

**Tribal Transit
Demographic Need Indicators**

Jon Mielke
David Ripplinger

Small Urban & Rural Transit Center
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota

October 2007

Disclaimer

The contents presented in this report are the sole responsibility of the Small Urban & Rural Transit Center, the Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute, and the authors.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Reservation Populations, Land Areas, and Population Densities	3
2.1 Introduction.....	3
2.2 Chapter Highlights	3
2.3 Geographic Size	4
2.4 Population	9
2.5 Population Density.....	10
3. Demographic Need Indicators.....	14
3.1 Introduction.....	14
3.2 Chapter Highlights	14
3.3 Mobility Dependent Populations	15
3.3.1 Population vs. Population Percentages.....	16
3.3.2 Senior Citizen Populations	17
3.3.3 Disabled Populations	19
3.3.4 Low Income Populations.....	20
3.3.5 School Age Youth Populations	21
3.3.6 Households Without Automobiles	22
3.3.7 Aggregate Mobility Dependent Populations	23
4. Comparisons – Demographic Need Indicators vs Tribal Transit Grant Recipients	28
4.1 Introduction.....	28
4.2 Chapter Highlights	28
4.3 Needy Reservations vs. Grant Recipients	28
5. Summary and Recommendations	36
Appendix A. Tribes With No Census Data Available	37
Appendix B. Demographic Database.....	39

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	Reservation Locations and FTA Regions	6
------------	---	---

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Reservation Land Areas	4
Table 2.2	Land Area Comparisons	5
Table 2.3	Reservation Locations and Land Areas	7
Table 2.4	Largest Reservation Populations.....	8
Table 2.5	Reservation Populations	8
Table 2.6	Population Density Comparisons.....	9
Table 2.7	Densely Populated Reservations vs. Medium Size Cities.....	10
Table 2.8	Reservation Populations Densities.....	11
Table 2.9	Metropolitan Tribes and Reservations.....	11
Table 3.1	Off-Reservation Trust Lands	15
Table 3.2	Concentrations of Senior Citizens	17
Table 3.3	Concentrations of Disabled Individuals.....	18
Table 3.4	Concentrations of Low Income Individuals.....	19
Table 3.5	Concentrations of School Age Youth	20
Table 3.6	Concentrations of No Vehicle Households.....	21
Table 3.7	Aggregate Mobility Depend Populations – Percentage-Based Rank.....	22
Table 3.8	Total Population vs. Mobility Dependent Sub-Populations.....	24
Table 3.9	Aggregate Mobility Dependent Populations – Population-Based Rank	26
Table 4.1	2006 Tribal Transit Applicants Ranked by Percentage-Based Estimate of Need.....	28
Table 4.2	2006 Tribal Transit Applicants Ranked by Small Urban & Rural Population	31

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2005, Congress enacted the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). This highway funding legislation created a new Section 5311c program, which provided funding for Indian tribes and the provision of public transit programs serving small urban and rural (other than urbanized) areas with populations of under 50,000.

This study provides transit-related demographic information concerning the 332 federally recognized Indian tribes in the lower 48 states. Quantifying related needs is an essential component of designing and carrying out public policy related to the new 5311c program.

This demographic data and corresponding mobility needs are analyzed in an attempt to identify areas with large populations or high concentrations of residents who are traditionally considered to be mobility dependent and therefore in need of transit services. The study then compares these areas with a list of tribes that received funding under the new tribal transit Section 5311c program.

All of this study's analysis of demographic data related to mobility dependence is based on small urban and rural populations. Urbanized populations were not considered since the focus of the Section 5311c tribal transit program is, by definition, non-metropolitan.

A review of census data indicates that Indian tribes and reservations are highly dissimilar. Reservations vary greatly in terms of their geographic size, their populations, and their population densities. There are also significant differences in the size of what are traditionally considered mobility-dependent subpopulations.

In terms of size, several reservations are larger than some states, but nearly one-third of all reservations cover less than one square mile. Ten reservations have over 50,000 residents, but the vast majority (256) has fewer than 5,000 residents. Reservation population densities vary greatly, but many of the most densely populated reservations are geographically small. Some reservations are located in or at least partially within metropolitan areas, but most are predominantly small urban and rural.

This study compares and interprets census data related to population subgroups that are traditionally mobility dependent. These subgroups include senior citizens, disabled and low income individuals, school age youth, and households without vehicles. Related demographic assessments are made based on both the actual size of related populations and on the percentage size of each subgroup compared to a reservation's total population.

Taken as a whole, reservations tend to mirror the nation in terms of the size of various mobility-dependent subgroups. Certain reservations do, however, greatly exceed national averages. For example, 16.3% of all U.S. residents are age 60 or over. There are, however, 31 reservations where 20% or more residents are seniors. Similar variances are observed relative to residents with disabilities.

More drastic differences are observed, however, relative to low income, school age, and households with vehicle populations. Regarding low income populations, 12% of all U.S. residents are considered low income; the average for all Indian reservations is 17.3%. Eighteen of the reservations identified in this study have low income populations of 40% or higher.

Concerning school age youth between the ages of five and 19, 20.4% of all U.S. residents fall within this age range. The average of all the reservations in the lower 48 states is comparable at 22.4%. There are, however, 30 reservations where one-third of all residents are school age.

Regarding households without vehicles, 10.3% of all U.S. households do not own an automobile. Despite relatively high poverty levels, only 7.8% of all reservation households in the lower 48 states do not own a motor vehicle. This discrepancy may be related to the highly rural nature of many reservations and the lack of public transportation services. Of 29 reservations in the lower 48 states, 15% or more of all households do not own a motor vehicle.

In terms of the actual size of the various subgroups listed above, there is a high correlation between a reservation's total population and the size of each mobility-dependent subgroup. Not surprisingly, high population reservations have more mobility-dependent residents.

