vehicle available have a higher need for public transportation because the household is occupied, but the residents of the household do not have a vehicle available for means of transportation. As a result, public transportation becomes a more likely option.

### Population Density

The population, land area, and density of the Texoma planning region are described in Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Land Area</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>38,558</td>
<td>874.76</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>33,775</td>
<td>890.84</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>121,975</td>
<td>932.80</td>
<td>130.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texoma Region</td>
<td>194,308</td>
<td>2,698.40</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>26,092,033</td>
<td>261,231.71</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5 illustrates the population density of the region. With a land area of 2,698 square miles, the population density of the region is 72 people per square mile. This is below the state average of 99.9 people per square mile. The most densely populated county in the region is Grayson, with 130.8 people per square mile.
Individuals Age 65 and older

The population age 65 and older in the Texoma planning region is described in Table 14. This cohort represents 16.6 percent of the population in the Texoma planning region, compared to the state average of 10.9 percent. The highest concentration of elderly population resides in Fannin County, although each of the three counties has similar percentages.

Table 14. Population Age 65+ in the Texoma Planning Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Age 65 and over</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>38,558</td>
<td>6,348</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>33,775</td>
<td>6,007</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>121,975</td>
<td>19,845</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texoma Region</td>
<td>194,308</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>26,092,033</td>
<td>2,849,757</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 illustrates the percent of population age 65+ by census tract in each county.
Youth Population
The population age 19 and younger is described in Table 15. This cohort represents 26.3 percent of the population in the Texoma planning region, compared to the state average of 29.7 percent. The highest concentration of the youth population resides in Cooke County, although each of the three counties has similar percentages.

Table 15. Population Age 19 and Younger in the Texoma Planning Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Age 0–19</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>38,558</td>
<td>10,456</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>33,775</td>
<td>8,139</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>121,975</td>
<td>32,564</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texoma Region</td>
<td>194,308</td>
<td>51,159</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>26,092,033</td>
<td>7,745,722</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individuals with a Disability
There are over 30,000 people in the Texoma planning region with one or more disabilities, or 15.5 percent, described in Table 16. This is slightly higher than the state average of 11.4 percent.

Table 16. Persons with a Disability in the Texoma Planning Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>One or More Disabilities</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>38,558</td>
<td>5,626</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>33,775</td>
<td>5,346</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>121,975</td>
<td>19,208</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texoma Region</td>
<td>194,308</td>
<td>30,180</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>26,092,033</td>
<td>2,969,042</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 illustrates where people with disabilities live within the Texoma planning region.
Population below Poverty Level

The region has 15.8 percent of the population for whom poverty status is determined below poverty level (Table 17), which is slightly lower than the state average of 17.7 percent.

Table 17. Poverty Statistics in the Texoma Planning Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population Below Poverty Level</th>
<th>Below Poverty Level</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>37,844</td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>30,948</td>
<td>5,479</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>119,015</td>
<td>18,771</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texoma Region</td>
<td>187,807</td>
<td>29,730</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>25,478,976</td>
<td>4,500,034</td>
<td>17.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8 illustrates where the population below poverty level live. The highest concentrations of people below poverty level are in Fannin County, particularly in the far north and south census tracts.

Figure 8. Percent below Poverty in the Texoma Planning Region by Census Tract.
No Vehicle Available
The region has 5.4 percent of households with no vehicle available, slightly lower than the state average of 5.9 percent (Table 18). Grayson County has the highest percentage of households without a vehicle.

Table 18. Households with No Vehicle by County in the Texoma Planning Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Households with No Vehicle</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>14,615</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>11,795</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>45,747</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texoma Region</td>
<td>72,157</td>
<td>3,909</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>9,013,582</td>
<td>529,628</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Veterans
Table 19 describes the veteran population in the Texoma region by county. The region is 11 percent veterans, higher than the state average of 8.2 percent. Fannin County has the highest concentration of veterans, at 13 percent.

Table 19. Veteran Population by County in the Texoma Planning Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Veteran Population</th>
<th>Percent of Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>3,443</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>10,153</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texoma Region</td>
<td>16,492</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1,564,501</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9 illustrates the veteran population by census tract in the Texoma planning region. Based on this map, there are higher concentrations of veterans in more rural areas of each county, and they seem to be evenly distributed between the three counties.
Figure 9. Veteran Population of the Texoma Planning Region by Census Tract.
Race/Ethnicity
Table 20 describes the racial composition of the Texoma planning region. Racially, the region consists of 87.5 percent White, 5.8 percent Hispanic or Latino, 5.4 percent Black or African American, 1 percent American Indian or Alaskan Native, and 3.2 percent Other Race. Compared to the state, the Texoma planning region has a significantly higher percentage of White people, and a significantly lower percentage of Hispanic people.

Table 20. Race by County in the Texoma Planning Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>American Indian Alaskan Native</th>
<th>Other Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pop.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Pop.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Pop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>35,448</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>6,319</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>29,626</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>2,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>104,887</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texoma Region</td>
<td>169,961</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>11,175</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>11,562,453</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>9,962,643</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>3,015,767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language Spoken at Home
All programs and activities of entities that receive federal financial assistance must comply with Executive Order 13166, “Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency.” All recipients of federal funds must take reasonable steps to ensure that limited English proficient (LEP) persons have meaningful access to programs, services, and information provided. Persons who do not speak English as their primary language and have a limited ability to read, speak, write, or understand English may be considered LEP.

As a result, all transportation providers in the region that receive federal funds must make sure they make information regarding their services as readily available for the language predominantly spoken in the language as it is for English. Therefore, transportation providers must take steps such as printing brochures in Spanish, having bilingual telephone operators, and having a Spanish option on the website in order to ensure that persons with LEP receive the same access to public transportation services as those who speak English as their primary language.

English is the most common language spoken in the region. Nine percent of the regional population over five years old speaks Spanish at home, well below the state average of 29.5 percent (Table 21). Cooke County has the highest percent speaking English less than “very well,” at 5.4 percent. No counties in the region have more than 1.6 percent of the population speaking a language other than English or Spanish.
Table 21. English Proficiency by County in the Texoma Planning Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population over 5 Years Old</th>
<th>Spanish Spoken at Home</th>
<th>Speak English Less than &quot;Very Well&quot;</th>
<th>Speak Other than English or Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>36,022</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>31,925</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>114,269</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>24,151,280</td>
<td>29.50%</td>
<td>14.20%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. Comprehensive Needs Assessment

The Texoma Planning Region 22 comprehensive needs assessment reflects the contributions of over 155 stakeholder respondents to the 2016 Texoma Region Transportation Needs Assessment Survey and 40 participants at regional stakeholder workshops. This appendix contains the following:

- Stakeholder Workshop outreach flyer.
- Stakeholder survey findings.
- Stakeholder survey outreach materials.