Because of the vast differences in geographic size, population, and population density, comparing reservations based on population and population percentages produce starkly different rankings. It may, therefore, be appropriate to consider both approaches when attempting to make actual assessments of an individual reservation's transit needs or when attempting to compare the needs of one reservation with those of others.

Using census data related to what are traditionally considered mobility-dependent subpopulations, this study attempts to identify Indian reservations with the greatest mobility needs. These rankings are compiled on both an aggregate number and a percentage of population basis. These rankings are then compared to the list of tribes and reservations that received funding during the first year of the Section 5311c tribal transit program.

This comparison reveals that many of the most need-intensive reservations did, in fact, receive first year 5311c tribal transit funding. However, several tribes and reservations with very small non-metropolitan populations also received 5311c funding. It appears that in two instances, reservations with no small urban or rural residents received program funding.

Given the subjective nature of determining mobility needs, it would be inappropriate to discredit the FTA for not funding applications strictly from highly-ranked tribes. Related discrepancies may, however, illustrate that it may be appropriate to consider related demographic data when making future assessments. It may be especially appropriate to give considerable weight to each reservation's small urban and rural, non-metropolitan population during the review process since that is, in fact, the focus of the 5311c program.

1. INTRODUCTION

This study is designed to help identify non-metropolitan, small urban and rural Indian tribes and reservations that have the most significant transit needs. The basis for this determination is an examination of traditional mobility need indicators such as senior citizens, people with disabilities, low income populations, school-age youth, and households without vehicles. Quantifying related needs is an essential component of designing and carrying out public policy related to mobility-enhancing transit programs.

The federal government recognizes 561 tribal entities that are eligible to received funding and services from the Bureau of Indian Affairs by virtue of their status as Indian tribes (70 FR 71194). Of these 561 tribes, 332 are located in the lower 48 states. The remaining 229 are in Alaska.

This study focuses on federally recognized tribes that are located in the lower 48 states. Alaska's 172,000 native residents live in relatively small villages, both in terms of population and land area. The vastness of the state and the remoteness of many of these villages may make it inappropriate to categorize them along with Indian tribes in other portions of the United States. Their situations may warrant separate study.

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) provides funding for Indian tribes to provide transit services in non-metropolitan, small urban and rural areas. This study will focus on reservations that are, by definition, at least partially small urban and rural. As such, they are located, in whole or in part, in non-metropolitan areas that have less than 50,000 residents. As prescribed by federal law, these reservations are eligible to receive Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding that is reserved for non-metropolitan, small urban and rural areas. These funding sources are generally referred to as Section 5311 programs, some of which are available for use exclusively by Indian tribes (5311c).

This study does not differentiate between Oklahoma's tribal statistical areas and traditional Indian reservations. Even though there are some historic and technical differences, these differences are considered insignificant for the purposes of this study.

This report is divided into six chapters. Following this introductory chapter, this report includes the following chapters:

- Reservation Populations, Land Areas, and Population Densities
- Demographic Need Indicators
- Comparisons – Demographic Need Indicators vs. FTA Tribal Transit Grantees
- Summary and Recommendations

Following an introductory paragraph, Chapters 2-5 each contain a section which, in a bullet format, summaries that chapter's highlights. This presentation is intended to give readers a preview of the contents of the chapter and to make it easier to refer back to the proper chapter to located desired information.

It is hoped this study will provide information that will further facilitate the effective expenditure of federal transit monies dedicated to tribal transit in non-metropolitan areas. It is important to note, however, that such expenditures cannot be made strictly on the outcome of statistical analysis. Such analysis may provide guidance to the deliberative process, but ultimately, such decisions must be based on each tribe's unique situation and subsequent subjective determinations. The analytical analysis

provided by this study may, however, assist policy makers in their deliberations and help them focus on areas of greatest need and potential benefits.

The preparation of traditional transit development plans typically involves a gap analysis. This analysis consists of a comparison of local mobility needs versus available means of personal transportation and the development of recommendations aimed at satisfying unmet needs.

Need identification is the most difficult component in this process. Some needs can be identified via a review of demographic data, but some are far more difficult to quantify and involve approaches such as citizen and user surveys, interviews with advocacy groups and social service providers, public input meetings, etc.

The artful and subjective nature of much of the need identification process requires that it be done on a case-by-case basis. It is important, however, that this process not overlook mobility-related demographic information.

This study focuses on demographic data that is often the starting point of need identification. While this study's findings should not be the final word on areas of greatest need, they will hopefully be a valuable tool in determining where future transit monies should be expended.

2. RESERVATION POPULATIONS, LAND AREAS, AND POPULATION DENSITIES

2.1 Introduction

An area's transit needs and the ease or difficulty associated with providing related services is closely linked to the area's geographic size, its population, and population density. Like states, Indian reservations are very diverse in terms of their geographic size, population, and population density. Many reservations are less than one square mile in size while others have land areas of several thousand square miles. Similarly, some reservations have large populations while others are quite small. Population densities also vary greatly from one reservation to another. Each of these factors may impact the need for and the ability to provide transit services to reservation residents.

This chapter presents and analyzes population, land area, and density information on Indian reservations in the lower 48 states. While this information is not necessarily reflective of the need for transit services, it does have a bearing on the ease or difficulty of providing such services.

This chapter's discussions concerning population densities will include a determination concerning the metropolitan vs. small urban and rural nature of each reservation. This determination is crucial since Section 5311 and 5311c transit funding is not, by definition, available to metropolitan areas.

Before proceeding further, it should be noted that the Census Bureau does not publish decennial data for approximately 24 federally-recognized tribes in the lower 48 states. This lack of data may be tied to a tribe's lack of land or the fact that the tribe became recognized after the most recent census. Whatever the case, the analysis in this and subsequent chapters is limited to tribes for which the U.S. Census Bureau compiles demographic data. Tribes that are not a part of the Census Bureau's demographic data base are identified in Appendix A. Tribes that are in the Bureau's extensive data base are identified, along with related demographic information, in Appendix B. Appendix C presents a narrative description of the column headings used in Appendix B.

It should also be noted that some tribes in Appendix B share lands with other tribes and, in some cases, tribes are listed more than once because they have multiple reservations. The data on tribes with shared reservations is identical for each tribe that is domiciled on that particular reservation; in some instances this may involve several tribes. For these reasons, the number of tribes listed in Appendix B does not coincide with the number of federally-recognized tribes.

2.2 Chapter Highlights

- The Census Bureau collects detailed demographic data concerning reservations.
- Of all reservations, 29.3% are less than one square mile in size.
- Twenty-four reservations are larger than the state of Rhode Island.
- The largest reservations, in terms of land area, tend to be in the Midwest and southwestern states.
- Six reservations have more than 100,000 residents.
- Several of the most populated reservations are located in Oklahoma.
- Two hundred fifty-six reservations have fewer than 5,000 residents.
- There are wide variations concerning population densities on reservations.
- Six reservations are located totally within metropolitan areas.
- Forty-seven reservations are located partially within metropolitan areas.

2.3 Geographic Size

As indicated earlier, many reservations are extremely small and have land areas of less than one square mile. Conversely, some reservations have land areas larger than some states. These factors and each reservation's location relative to medical and social services, shopping, employment opportunities, etc. impact the way transit services are provided.

Appendix B identifies each of the federally-recognized Indian entities in the lower 48 states for which census data is collected and includes data concerning their physical size. A review of this data highlights the fact that it is inappropriate to stereotype reservations in terms of their size. In fact, the reservations listed in Appendix B range in size from less than one square mile to over 22,000 square miles.

Table 2.1 stratifies reservations into categories based on their surface areas. As this table indicates, nearly 30% of all Indian reservations in the lower 48 states have a land area of less than one square mile, and nearly 20% have less than 10 square miles; another 21% of all reservations have between 10 and 100 square miles of land area. On the other end of the spectrum, nearly 20% of all reservations have land areas between 100 and 1,000 square miles, and over 10% have land areas in excess of 1,000 square miles.

Table 2.1 Reservation Land Areas

Square Miles	# of Reservations	% of Reservations
Less than 1	106	29.3%
1 – 9.99	69	19.1%
10 – 49.99	52	14.4%
50 – 99.99	23	6.4%
100 – 499.99	53	14.6%
500 – 999.99	18	5.0%
1,000 or more	41	11.3%

As noted earlier, the reservation listing in Appendix B and the related presentations in Table 2.1 include data on over 360 reservations, well in excess of the 332 federally-recognized tribes in the lower 48 states. This occurs because several tribes have multiple, disconnected land tracts and because some tribes share reservation areas with other tribes. The lists in Appendix B and corresponding presentations herein are based on each of these individual and shared tracts of land; this is also the manner in which they are presented by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Table 2.2 identifies the nation's largest Indian reservations and compares their size to the smallest states. As this table illustrates, each of the 24 reservations listed covers more square miles than the state of Rhode Island. The nation's largest reservation, the Navajo Nation in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah, is larger than each of the nine states listed. As Table 2.2 illustrates, the nation's largest reservations tend to be in the midwest and southwestern states.

Table 2.2 Land Area Comparisons

Reservation / State	Total Square Miles
Navajo Nation (AZ, NM, & UT)	22,174
Maryland	12,407
Hawaii	10,932
Choctaw Nation (OK)	10,613
Massachusetts	10,555
Vermont	9,615
Hew Hampshire	9,351
New Jersey	8,722
Cheyenne-Arapaho Nation (OK)	8,121
Chickasaw Nation (OK)	7,285
Ute Tribe (UT)	6,768
Cherokee Nation (OK)	6,702
Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Fort Sill Apache OTSA (OK)	6,360
Connecticut	5,544
Creek Nation (OK)	4,678
Tohono O'odham Tribe (AZ)	4,453
Cheyenne River Sioux (SD)	4,260
Standing Rock Sioux (ND & SD)	3,572
Crow Tribe (MT)	3,562
Wind River (WY)	3,465
Fort Peck (MT)	3,289
Pine Ridge (SD & NE)	3,159
San Carlos Apache (AZ)	2,911
Fort Apache (AZ)	2,628
Hopi Reservation (AZ)	2,531
Delaware	2,489
Blackfeet Reservation (MT)	2,371
Osage Nation (OK)	2,251
Confederated & Yakima (WA)	2,153
Confederated Tribes (WA)	2,117
Flathead Reservation (MT)	1,938
Hualapai Reservation (AZ)	1,590
Rhode Island	1,545

Figure 2.1 presents a national map that illustrates where Indian reservations are located within the lower 48 states. This map also identifies the Federal Transit Administration's ten administrative regions. This map also shows the number of reservations in each region and the average size of those reservations.



Figure 2.1 Reservation Locations and FTA Regions

Table 2.3 presents a further analysis of the number and size for reservations by FTA region. As this table and Figure 2.1 illustrate, reservations in the eastern United States are relatively few in number and small in size while midwest and southwestern reservations tend to be larger and more plentiful. Pacific coast states have a significant number of reservations, but they are relatively small compared to their midwest and southwestern counterparts. As Table 2.3 indicates, 13 reservations straddle FTA regional boundaries.