Stakeholder Workshops

Researchers with TTI facilitated six stakeholder workshops in the Texoma planning region in October 2016, focusing on the unmet transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, individuals age 65+, and other priority populations in the Texoma planning region. Figure 10 is the outreach flyer created to advertise for all stakeholder workshops. Similar flyers were used for each individual event as well.
Advertisements for each stakeholder workshop were posted to TTI’s social media pages on Facebook and Twitter. Direct posts were made on the following social media pages: Texoma
2017–2021 Texoma Regional Coordinated Transportation Plan

COG, City of Sherman, Gainesville Chamber, Gainesville Daily Register, Austin College, and GoTAPS.

**Stakeholder Survey Findings**
TTI conducted a stratified random sample survey of Texoma residents to explore public opinion regarding public transportation and travel needs in the region. This section documents the survey methodology, participation, and findings.

**Survey Methodology**
A survey invitation letter and survey in both English and Spanish were mailed to a stratified random sample of adults in the three-county Texoma region. Appendix B contains the full letter and survey in both English and Spanish. Recipients were invited to complete the brief survey and return it postage-paid to TTI’s Houston office or complete the survey online. TTI archived each physical response by scanning and data-entering the response. The materials (letter and survey form) and outreach methodology were reviewed and approved by the Texas A&M University Institutional Review Board in September–October 2016.

The invitation letter included a quick response code and a hyperlink to an online version of the survey. The survey instrument was developed from several peer agency surveys and the survey used previously in the region. The survey consisted of two pages printed front and back. The first page included resident survey questions, and if the respondent had used transit service, they could answer the transit-specific questions on the second page. A few open-ended questions were included in the survey to collect qualitative perceptions about transit in the region. The following is a list of each question asked in order as presented to potential respondents:

- **Part 1. Public Transportation in Your Area**
  - What kinds of transportation do you normally use to travel around your area?
  - Which transportation problems exist in your area?
  - How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement? “It is important for public transit to continue to be available to residents of my community.”
  - Why is it important to have public transit service?
  - How often do you use public transit in your region?
  - How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement? “I can easily travel to places I need to go using my current travel options.”
  - Do you have unmet transportation needs?
  - If YES, how can transportation providers in your region assist in meeting more of your transportation needs? Please explain:

- **Part 2. Understanding Who Took Our Survey**
  - Are you? [gender]
  - What is your age?
  - What is your race, ethnicity?
o Including yourself, how many people live in your household?
o What is the combined annual income for all people living in your household?
o How many working vehicles (cars, trucks, and motorcycles) are available in your household?
o Which of the following best describes your current employment status?
o Which county do you live in?
o Have you ever served on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces, Reserves, or National Guard?
o Do you have the following disabilities? [Mobility or orthopedic impairment, Visual impairment, Deaf or Hard of Hearing, Mental Illness, Developmental disability]
o Are you currently covered by either of the following programs? [Medicare, Medicaid]
o Please share any final comments regarding transportation needs in your region in the space below:

• **Part 3. Questions for Public Transit Users**
o Which public transit services have you used in your region in the last year?
o How important is public transportation service to your personal quality of life?
o Do you rely on public transportation to get to and from your place of employment?
o How satisfied are you with the public transportation service you use most often?
o Why did you start using public transportation?

Addresses were purchased from DirectMail.com. Researchers intentionally purchased a moderate surplus of addresses to enable a stratification process. Stratifying the random sample selection by county, by gender, and by age group guaranteed selected adults represented the population of the region. Table 22 contains the exact number of sampled adults per each stratum.

Table 22. Sample Stratification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fannin County</th>
<th>Grayson County</th>
<th>Cooke County</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male, Age 18–64</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Age 65 or over</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Age 18–64</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Age 65 or over</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>535</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,877</strong></td>
<td><strong>588</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TTI also conducted two validity checks to verify the selected adults would include key demographic groups:

- **Income check.** U.S. Census mean household income in 2014 for the counties was $62,554. Therefore, TTI checked to ensure the sample mean household income was in the range of $56,298 to $68,809 (+/− 10 percent) to ensure representativeness.
- **Own versus Rent Check.** U.S. Census mean percentage of housing units owner-occupied in 2014 for the counties was 69 percent. TTI ensured no more than 75 percent of sampled individuals were marked as owner-occupied.

The following section summarizes survey participation.

**Survey Deliverability, Participation, Fit**

The research team mailed 3,000 surveys to Texoma region residents and received 155 responses (response rate ~5 percent). The surveys were mailed first-class on Tuesday, October 11, 2016 from Houston, Texas. Most recipients received the survey invitation by Friday, October 14, 2016. The U.S. Postal Service was able to deliver 94 percent of survey packets (see Table 23).

**Table 23. Mail Deliverability and Survey Participation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mail Piece Deliverability</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mailed Survey Packets</strong></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USPS Returned Mail Reason:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not deliverable as addressed</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted—not known</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No such number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved left no address</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No mail receptacle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Successfully Delivered</strong></td>
<td>2,814</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Participation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Delivered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English paper responses</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English online responses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish paper responses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish online responses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The invitation letter in the mailed packet asked recipients to respond by Friday, October 21, 2016—an arbitrary date selected to instill a sense of some urgency. Mailed surveys typically see most responses returned in the first two weeks. As of November 18, 2016, Texoma residents returned 155 completed surveys. Most responses arrived in October. Some responses continued to arrive in the first weeks of November. Findings reported directly in this report derive from survey responses as of Friday, November 18, 2016. TTI will continue entering data from the few late-return surveys received; the online interactive reports in the next section automatically update.

Table 24 explores the sample response fit compared to the Texoma region. The survey successfully reached the general adult population, with especially strong participation from veterans, individuals with a disability, and seniors. Three Spanish responses mean the sample reflects the language diversity of the region.

Table 24. Sample Fit to Population and Key Demographic Characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Survey Responses</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent Veterans</th>
<th>Percent Disability</th>
<th>Percent Age 65 or over</th>
<th>Other than White/Caucasian</th>
<th>Percent 18+ Speak Spanish (English less than &quot;very well&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38,437</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33,915</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>120,877</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texoma Region</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>193,229</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparable Survey Sample Percentages | 20% | 19% | 51% | 11% | 1.9%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010–2014 American Community Survey Five-Year Estimates

The 155 responses from 2,819 successfully delivered invitations results in a 5.5 percent response rate. The survey sample is statistically valid and has a 90 percent confidence interval with a 7 percent margin of error. In non-technical language, conducting a similar survey would result in similar responses nine out of 10 times. Response values within 7 percent are potentially equal (given the margin of error).

The following sections explore the major findings from the survey. Findings are available in online reports and directly in this report.
Findings: Online Summary Reports
Researchers entered the survey data into SurveyGizmo to enable interactive reporting of findings. Findings reported directly in this report derive from survey responses as of Friday, November 18, 2016. TTI will continue to enter the data from the few late-return surveys received—very few. As a result, the following interactive online reports reflect all responses up to the date when being accessed:

- All Questions All Respondents Combined:
  http://data.surveygizmo.com/r/297775_580a888818e921.65896555
- Three Segmentation Cross Tabulation (Current Rider, Former Rider, Never Use Transit):
  http://data.surveygizmo.com/r/297775_582399985d69ef7.78736852
- Never Use Transit Segment Only:
  http://data.surveygizmo.com/r/297775_5823958802a527.49791191
- Former Transit Rider Segment Only:
  http://data.surveygizmo.com/r/297775_5823952fd8e0e6.97503256
- Current Transit Rider Segment Only:
  http://data.surveygizmo.com/r/297775_582394c1722c60.78592858

Findings: Current Riders, Former Riders, and Never Use Transit
This section discusses survey responses split into three cross-tabulations comparing the opinions of current transit riders (N = 21), former transit riders (N = 21), and respondents indicating they never use transit in their region (N = 112). The three categories are mutually exclusive.

Which transportation problems exist in your area?
The most prominent transportation problem for current riders is not enough public transit (see Figure 11), whereas to former riders and respondents that never use transit in the Texoma region, the most important problem was a lack of adequate sidewalks or bike routes. About 21 percent of persons never using transit indicated that an important problem was that there is no public transit. About 1 in 10 respondents cited inter-town travel as a problem.
How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement? “It is important for public transit to continue to be available to residents of my community.”

Figure 12 compares responses concerning the relative importance of continuing public transit service in the region. Please note that the survey did not provide any additional information and avoided any commentary about the existing supply of transit. Respondents simply marked a response based on their perception of available services and the importance to continue said services. All three respondent segments agree it is important to continue transit service in the region. Current riders unanimously agree it is important to continue service. Five percent of former riders were neutral on the question, but the other 95 percent agreed. Four percent of the never use transit group strongly disagreed that transit was important to continue, but overall, 79 percent of the cohort agreed or strongly agreed that transit was important.
Why is it important to have public transit service?

Figure 13 summarizes responses about why transit is important. A small percentage of respondents indicated they did not think it is important to have transit service. The most prominent reasons for transit to exist in the Texoma region, based on survey responses, are as a travel option for seniors and persons with a disability, as an option for people who cannot afford to drive or who choose not to drive, and as a travel mode assisting individuals in reducing their energy consumption and in protecting air quality.
How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement? “I can easily travel to the places I need to go using my current travel options.”

About 85 percent of the never use transit group and 67 percent of former transit riders agree or strongly agree that they can easily travel to the places they need to go (see Figure 14). A slight majority, 55 percent, of current transit riders feel that they can easily make the trips they need with their current travel options. About 30 percent of current riders disagree or strongly disagree that they can easily travel where they need to go.

![Figure 14. Ease of Travel.](image)

Do you have unmet transportation needs?

About one-third (29 percent) of current and former transit riders indicated that there are times they could not get to where they needed to go (see Figure 15).

![Figure 15. Unmet Transportation Needs.](image)

Respondents who marked “yes” were invited to provide written comments about how transportation providers in the region could meet more of the respondent’s transportation needs.

The conclusion of this chapter of the report discusses written responses to this question and the open-ended final comment question available to all respondents.
Findings: Demographic Characteristics of Cross-Tabulated Responses
This section summarizes the demographic characteristics of the three cross-tabulations compared in the previous section: current transit riders (N=21), former transit riders (N=21), and respondents indicating they never use transit in their region (N=112).

Are you male, female, other?
The gender distribution of survey responses were near even—slightly more women responded (see Figure 16). No respondents marked “Other.”

![Figure 16. Respondent Gender.](image)

What is your age?
The age distribution of survey responses is similar between the three cohorts (see Figure 17).

![Figure 17. Respondent Age.](image)

What is your race, ethnicity?
Current transit riders are more likely to be of a minority race/ethnicity (see Figure 18).
Including yourself, how many people live in your household?
The distribution of household size is similar between the three cohorts, with one exception where the never use transit group has a larger proportion of two-member households (see Figure 19).

What is the combined annual income for all people living in your household?
Figure 20 highlights the household income distribution of survey responses. The most important observation about income and survey responses is that responses do represent low, middle, and high-income levels in each cross-tabulation segment.
Figure 20. Respondent Household Income.

How many working vehicles (cars, trucks, and motorcycles) are available in your household?

Current riders live in households with fewer vehicles than former riders and never use transit respondents (see Figure 21). About 20 percent of current riders live in households with no vehicle, but another 40 percent live in households with two vehicles. Former riders are most likely to live in households with one vehicle. About 75 percent of never use transit respondents live in households with two or more vehicles.

Figure 21. Respondent Household Vehicle Availability.

Which of the following best describes your current employment status?

Figure 22 highlights responses regarding employment and student status. Respondents checked each that applied to their circumstance. Overall, about 40 percent of respondents were retired. About 30 percent were employed full time. A disability prevents about 15 percent of respondents from participating in the workforce.
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Figure 22. Respondent Employment Status.