Table 2.3 Reservation Locations and Land Areas

FTA Region	Number of Reservations	Cross Boundary Reservations	Total Area (Sq. Miles)	Average Size (Sq. Miles)
1	7	0	58	8
2	9	0	231	26
3	0	0	0	0
4	8	0	249	31
5	35	0	4,908	140
6	63	3	64,370	1,021
7	9	0	1,063	118
8	28	3	44,033	1,573
9	142	5	32,947	232
10	43	2	9,346	217
Total	344	13	157,205	457

As indicated earlier, the geographic size of a reservation is not necessarily indicative of its residents' need for transit services. It may, however, impact the ease or difficulty of providing such services. Very large reservations may experience significant challenges when it comes to designing and operating transit systems. Similarly, small reservations may face similar difficulties if they are located a long distance from regional centers that are their primary source of medical and social services, shopping, employment, etc.

2.4 Population

As is the case with land area, there are wide variations regarding reservation populations. By national standards, however, reservations tend to have relatively few residents. According to the 2000 census, only 36 reservations have populations of more than 10,000 people, and only eight have more than 100,000 residents. By comparison, there are 238 cities in the United States that have more than 100,000 residents.

Table 2.4 identifies the eight reservations that have over 100,000 residents. It should also be noted that these population totals include both native and non-native residents.

Table 2.4 Largest Reservation Populations

Reservation	Population
Muscogee-Creek Nation (OK)	704,565
Cherokee Nation (OK)	462,327
Chickasaw Nation (OK)	277,416
Choctaw Nation (OK)	224,472
Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Fort Sill Apache OTSA (OK)	193,260
Cheyenne-Arapaho (OK)	157,867
Navajo Nation (AZ, NM, UT)	155,214
Citizen Potawatomi Nation (OK)	106,624

The population of Indian reservations declines rapidly from those listed in Table 2.4. As Table 2.5 illustrates, the vast majority of Indian reservations has fewer than 5,000 residents, and only 10 have more than 50,000 residents. By comparison, in 2000 there were 601 cities in the United States with over 50,000 residents.

Table 2.5 Reservation Populations

Reservation Population	# of Reservations
100,000 or more	8
50,000 to 99,999	2
25,000 to 49,999	9
10,000 to 24,999	32
5,000 to 9,999	29
Less than 5,000	256

As is the case with geographic size, reservation populations are not necessarily indicative of mobility needs. Resident numbers do, however, ultimately influence system designs and operating costs.

2.5 Population Density

Population density is perhaps more important than either the geographic size or overall population when it comes to the provision of transit services. As was the case with previous discussions, Indian reservations cannot be stereotyped in terms of population density.

As indicated in the previous sections, the Navaho Nation is the country's largest, and one of the most populated, reservations. It is also important to note, however, that it has a population density of only seven residents per square mile. This density is not unlike many of the large reservations discussed earlier. This occurrence presents some significant challenges when it comes to the provision of transit services.

Table 2.6 presents population density information on the nation's largest Indian reservations, both in terms of land area and population, and compares them with select states. As this table illustrates, in many instances large reservations have population densities similar to sparsely populated states. Even the majority of the most populated Indian reservations have population densities comparable to relatively rural states.

Table 2.6 Population Density Comparisons

Reservation / State	Area (sq. mi.)	Pop. / sq. mi.
Geographically Large Reservations		
Navajo Nation (AZ, NM, & UT)	22,174	7
Choctaw Nation (OK)	10,613	21
Cherokee-Arapaho Nation (OK)	8,121	19
Chickasaw Nation (OK)	7,285	38
Ute Tribe (UT)	6,768	3
Cherokee Nation (OK)	6,702	69
Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Fort Sill		
Apache OTSA (OK)	6,360	30
Creek Nation (OK)	4,678	152
Tohono O'odham Tribe (AZ)	4,453	2
Cheyenne River Sioux (SD)	4,260	2
Standing Rock Sioux (ND & SD)	3,572	2
Crow Tribe (MT)	3,562	2
Wind River (WY)	3,465	7
Fort Peck (MT)	3,289	3
Pine Ridge (SD & NE)	3,159	5
San Carlos Apache (AZ)	2,911	3
Fort Apache (AZ)	2,628	5
Hopi Reservation (AZ)	2,531	3
Blackfeet Reservation (MT)	2,371	4
Osage Nation (OK)	2,251	20
Confederated & Yakima (WA)	2,153	15
Confederated Tribes (WA)	2,117	4

Table 2.6 continued

Most Populated Reservations		
Creek Nation (OK)	704,565	152
Cherokee Nation (OK)	462,327	69
Chickasaw Nation (OK)	277,416	38
Choctaw Nation (OK)	224,472	21
Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Fort Sill		
Apache OTSA (OK)	193,260	30
Cheyenne-Arapaho (OK)	157,867	19
Navajo Nation (AZ, NM, UT)	155,214	7
Citizen Potawatomi Nation (OK)	106,624	96
Select States		
Alaska	571,951	1
Wyoming	97,100	5
North Dakota	68,976	9
Nebraska	76,872	22
Maine	30,862	41
Vermont	9,615	66
Kentucky	39,728	102
North Carolina	48,711	165

As indicated earlier, over 100 of the federally-recognized tribes in the lower 48 states have land areas of one square mile or less. A review of the data in Appendix B indicates these are typically the reservations that have the highest population densities.

Conversely, only three of the Indian tribes that have land areas greater than one square mile have a population density that approaches that of cities with populations in the 40,000-50,000 range. These tribes and a sampling of representative cities are presented in Table 2.7.

Table 2.7 Densely Populated Reservations vs. Medium Size Cities

Reservation / City	Population	Area (sq. Mi.)	Pop. / sq. mi.
Littleton, CO	40,340	13.5	2,984
Manhattan, KS	44,831	15.0	2,984
Apple Valley, MN	45,527	17.1	2,625
Olympia, WA	42,514	16.7	2,544
Bismarck, ND	55,532	26.9	2,065
Middleton, OH	51,605	25.7	2,011
Pascua Yaqui Tb. (Tucson)	3,315	1.9	1,777
Puyallup Tribe (Tacoma)	41,335	28.5	1,449
Flagstaff, AZ	52,894	63.6	832
Enid, OK	47,045	73.8	636
Suquamish Tribe (Seattle)	6,536	11.7	559
Palm Springs, CA	42,807	94.3	454

Based upon the fact that even the most densely populated reservations, with land areas in excess of one square mile, have population densities less than cities with approximately 50,000 residents, it seems appropriate that Congress chose to treat them in a manner consistent with small urban and rural areas in terms of transit funding.