Have you ever served on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces, Reserves, or National Guard? About 11 percent of the region are civilian veterans age 18 or over (U.S. Census, 2010–2014 American Community Survey Five-Year Estimates). Twenty percent of survey respondents were veterans, and one respondent was actively serving in the military (see Figure 23).

Do you have the following disabilities?
Table 25 summarizes responses regarding five types of disabilities. Nineteen percent of respondents indicated that they had a mobility or orthopedic impairment. In general, a higher proportion of current and former transit riders live with one or more disabilities as compared to the never use transit cohort.
Table 25. Percent of Respondents with a Disability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Disability</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility or orthopedic impairment</strong></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Riders</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former Riders</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never Use Transit</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual impairment</strong></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Riders</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former Riders</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never Use Transit</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deaf or hard of hearing</strong></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Riders</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former Riders</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never Use Transit</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental illness</strong></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Riders</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former Riders</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never Use Transit</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development disability</strong></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Riders</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former Riders</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never Use Transit</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you currently covered by either of the following programs [Medicare, Medicaid]?

Medicare recipients are people age 65 or over and people with certain disabilities. Medicaid recipients are people under age 65 with low income and/or a certain disability. Medicare and Medicaid programs both seek to ensure clients are able to access medical appointments. Table 26 documents respondent participation in both programs.
Table 26. Enrollment in Medicare/Medicaid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicare (People 65 and</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over or people with</td>
<td>Current Riders</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certain disabilities)</td>
<td>Former Riders</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never Use Transit</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid (People under</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 65 with low incomes</td>
<td>Current Riders</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or a disability)</td>
<td>Former Riders</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never Use Transit</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please remember that 51 percent of respondents were age 65 or over, and 19 percent had one or more disabilities that may or may not meet the criteria for these programs.

**Findings: Current Transit Riders**

This section documents findings for questions specifically asked of current transit riders (N=21) about their use of public transit.

Which public transit services have you used in your region in the last year?
Eleven of the 21 current riders indicated using TAPS in the last year. Other responses about services used in the past year included DART (4), Amtrak (2), taxicab (2), Uber (1), and LeFleur (1). Some respondents did not write in which provider they used in the last year.

How often do you use public transit in your region?
About half of current riders use transit less than once per month (see Figure 24). About 14 percent ride five or more days each week, and another 14 percent ride two to four days per week.

![Figure 24. Frequency Using Transit.](image)

Do you rely on public transportation to get to and from your place of employment?
About one in 10 current riders rely on transit to access employment (see Figure 25).
How important is public transportation service to your personal quality of life?
Current riders were asked about their general view on how important transit is for their personal quality of life. Opinions were uneven: 55 percent marked transit as absolutely essential or of high importance, and 35 percent marked transit as low in importance or not important (see Figure 26). The dichotomy is partially explained by responses to the next question about satisfaction with transit services.

How satisfied are you with the public transportation service you use most often?
More than one-third of riders, 37 percent, are not at all satisfied with the transit service they use (see Figure 27). Five percent of riders are completely satisfied with present services.
Figure 27. Satisfaction with Current Services.

Why did you start using public transportation? Figure 28 documents the underlying reasons why responding current riders began to use transit. The most commonly cited reason was to save money (33 percent). Other reasons cited include difficulty or inability to drive, convenience, avoiding driving in poor weather, and no longer having access to a vehicle.

Figure 28. Reasons Started Using Transit.

Please note that the reasons a person first began using transit may or may not be the reasons they continue to do so.

Findings: Written Comments
This section documents written responses to the two open-ended questions in the survey. TTI conducted minor grammatical editing that in no way changed the meaning of the comment.
Do you have unmet transportation needs? If YES, how can transportation providers in your region assist in meeting more of your transportation needs? Please explain:
Eleven respondents, four former riders and seven current riders, provided written explanations about how transportation providers can better meet users’ needs (see Table 27):