Table 2.8 categorizes Indian reservations based on their population density. As this table illustrates, 24 reservations have 1,000 or more residents per square mile and another 23 have between 500 and 999 residents per square mile. Another 87 reservations have between 100 and 499 residents per square mile. As discussed earlier and as presented in Appendix B, more densely populated reservations tend to have relatively small land areas.

Table 2.8 Reservation Population Densities

Residents / Sq. Mile	# of Reservations.
1,000 or more	24
500 to 999	23
100 to 499	87
50 to 99	42
25-to 49	35
10 to 24	52
5 to 9	32
Less than 5	42

As discussed earlier, 5311c tribal transit funding is not available for use to provide service strictly within a metropolitan area. Using the data presented in Appendix B and map overlay techniques, SURTC researchers determined that there are only six reservations in the lower 48 states that are strictly metropolitan in nature. These tribes and reservations are identified in Table 2.9.

Table 2.9 Metropolitan Tribes and Reservations

Tribe	Reservation (Location)
Seminole Tribe	Coconut Creek Reservation (Florida)
	Hollywood Reservation (Florida)
	Seminole Trust Land (Florida)
	Tampa Reservation (Florida)
Redding Rancheria	Redding Rancheria (California)
Yavapai-Prescott Tribe	Yavapai-Prescott Reservation (Arizona)

In addition to the reservations identified in Table 2.8, another 47 reservations in the lower 48 states are partially located in metropolitan areas. The non-metropolitan areas of these reservations are eligible for funding under the 5311c tribal transit program. Their proximity to a metropolitan area may impact the type of transit services that they require and the amount of coordination that is possible with other local service providers. These partially metropolitan reservations are identified in Appendix B.

Other than the previously discussed metropolitan and partially metropolitan reservations, all the reservations listed in Appendix B are situated entirely in small urban and rural areas. As is the case with non-Indian small urban and rural areas, some of their transit needs include local transportation while others involve travel to the nearest regional center for medical and social services, employment, shopping, etc. In some cases, these regional centers may be located over 100 miles away from the reservation.

The following chapter uses census data to identify reservations with high concentrations of subpopulations that are traditionally transit dependent. This data may be a useful determinant when it comes to selecting recipients of scarce tribal transit funds.

3. DEMOGRAPHIC NEED INDICATORS

3.1 Introduction

As indicated in the preceding chapters, there are 332 federally-recognized Indian tribes in the lower 48 states. The U.S. Census Bureau compiles census data on the vast majority of these reservations. This chapter presents demographic information on reservations, primarily concerning factors that are traditionally associated with mobility-dependent segments of the population.

At the outset, it should be noted that, in most instances, a reservation is synonymous with a particular tribe, and the data presented in Appendix B relates to one tribe and its reservation. In some cases, however, tribes have multiple reservations and in other instances, two or more tribes share a single reservation. It should also be noted that the data in Appendix B is limited to reservations and does not include off-reservation tribal members and tribal lands.

Each reservation will be ranked compared to all other reservations in each of the population segments discussed in this chapter. Aggregate mobility dependent rankings will be determined by combining each reservation's ranking in each of the categories discussed.

It is important to recognize that the needs indicators discussed in this chapter are not synonymous with unmet needs or ridership that might actually result if transit services are provided. Concerning needs indicators vs. unmet needs, this chapter's needs analysis looks strictly at census data concerning population subgroups that traditionally require transit services. It does not, however, consider transit services that might actually be in place. To the extent that some tribes are already providing transit services, the potential needs identified in this chapter may already have been satisfied.

It is also important to note that identified needs do not necessarily translate into actual demand and ridership. The mobility dependent populations identified in this chapter should not, therefore, be considered as a surrogate for system users. They are, however, an important starting point in identifying mobility needs, demands for service, and eventual ridership. Related federal Transit Research Cooperative Program studies have been undertaken and are ongoing.

Finally, it should also be noted that the subgroup populations identified in this chapter cannot be combined to determine the actual size of each reservation's mobility dependent population. This limitation results since many individuals may be a part of multiple subgroups (e.g. a low income, disabled senior citizen without an automobile). It is, however, assumed that such occurrences may be observed universally and that tribe-to-tribe comparisons still produce valid comparisons of need within the universe of tribes.

3.2 Chapter Highlights

- Mobility-dependent populations traditionally include senior citizens, disabled individuals, low income individuals, school age youth, and households without automobiles.
- Mobility needs analysis may consider both aggregate populations and relative percentages.
- There is a high correlation between aggregate population and the size of each mobility dependent subgroup.
- Taken as a whole, reservations tend to mirror the nation in terms of the size of various mobility dependent subgroups. Certain reservations do, however, greatly exceed national averages.

- There is a stark difference in outcomes if need determinations are based on aggregate populations or on a percentage of population basis. It may, therefore, be appropriate to give consideration to both approaches.

3.3 Mobility Dependent Populations

Certain segments of the population are typically more inclined to be mobility impaired and therefore transit dependent. These segments include the following:

- Senior citizens (age 60 and over)
- Disabled persons
- Low income persons
- School age youth (ages 5-19)
- Households without automobiles

The U.S. Census Bureau compiles related data on various geographic areas, including Indian reservations. Appendix B identifies each of the Indian reservations in the lower 48 states and presents corresponding census data concerning each reservation's population in each of the population subgroups listed above.