Table 27. Comments about Unmet Needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-Tab Segment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>Public transit needs to be cheaper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>I need to be able to get to DART in Dallas every other month. TAPS has stopped going to the DART rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>We used to have TAPS public transit for transportation to school, and two years ago they went out of business, and after that we been having problems, so we need a private transportation for kids to school and going home after school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>I do not drive. I need to go to doctor appointments, go shopping, and sometimes go to Sherman from Denison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>Need to connect Pottsboro, Bonham, and Dallas. I need to get to VA facilities. Local service also needed due to poor personal transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>Better roads with more public transportation for easy access to popular areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>My son needs rides to Children's Medical Center in Plano and Dallas. My car will not make the trip. Please come up with a transportation system to gain access to those locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>I am a senior of 73 years. I live in Grayson County Housing for seniors. I can get appointments to ride TAPS, but I can only go for my doctor appointments. They will not take me to the grocery store or for church or social events. I am stuck in the house 24/7. Family lives far away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>Provide rides for low-income families. Taxis can cost $20 for a 3-mile round trip (pick-up/drop-off). TAPS no longer exists. When TAPS did exist, they could never make a correct schedule and then banned riders for the facility’s fault.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>My husband is disabled and will need public transportation or at least the option of a dependable choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>When I get dizzy, I do not drive. Public transportation takes you safely to a doctor appointment or grocery store; drivers are courteous and friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>Public transit needs to be cheaper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please share any final comments regarding transportation needs in your region in the space below:
About 45 percent of respondents, about 70 individuals, provided written comments about transportation needs in the Texoma region (see Table 28):
Table 28. Final Comment Responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-Tab Segment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>It is hard to make my appointments if the buses are full, and it is hard to get home if there are not any seats. I am scared I will not get back home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>It would be good if we could have accessible buses for the elderly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>We need some kind of transportation to take kids to school or home after school like the service we used to have from TAPS public transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>We need taxi service, public bus transportation, and curb-to-curb service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>I have many friends who are in need of medical care or transportation to get to medical appointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>I sometimes ride to doctor appointments locally. I also sometimes ride transit to Bonham, TX, VA clinics or to get on the Bonham VA bus to Dallas. I never use transit to go shopping or food stores, only doctor visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>I have a car but feel as if this is not the best long-term option (driving my own car).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>A van (bus) service once or twice a week from small town to small town would be good. Our son could not get from McKinney to Gainesville without going to Dallas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>We need better roads and clean, quick, safe, cost-effective public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transit rider</td>
<td>My sons are on Medicaid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>I have used TAPS and DART vans while I was commuting to McKinney and found them quite useful and a great cost savings. Since retiring, I do not need the service. TAPS used to run DFW Express buses to the airport but have since stopped. While I do not have the need that other people might need, every city needs a viable mass transit system. On the topic of bicycles. I use to ride around Sherman for fun and found that drivers are unfriendly to bicycles. I hope it is just from lack of education that a bike is a vehicle also.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>We need public transport badly. There are also two dangerous locations: (1) entrance to Highway 75 from northbound service road and between Houston and Washington streets in Sherman and (2) entrance to northbound service road from Travis in Sherman is improperly marked and very dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>I would have a much happier life if I could move around some. It is depressing and sad. I miss church and movies, going out to eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>Our public transit shut down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>I work at Austin College and a number of our students and staff need public transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Tab Segment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>TAPS is unstable financially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>If I had public transport, I would go more places, work more days. I do not like to drive after sundown. Small RVs, vans would be ideal. Large buses are useless. Sometimes a ride from our town to DFW would be good. Also, please allow service/therapy dogs on rides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>TAPS is no longer in service. I have used TAPS; it was a good system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>Reliable and affordable transportation is needed, such as a regular bus route that has a schedule and routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>It would be great to have public transit for our community, so the elderly would have means of transportation and for young people who need a ride to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former transit rider</td>
<td>Need dependable transportation for elderly, disabled, and disadvantaged. We are “rural.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>I am lucky to have access to a working private vehicle with $$ for gas. However, I would walk and ride my bike more if there were safe bike routes. Also, as I get older, I anticipate using a car less and less and would prefer to have access to public transportation. Many of the people I work with do not have access to a car, which drastically limits their participation in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>Plan moderate growth it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>I am a pediatric healthcare provider in Grayson County. Public transportation and Medicaid transportation do not meet the needs of many of our patients. The waits are incredibly long and what transportation there is does not go where the patients need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>Services from small towns to the big cities for work, shopping, concerts, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>I would love to see daily public transportation to Dallas Love Field and DFW Airport. Also, direct service to nearest DART station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>Right now, I am able to get where I want, but how much longer do any of us old people have where we can be by ourselves?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>Public transportation is a boondoggle. Some of us pay (taxes) and others ride. DART in Dallas blows 400 million a year while riders pay 70 million!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>I am nearly 83 years of age. The time may soon come that I must stop driving. Then what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>To the airport mainly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>TAPS service is very unreliable and does not seem to be a long-term solution based on news stories!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Tab Segment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>Make it SAFE and I will use it. I would travel on a train to Dallas Ft. Worth if it were safe and comfortable. Public Transportation needs to be safe to use. Google DART Transportation Violence. Solve this issue and people will use public transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>We need low-cost taxi service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>I have a son living with me on disability, and it is hard to get to the doctor at times. Some people cannot drive or are disabled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>Need more cycling trails, lanes, community support for cycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>In the future, I will need public transit. In the future, public transportation will be the easiest and safest; I will not drive when I am nervous and afraid of the faster traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>I am a home health nurse, and my patients often need transportation to appointments. TAPS is hard to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>FM 84 intersection is too dangerous for lack of visibility from vegetation (trees) and speeding vehicles at Coushatta Drive and the highway. FM 84 needs to be double-striped, no passing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>I absolutely have neighbors that could use public transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>We used TAPS to pick up our children at local schools. They suspended service due to mismanagement; it was great for parents who worked to ensure that their children arrived home safely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>The lack of public transportation is a real problem for students at Austin College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>The railway that runs from Bonham, TX, all the way to Honey Grove, TX, has not been used in years. I have heard from my daughter that other states have turned their old railways into running paths or walking paths. If that could happen, that would be a pleasure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>I have a car, so I can travel where I need to go, but I would like a cheap alternative to get to DFW airport. Driving and paying for parking can be costly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>Public transportation should only be for people on social security and only for necessary doctor/hospital visits and possibly buying groceries. We cannot afford to bus children and adults all the time, even to Choctaw Casino.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>Even though my husband and I do not currently need public transportation, so many others do need it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>We have a lot of disabled and geriatric population who have few travel options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>Need for transportation to and from medical specialists in Denton and Dallas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Tab Segment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>We had/have a public transportation system here that is in bankruptcy due to lack of use and funding issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>We lost our TAPS program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>We need public transportation, but we do not need 20 passenger buses to carry one or two riders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>I need to get into the city and hate driving at night; too long a trip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>I have no confidence in reorganized TAPS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>TAPS seemed to meet needs but tried to grow too fast. They got in financial trouble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>I wish there were a biking trail or walking trail between Denison and Sherman. See Pullman, WA, to Moscow, ID, for example. They have a great trail, paved but not for motorized vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>After identifying needs, regular, dependable bus routes with stops at integral places are needed. It worked during WWII in small towns. It was shameful that the grant money was wasted last year by using it on new offices, a huge fleet of buses, administrative costs, and inadequate outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>I am able to drive, but foresee that option fading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>No complaints!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>A local bus service that does not require 24-hour notice is needed; our TAPS service currently requires notice. I ride a bicycle exclusively except when weather does not permit (including TX heat). Cannot afford cost of using my truck (registration, license, fuel). Need bike paths in Bonham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>What transportation providers? It is unbelievable that a city (Sherman) of this size has no public bus company now but did have back in the 40s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>Service from Sherman to DFW is needed. It is not feasible to walk within the community. It is difficult/dangerous to travel to Dallas or DFW. We have a large population of seniors who cannot or should not drive, but there are not any public transit options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>I regularly see DART buses in town with no one but the driver onboard. It is a waste of money!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>County roads are in deplorable condition. Gainesville streets are a national joke! State roads are very good. We need safe bike paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>My town, Gainesville, is probably too small to need, or meaningfully use, public transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>More roads!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Tab Segment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>Why ask? Your policies are going to force it upon us!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>Public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>Need to have public transportation available to all residents. Need public transportation for the disabled or those who do not drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>By having transit here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never use transit</td>
<td>It would be nice to have an option if I ever need it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Outreach Materials**

This Appendix contains outreach materials used for the stakeholder survey.

**Invitation Envelope**

```
[Name]
[Address]
[City] [State] [ZIP]
```
Dear Friends of the Texoma Region:

My name is Jonathan Brooks. I am a researcher with Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI), part of the Texas A&M University System. Stakeholders in communities across Texas are meeting to develop 5-year public transit-human services transportation plans for their respective regions. The objective is to ensure a network of transportation services is available to effectively and efficiently get people where they need to go. These plans will identify transportation resources, gaps in services, and solutions for filling these gaps. We are surveying residents in Cooke, Grayson, and Fannin counties as part of our research study to identify unmet transportation needs, explore solutions for meeting needs, and set priorities for your region’s 5-year public transit-human service transportation plan. The survey is made possible with funding from the Texas Department of Transportation, Public Transportation Division.

Participation is voluntary and anonymous. You may elect not to participate by not returning the survey without penalty or loss of any benefits to which you are entitled. If you are age 18 or over, please take about 7 minutes to share your opinion. You can take the survey by completing the enclosed paper copy (postage paid return envelope provided) or by visiting:

TEXOMA.LIVABILITYSURVEY.COM
Please respond by October 21st!

Your answers are confidential and will be combined anonymously with all other responses. If you have any questions or need assistance taking the survey please contact me by email j-brooks@tti.tamu.edu or phone (713) 613-9206.

Thank you for your participation in this research. Have a great, safe day!

Sincerely,

Jonathan Brooks
Assistant Research Scientist
Texas A&M Transportation Institute

For questions about your rights as a research participant, to provide input regarding research, or if you have questions, complaints, or concerns about the research, you may call the Texas A&M University Human Research Protection Program office by phone at 1-979-458-4067, toll free at 1-855-795-8636, or by email at irb@tamu.edu. IRB Protocol #2016-0631.
Estimados amigos de la región Texoma:

Me llamo Jonathan Brooks y soy un investigador del Instituto de Transporte de la Universidad Texas A&M (TTI, por sus siglas en inglés). Este Instituto forma parte del sistema universitario Texas A&M. Los interesados en diversas comunidades en todo Texas se están reuniendo para desarrollar planes de cinco años sobre servicios de transporte público para personas en sus regiones respectivas. El objetivo es garantizar una red de servicios de transporte disponibles para que las personas puedan trasladarse donde lo necesiten de manera eficiente y eficaz. Estos planes identificarán recursos de transporte, carencias en los servicios y soluciones para cubrir esas carencias. Estamos realizando encuestas entre los residentes de los condados de Cooke, Grayson, y Fannin, como parte de nuestro estudio de investigación, para identificar las necesidades de transporte no cubiertas, explorar soluciones para cubrirlas y establecer prioridades para el plan de cinco años de servicios de transporte público para personas en su región. La encuesta está financiada por el Departamento de Transporte de Texas, División de transporte público.

La participación en la encuesta es voluntaria y anónima. Si usted decide no participar, simplemente no envíe la encuesta. No será penalizado ni perderá ninguno de los beneficios a los que usted tenga derecho. Si es usted mayor de 18 años le agradecemos dedique unos 7 minutos para compartir su opinión. Puede completar la encuesta directamente en la copia impresa adjunta (incluímos un sobre con la dirección y franqueo pagado para que nos la devuelva por correo), o puede completarla online visitando:

[QR Code Link]

ESPAÑOL.LIVABILITYSURVEY.COM
Le agradecemos responda antes del 21 de octubre.

Sus respuestas son confidenciales y las combinaremos de forma anónima con las de otras personas. Si tiene preguntas o necesita ayuda para completar la encuesta, no dude en comunicarse conmigo, por correo electrónico dirigido a j-brooks@tti.tamu.edu, o por teléfono al (713) 613-9206. Le agradecemos su participación en este estudio de investigación. Le deseamos un día seguro y agradable.

Atentamente,

Jonathan Brooks
Científico investigador adjunto
Instituto de Transporte de la Universidad Texas A&M

Si tiene preguntas acerca de sus derechos como participante en un estudio de investigación, o desea ofrecer opiniones acerca de la investigación, o tiene dudas, quejas o inquietudes acerca de la investigación, puede comunicarse con la oficina del Programa de protección de seres humanos en la investigación, de la Universidad Texas A&M, llamando al 1-979-458-4067, o al teléfono gratuito 1-855-795-8636, o por correo electrónico a irb@tamu.edu. IRB Protocolo #2016-0631.
Survey Instrument

**Part 1. Public Transportation in Your Area**

What kinds of transportation do you normally use to travel around your area? Check all that apply:

( ) Car, Truck or Van
( ) Bus
( ) Taxi
( ) Rides from a friend or relative
( ) Walking
( ) Bicycle
( ) Other: ___________________________

Which transportation problems exist in your area? Check all that apply:

( ) No public transit
( ) Not enough public transit
( ) No door-to-door (curb-to-curb) transit service
( ) Not enough door-to-door (curb-to-curb) transit
( ) Lack of sidewalks, bike routes
( ) Inaccessible environments (sidewalks, crossings)
( ) No way to get from one town to another
( ) Other: ___________________________

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

"I can easily travel to places I need to go using my current travel options."

( ) Strongly agree  ( ) Agree  ( ) Neutral
( ) Disagree  ( ) Strongly disagree

Do you have unmet transportation needs?

( ) No. I am able to travel where I need to go.
( ) Yes. There are times I cannot get to where I need to go. If YES, How can transportation providers in your region assist in meeting more of your transportation needs? Please explain:

__________________________________

__________________________________

__________________________________

How is it important to have public transit service?

Check up to three:

( ) Reduce energy consumption and protect air quality
( ) Because walking is difficult in our community
( ) Option for those who choose not to drive
( ) Option for seniors and persons with disabilities
( ) Option for people that cannot afford to drive
( ) Option for saving on cost of transportation
( ) I do not think it is important to have transit service

**Part 2. Understanding Who Took Our Survey**

The following questions help us know who responded to our survey. They also help us understand who is using public transportation in your region. Your answers are confidential and will be combined anonymously with all other responses. Please answer every question.

Are you?

( ) Male  ( ) Female  ( ) Other

What is your age?