As indicated earlier, no attempt is made to sum the various subpopulation data in Appendix B in an attempt to determine a total population of mobility-dependent residents on each reservation. Doing so would be inappropriate since many individuals may be included in multiple categories and because not all of the individuals reflected in each category are mobility impaired. It is assumed that such occurrences occur universally and that reservation comparisons are, therefore, appropriate.

Using the population data presented in Appendix B, each reservation is ranked in each category relative to all the other reservations. These individual rankings are then compiled to develop aggregate rankings that are summed to identify which reservations have the largest populations of mobility-impaired residents.

The comparisons presented in the remaining subsections of this chapter are compiled on both an actual population and a percentage basis. Presenting information on strictly a population basis would naturally highlight the needs of the reservations with the largest populations. Conversely, basing comparisons strictly on percentages might skew rankings toward reservations with relatively small populations but high percentages within certain subgroups. It is therefore deemed appropriate to consider both actual populations and population percentages.

It should be noted that reservations that receive relatively low rankings are not necessarily without needs. This assessment merely suggests that demographic conditions are right on certain reservations to suggest that their needs may be more significant.

As indicated earlier, it should also be noted that this analysis does not suggest that residents' mobility needs are going unmet if a reservation is highly ranked in any of the categories present. In some instances, reservations may have transit services in place that are satisfying many of these residents' mobility needs.

Before proceeding with a review of mobility-related demographic data, it should also be noted that the analysis presented in the following subsections is based on census data that pertains strictly to Indian reservations and Oklahoma Tribal Statistical Areas. In many instances, however, tribes have trust land located outside a statistical area or a reservation's geographic boundaries. Some of this land may be

located contiguous to or otherwise near the statistical area or reservation, but in some cases it may be hundreds of miles away.

Table 3.1 identifies Indian tribes that have off-reservation tribal trust lands with more than 500 residents. As indicated above, in some instances these lands and residents may be located very near their corresponding reservation. In such instances, these residents might utilize tribal transit services.

Table 3.1 Off-Reservation Trust Lands – Populations Exceeding 500

Reservation (State)	Land Area (sq. mi.)	Population
Grand Traverse (MI)	1	545
Mississippi Choctaw (MS)	8	879
Navajo Nation (AZ, NM, & UT)	1,904	25,248
Nooksack (WA)	4	547
Pine Ridge (SD & NB)	310	1,453
Rock Boy's (MT)	83	1,071
Rosebud (SD)	582	1,419
Sault Ste. Marie (MI)	1	1,322
Turtle Mountain (ND, SD, & MT)	165	2,516

Including off-reservation residents in the calculations discussed in the remainder of this chapter would alter related tribal need rankings. However, since it is impossible to readily determine the location of these lands relative to each reservation, the determination was made to use strictly census data that was specific to reservations and not to include tribal trust land residents. In cases such as the Turtle Mountain Reservation in north central North Dakota, where most off-reservation trust lands are immediately adjacent to the reservation, including these populations would have moved the reservation up significantly in several rankings.

3.3.1 Population vs. Population Percentages

Appendix B contains an extensive data base on Indian tribes and reservations. This database includes demographic information related to both total populations and the size of the various subgroups discussed earlier. Statistical analysis of this data shows there is a very high correlation between total population and the size of each subgroup. Therefore, reservations with the largest populations would expectedly have the largest numbers of senior citizens, disabled residents, etc.

Based on these correlations and the fact that these subgroups typically have the greatest needs for transit services, it would be relatively easy to distribute scarce transit assistance funds if the goal was to give it to tribes and reservations with the most transit dependent residents – the FTA would simply grant the money to the reservations with the most residents. This approach would not, however, be fair to tribes and reservations that have smaller populations but significantly higher relative concentrations of transit dependent residents.

It is, therefore, appropriate to identify transit dependent populations based on both aggregate numbers and as a percentage of the total population. Given the correlation that exists between total population and the number of seniors, disabled, etc., this chapter will not go into further discussions concerning the size of these subgroups on various reservations. Suffice it to say that, in most instances, the most populous reservations have the largest populations of what are traditionally considered transit dependent subpopulations.

The remaining sections of this chapter will, therefore, be devoted to identifying reservations that have the greatest concentrations, on a percentage basis, of transit dependent subpopulations. This information, in concert with actual total populations, may be helpful when identifying appropriate recipients for scarce tribal transit monies.

Prior to ranking reservations based on the percentage size of various transit dependent subpopulations, it should be pointed out that SURTC researchers made a subjective decision to limit ranking considerations based on non-metropolitan, small urban and rural populations (vs. total population). This determination was made given the fact that FTA 5311c monies are intended for use related to the provision of transit services that benefit of non-metropolitan areas.

It was also decided that ranking considerations would be dependent on a reservation having at least 500 small urban and rural residents. Approximately 180 reservations have at least 500 small urban and rural residents.

A similar analysis was also run based on as few as 250 small urban and rural residents, but in some cases, the number of residents in some categories was so small that a change of only a very limited number of residents in any category would result in significant changes in related percentage rankings.

Limiting consideration based on the number of small urban and rural residents was also justified by the fact that small transit systems need a critical mass of residents to justify their existence. This is not to say that such small populations are without transit needs, but it may be more appropriate to address these needs with nontraditional approaches such as friends and family ridesharing or vanpooling.

With these qualifiers in mind, the following subsections rank reservations based on the percentage size of various transit-dependent subpopulations. In each case, the top 25 reservations in terms of percentage concentrations are listed. Each listing also includes the actual number of related residents on each reservation. As eluded to earlier, some very small reservations rank quite highly on various lists. Even a change of only a few residents would have a significant impact on such a reservation's percentage ranking. Therefore, a cut-off of even more than 500 small urban and rural residents might be worthy of consideration.

3.3.2 Senior Citizen Populations

SURTC researchers analyzed the data in Appendix B to identify which reservations, on a percentage basis, have the most senior citizen residents. The reservations with the highest concentrations of seniors are identified in Table 3.2.