( ) 18 to 24 years  ( ) 25 to 34 years
( ) 35 to 44 years  ( ) 45 to 54 years
( ) 55 to 64 years  ( ) 65 or over

What is your race, ethnicity? Check all that apply:

( ) Asian, Pacific Islander
( ) Black, African American
( ) Hispanic, Latino(a)
( ) Native American, Alaska Native
( ) White, Caucasian
( ) Other: ___________________________

Continue on back
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Including yourself, how many people live in your household?
( ) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( ) 5 ( ) 6 or more

What is the combined annual income for all people living in your household?
( ) Less than $15,000 ( ) $15,000 to $24,999
( ) $25,000 to $34,999 ( ) $35,000 to $49,999
( ) $50,000 to $74,999 ( ) $75,000 to $99,999
( ) $100,000 or more

How many working vehicles (cars, trucks, and motorcycles) are available in your household?
( ) 0 ( ) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 or more

Which of the following best describes your current employment status? Check all that apply
( ) Employed full-time ( ) Employed part-time
( ) Student ( ) Homemaker
( ) Retired ( ) Unable to work due to a disability
( ) Not employed, looking for work
( ) Other: ____________________________

Part 3. Questions for Public Transit Users

Which public transit services you have used in your region in the last year?
Service you use most often: ____________________________
Other services you use: ____________________________

How important is public transportation service to your personal quality of life?
( ) Absolutely essential ( ) High importance
( ) Average importance ( ) Low importance
( ) Not important

Do you rely on public transportation to get to and from your place of employment?
( ) Yes ( ) No

How satisfied are you with the public transportation service you use most often?
( ) Completely satisfied ( ) Very satisfied
( ) Moderately satisfied ( ) Somewhat satisfied
( ) Not at all satisfied

Why did you start using public transportation?
Check all that apply
( ) I prefer public transportation
( ) I use public transportation to save money
( ) I use public transportation for convenience
( ) I use public transportation to reduce energy consumption and protect air quality
( ) I have a disability that limits my ability to travel other ways
( ) I no longer had access to a vehicle
( ) I could not get a ride from others or did not want to
( ) I could no longer drive or had difficulty driving
( ) I don't like to drive in poor weather (hot, cold, rain, snow)
Parte 1. El transporte público en su área

¿Qué tipo de transporte utiliza normalmente para trasladarse en su región?
Marque todos los que correspondan
( ) Vehículo, camioneta o furgoneta
( ) Autobús
( ) Taxi
( ) Me lleva un amigo o familiar
( ) Voy caminando
( ) Bicicleta
( ) Otro: ____________________________

¿Qué problemas de transporte hay en su región?
Marque todos los que correspondan
( ) No hay transporte público
( ) No hay suficiente transporte público
( ) No hay servicio de transporte puerta a puerta (acera a acera)
( ) No hay suficiente servicio de transporte puerta a puerta (acera a acera)
( ) Falta de aceras, rutas para bicicletas
( ) Entornos inaccesibles (calles, aceras, cruce, etc.)
( ) No hay manera de llegar de una población a otra
( ) Otro: ____________________________

¿Qué tanto concuerda usted con la siguiente declaración?
"Es importante que el transporte público continúe estando disponible para los residentes de mi comunidad."
( ) Totalmente de acuerdo
( ) De acuerdo
( ) Sin opinión
( ) En desacuerdo
( ) Totalmente en desacuerdo

¿Por qué es importante tener servicio de transporte público?
Marque hasta tres respuestas
( ) Reduce el consumo de energía y protege la calidad del aire
( ) Porque es difícil caminar en mi comunidad
( ) Es una alternativa para quienes prefieren no conducir
( ) Es una alternativa para personas menores de edad o personas discapacitadas
( ) Es una alternativa para las personas que no pueden permitirse conducir
( ) Es una alternativa para ahorrar en el costo del transporte
( ) No creo que sea importante tener servicios de transporte público

¿Con qué frecuencia utiliza el transporte público en su región?
( ) 5 o más días a la semana
( ) De 2 a 4 días a la semana
( ) 1 día a la semana
( ) 1 o 2 días al mes
( ) Menos de una vez al mes
( ) Ya no uso transporte público, pero sí solía usarlo
( ) Nunca he usado transporte público en mi región

¿Qué tanto concuerda con la siguiente declaración?
"Puedo trasladarme fácilmente a los lugares que necesito utilizando mis alternativas actuales de transporte."
( ) Totalmente de acuerdo
( ) De acuerdo
( ) Sin opinión
( ) En desacuerdo
( ) Totalmente en desacuerdo

¿Tiene necesidades de transporte sin cubrir?
( ) No. Puedo trasladarme donde necesito ir.
( ) Sí. Hay ocasiones en que no puedo llegar donde necesito ir.
Si respondió Sí, expírale de qué manera los proveedores de transporte en su región pueden ayudar a cubrir mejor sus necesidades de transporte:
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Parte 2. Deseamos saber quién respondió a nuestra encuesta

Las siguientes preguntas nos ayudarán a conocer mejor a las personas que han respondido a nuestra encuesta. También nos ayudarán a comprender mejor quién está utilizando los servicios de transporte público en su región. Sus respuestas son confidenciales y se combinarán de manera anónima con todas las demás respuestas recibidas. Le agradecemos responda a todas las preguntas.

¿Es usted...?
( ) Hombre
( ) Mujer
( ) Otro

¿Qué edad tiene?
( ) 18 a 24 años
( ) 25 a 34 años
( ) 35 a 44 años
( ) 45 a 54 años
( ) 55 a 64 años
( ) 65 o más

¿A qué raza o grupo étnico pertenece?
Marque todos los que correspondan
( ) Asiático, de las Islas del Pacífico
( ) Negro, afroamericano
( ) Hispano, Latino
( ) Indio americano, autóctono de Alaska
( ) Blanco, caucásico
( ) Otro: ____________________________

Continúa en la espalda
¿Incluido usted? ¿Cuántas personas viven en su hogar?

( ) 1  ( ) 2  ( ) 3  ( ) 4  ( ) 5  ( ) 6 o más

¿Cuáles son los ingresos anuales combinados de todas las personas que viven en su hogar?

( ) Menos de $15,000  ( ) $15,000 a $24,999
( ) $25,000 a $34,999  ( ) $35,000 a $49,999
( ) $50,000 a $74,999  ( ) $75,000 a $99,999
( ) $100,000 o más

¿Cuántos vehículos en funcionamiento (autos, camionetas y motocicletas) tienen a su disposición en su hogar?