As Table 3.2 indicates, at least 20% of the population of each of the reservations listed is 60 years of age or older. The average size of the senior population for all the reservations listed in Appendix B is 17.0%, a size that is quite comparable to the national average of 16.3%.

Some reservations listed in Table 3.2 have sizable senior populations, but many are relatively small. As indicated earlier, a reservation needed to have a small urban and rural population of at least 500 to be considered in this comparison.

Table 3.2 Concentrations of Senior Citizens

Reservation (State)	Senior Population	% Seniors
1. Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla (CA)	10,310	48%
2. Cocopah Tribe (AZ)	484	47%
3. Swinomish Indians (WA)	936	35%
4. Seneca-Cayuga Tribe (OK)	1,218	30%
5. Peoria Tribe of Indians (OK)	1,316	27%
6. Mille Lacs Band of Chippewa (MN)	1,188	26%
7. Samish Indian Tribe (WA)	8,601	26%
8. Fort Mojave Indian Tribe (AZ)	206	25%
9. Aroostook Band of Micmac Indians (ME)	2,347	24%
10. Miami & Peoria Tribes (OK)	1,039	24%
11. Muscogee (Creek) & Seminole Area (OK)	492	23%
12. Kickapoo Tribe (KS)	1,019	23%
13. Lac du Flambeau Chippewa (WI)	663	22%
14. Nez Perce Tribe (ID)	3,955	22%
15. Seminole Nation (OK)	4,912	22%
16. Kaw Nation (Kaw OTSA –OK)	1,317	22%
17. Kaw & Ponca (Joint Use – OK)	5,977	21%
18. Pueblo of Cochiti (NM)	322	21%
19. Keweenaw Bay Indian Community (MI)	744	21%
20. Pueblo of Taos (NM)	940	21%
21. Chickasaw Nation (OK)	57,629	21%
22. Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate (SD)	2,140	21%
23. Seneca Nation (NY)	1,397	21%
24. Choctaw Nation (OK)	45,938	20%
25. Stockbridge Munsee Community (WI)	312	20%
26. Yurok Tribe (CA)	225	20%
27. Sac & Fox Nation (OK)	11,342	20%
28. Caddo, Delaware, & Wichita and Affiliated Tribes (OK)	2,901	20%
29. Colorado River Indian Tribes (CO)	1,818	20%
30. Pawnee Nation (OK)	3,259	20%
31. White Earth Band of Chippewa (MN)	1,803	20%

3.3.3 Disabled Populations

SURTC researchers also analyzed the data in Appendix B to identify which reservations, on a percentage basis, have the most disabled residents. The reservations with the highest concentrations of disabled individuals are identified in Table 3.3.

All reservations listed in Table 3.3 have disabled populations of at least 8%. This compares to a national average of 7.7%. On an aggregate basis, all the reservations listed in Appendix B have a disabled population of 6.2%. As indicated earlier, a reservation needed to have a small urban and rural population of at least 500 to be considered in Table 3.3's comparison.

Table 3.3 Concentrations of Disabled Individuals

Reservation (State)	Disabled Population	% Disabled
1. Seminole Tribe (Brighton – FL)	116	20%
2. Pueblo of Sandia (NM)	772	17%
3. Crow Creek Tribe (SD)	372	17%
4. Tohono O'odham Nation (AZ)	1,246	12%
5. White Mountain Apache (AZ)	1,438	12%
6. Miami & Peoria Tribes (OK)	480	11%
7. Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians (CA)	437	11%
8. Cocopah Tribe (AZ)	108	11%
9. Ottawa Tribe (OK)	636	10%
10. Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians (CA)	1,985	9%
11. Pueblo of Santo Domingo (NM)	285	9%
12. Seminole Nation (OK)	2,016	9%
13. Quapaw Tribe (OK)	643	9%
14. Pueblo of Picuris (NM)	151	8%
15. Eastern Band of Cherokee (NC)	677	8%
16. Confederated Tribes of Yakima (WA)	2,626	8%
17. Hualapai Indian Tribe (AZ)	112	8%
18. Navajo Nation, Arizona (NM & UT)	12,817	8%
19. Choctaw Nation (OK)	18,402	8%
20. Iowa Tribe (OK)	491	8%
21. Yurok Tribe (CA)	88	8%
22. Otoe-Missouria Tribe (OK)	62	8%
23. Santa Rosa Indian Community (CA)	41	8%
24. Mississippi Band of Choctaw (MS)	338	8%
25. Jena Band of Choctaw (LA)	4,661	8%
26. Muscogee - Seminole (Joint Use – OK)	163	8%
27. Quechan Tribe of Fort Yuma (AZ & CA)	184	8%
28. Aroostook Band of Micmac (MA)	750	8%

3.3.4 Low Income Populations

The data in Appendix B was also analyzed to identify which reservations, on a percentage basis, have the largest low income populations. The reservations with the highest concentrations of low income individuals are identified in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4 Concentrations of Low Income Individuals