( ) 0  ( ) 1  ( ) 2  ( ) 3 o más

¿Cuál de los siguientes enunciados describe mejor su situación de empleo actualmente?

Marque todos los que correspondan

( ) Empleado a tiempo completo
( ) Empleado a tiempo parcial
( ) Estudiante
( ) Ama de casa
( ) Retirado
( ) No puedo trabajar debido a una discapacidad
( ) No estoy empleado, estoy buscando trabajo
( ) Otro

¿En qué condado vive?

( ) Cooke  ( ) Grayson  ( ) Fannin

¿Ha servido en el ejército en las fuerzas armadas de los Estados Unidos, en la reserva militar o en la guardia nacional?

( ) No, nunca he servido en el ejército
( ) Sí, ya he completado mi servicio
( ) Sí, todavía estoy en servicio activo

¿Tiene usted alguna de las siguientes discapacidades?

Marque una respuesta en cada línea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discapacidad</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problemas de movilidad o discapacidad ortopédica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problemas de visión</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sordera o problemas de audición</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfermedad mental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discapacidad de desarrollo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Está cubierto actualmente por alguno de estos programas?

Marque una respuesta en cada línea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programa</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicare (para mayores de 65 años o personas con ciertas discapacidades)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid (para menores de 65 años con bajos ingresos y/o alguna discapacidad)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Si tiene comentarios adicionales acerca de sus necesidades de transporte en su región, escriba los a continuación:

________________________
________________________
________________________

**Parte 3. Preguntas para los usuarios de transporte público**

¿Qué servicios de transporte público ha utilizado en su región durante el último año?

Servicio que utiliza con más frecuencia: ______________________

Otros servicios que utiliza: ______________________

¿Qué tan importantes son los servicios de transporte público para su calidad de vida personal?

( ) Absolutamente esenciales  ( ) Muy importantes
( ) Importantes  ( ) Poco importantes
( ) Nada importantes

¿Depende usted del transporte público para ir y volver de su lugar de empleo?

( ) Sí  ( ) No

¿Qué tan satisfecho está usted con el servicio de transporte público que utiliza con más frecuencia?

( ) Completamente satisfecho  ( ) Muy satisfecho
( ) Moderadamente satisfecho  ( ) Algo satisfecho
( ) Nada satisfecho

¿Por qué empezó a usar transporte público?

Marque todos los que correspondan

( ) Prefiero el transporte público
( ) Usa el transporte público para ahorrar dinero
( ) Usa el transporte público por comodidad
( ) Usa el transporte público para reducir el consumo de energía y proteger la calidad del aire
( ) Tengo una discapacidad que me limita para viajar de otro modo
( ) Ya no tenía acceso a un vehículo
( ) No pude, o no quise, ir como pasajero en otro vehículo
( ) Ya no podía conducir o tenía dificultades para conducir
( ) No me gusta conducir cuando hace mal tiempo (demasiado calor, demasiado frío, lluvia, nieve)

¡Hemos terminado! Gracias.
Appendix C. Transit Need Analysis
This section presents analysis on the nexus of demographic transit need data. Comparing needs to supply may reveal potential public transportation service gaps and provide impetus for agencies to seek resources, such as grant funds, to address gaps through some means.

TTI utilized the most recently available data to produce a TNI—American Community Survey Five-Year Estimates from 2011 to 2015. These data are displayed at the census tract level for the Texoma region. The following sections describe each of the five characteristics researchers analyzed.

Population Age 65 and Over
Defined as people age 65 and older, the elderly population has a higher need for public transportation due to an increasing inability to operate an automobile without the assistance of others. Figure 29 illustrates where the population age 65 and over lives within the three-county Texoma region.

In the region, there is a minimum of 6.6 percent and a maximum of 27.3 percent of individuals age 65 or older living in each census tract. This cohort appears to be distributed evenly throughout the region, with higher concentrations in southeastern Cooke County, northern Grayson County, and northern Fannin County, and lower concentrations in the large cities—Bonham, Gainesville, and Sherman.
Figure 29. Percentage of Population Age 65 and Over.
Individuals with Disabilities
The non-institutionalized population with a disability has a higher need for public transportation due to an inability to operate or ride an automobile without the assistance of others. In addition, people with a disability tend to need trips more frequently for medical purposes. Figure 30 illustrates where individuals with disabilities live within the Texoma region.

Between 10.2 percent and 26.9 percent of the population within each census tract are individuals with disabilities. There is a large percentage of individuals with disabilities in Fannin County, northern Grayson County, and eastern Cooke County.
2015 Percentage of the Population with a Disability in the Texoma Region

Sources: Federal Highway Administration, Texas Department of Transportation, U.S. Census Bureau. ACS 2011-2015 5-Year Estimates

Texas A&M Transportation Institute

Figure 30. Percentage of the Population with a Disability.
Veteran Population
Specific funding may be available for transportation and accessibility for individuals designated as veterans in the armed forces. Figure 31 shows the veteran population in the Texoma region.

Between 4.5 percent and 20.9 percent of the population are classified as veterans. Most census tracts are between 11.9–20.9 percent. There is a lower percentage of veterans in the larger cities—Gainesville and Sherman.
Figure 31. Veteran Population.
Households Living in Poverty

Individuals below the poverty level have a higher need for public transportation due to not having the financial means of owning and maintaining an automobile. Figure 32 illustrates where households living in poverty are located within the Texoma region.

Between 4.0 and 35.4 percent of households are living in poverty, with the highest concentration in Fannin County—at least 17 percent in all census tracts. In Cooke County, Gainesville has a high concentration of households living below poverty compared to the rest of the county.
Figure 32. Percentage of the Population in Poverty.
No Vehicle Available
Occupied housing units with no vehicle available have a higher need for public transportation because the residents do not have a vehicle available for means of transportation. As a result, public transportation becomes a more likely option. Figure 33 shows where households without vehicle access are located within the Texoma region.

Between 0.88 and 18 percent of households do not have access to a vehicle. Although households without access to a vehicle are distributed throughout the region, there is a higher concentration in rural areas of Fannin County.
Figure 33. Percentage of Households with No Vehicle Available.
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