Reservation (State)	Low Income Pop.	% Low Income
1. Crow Creek Sioux (SD)	1,220	55%
2. Oglala Sioux (SD)	7,234	51%
3. San Carlos Apache (AZ)	4,724	50%
4. Gila River Community (AZ)	5,625	50%
5. Lower Brule Sioux (SD)	653	48%
6. White Mountain Apache (AZ)	5,949	48%
7. Rosebud Sioux (SD)	4,294	47%
8. Sac & Fox of the Mississippi (IA)	288	47%
9. Zuni Tribes (NM)	3,540	46%
10. Northern Cheyenne (MT)	2,025	45%
11. Tohono O'odham Nation (AZ)	4,742	45%
12. Havasupai Tribe (AZ)	223	44%
13. Santa Rosa Indian Community (CA)	227	44%
14. Navajo Nation, Arizona (NM & UT)	65,001	42%
15. Ute Mountain Tribe (CO, NM, & UT)	692	41%
16. Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla (CA)	1,698	41%
17. Pala Band of Luiseno Mission Indians (CA)	637	40%
18. Hopi Tribe (AZ)	2,702	40%
19. Standing Rock Sioux (ND & SD)	3,256	39%
20. Red Lake Band of Chippewa (MN)	2,024	39%
21. Pueblo of Santo Domingo (NM)	1,225	39%
22. Fort Belknap Indian Community (MT)	1,142	39%
23. Cheyenne River Sioux (SD)	3,229	38%
24. Spirit Lake Sioux (ND)	1,680	38%
25. Turtle Mountain Chippewa (ND)	2,165	37%
26. Passamaquoddy Tribe (ME)	238	37%
27. Chippewa-Cree Indians (MT)	593	37%

All the reservations listed in Table 3.4 have low income populations of at least 37%. The national average is 12% and the average of all the reservations listed in Appendix B is 17.3%, well above the national average. Approximately 80% of all the reservations listed in Appendix B have a poverty level that exceeds the national average.

As with earlier comparisons, a reservation needed to have a small urban and rural population of at least 500 to be considered in this table's comparison.

3.3.5 School Age Youth Populations

Appendix B's data was also used to identify which reservations, on a percentage basis, have the most school-age residents. The reservations with the highest concentrations of school age residents are identified in Table 3.5.

Nationally, 20.4% of all residents are between the ages of 5 and 19. The average of all the reservations listed in Appendix B is 22.4%. Approximately one-third of the total population in each of the reservations listed in Table 3.5 is school age. A reservation needed to have a small urban and rural population of at least 500 to be considered in Table 3.5's comparison.

Table 3.5 Concentrations of School Age Youth

Reservation (State)	School Age Pop.	% Youth
1. Yavapai-Apache Nation (AZ)	284	38%
2. Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of Duck Valley (NV)	482	38%
3. Onondaga Nation (NY)	536	36%
4. Santa Rosa Indian Community (CA)	188	36%
5. Red Lake Chippewa (MN)	1,859	36%
6. White Mountain Apache (AZ)	4,455	36%
7. Passamaquoddy Tribe (ME)	242	36%
8. San Carlos Apache (AZ)	3,329	35%
9. Menominee Indian Tribe (WI)	1,136	35%
10. Chippewa Cree (MT)	562	35%
11. Oglala Sioux (SD)	4,911	35%
12. Sac & Fox Tribe of the Mississippi (IA)	214	35%
13. Mescalero Apache Tribe (NM)	1,089	35%
14. Morongo Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians (CA)	327	34%
15. Forest County Potawatomi Community (WI)	178	34%
16. Northern Cheyenne (MT)	1,502	34%
17. Mississippi Band of Choctaw (MS)	1,448	34%
18. Spirit Lake Sioux (ND)	1,488	34%
19. Gila River Indian Community (AZ)	3,754	33%
20. Port Gamble Indian Community (WA)	233	33%
21. Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation (AZ)	274	33%
22. Fort Belknap Indian Community (MT)	982	33%
23. Rosebud Sioux (SD)	3,001	33%
24. Ho-Chunk Nation (WI)	210	33%
25. Crow Creek Sioux (SD)	729	33%
26. Navajo Nation (AZ, NM, & UT)	50,811	33%
27. Tule River Indian Tribe (CA)	185	33%
28. Lower Brule Sioux (SD)	442	33%
29. Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs (OR)	1,080	33%
30. Bad River Lake Superior Chippewa (WI)	460	33%

3.3.6 Households Without Automobiles

Nationally, approximately 10.3% of all households do not own an automobile. A review of the data in Appendix B indicates that about half of the reservations in the country have no vehicle household populations which exceed the national average, but the average of all the reservations listed in Appendix B is 7.8%, well below the national average.

Table 3.6 identifies the reservations which have the highest percentage of no vehicle households; all are well above the national average. A reservation needed to have a small urban and rural population of at least 500 to be considered in this listing.

Table 3.6 Concentrations of No Vehicle Households (NVH)

Reservation (State)	NVH	% NVH
1. Havasupai Tribe (AZ)	97	77%
2. Tohono O'odham Nation (AZ)	867	30%
3. San Carlos Apache Tribe (AZ)	598	27%
4. Ak Chin Indian Community (AZ)	55	25%
5. Hualapai Indian Tribe (AZ)	87	25%
6. White Mountain Apache Tribe (AZ)	759	25%
7. Hopi Tribe (AZ)	456	24%
8. Gila River Indian Community (AZ)	649	24%
9. Lower Brule Sioux Tribe (SD)	82	23%
10. Mescalero Apache Tribe (NM)	185	22%
11. Passamaquoddy Tribe (Indian Township – ME)	52	21%
12. Zuni Tribe (NM)	352	19%
13. Navajo Nation (AZ, NM, & UT)	7,648	19%
14. Tule River Indian Tribe (CA)	28	18%
15. Ho-Chunk Nation (WI)	33	18%
16. Passamaquoddy Tribe (Pleasant Point – ME)	41	18%
17. Ute Mountain Tribe (CO, NM, & UT)	89	18%
18. Seneca Nation (NY)	469	17%
19. Pala Band of Luiseno Mission Indians (CA)	66	17%
20. Pueblo of Jemez (NM)	78	17%
21. Rosebud Sioux (SD)	399	16%
22. Quechan Tribe of Fort Yuma (AZ & CA)	128	16%
23. Aroostook Band of Micmac Indians (MA)	683	16%
24. Chippewa-Cree Indians (MT)	63	15%
25. Red Lake Band of Chippewa (MN)	206	15%
26. Crow Creek Sioux (SD)	83	15%
27. Ottawa Tribe (OK)	362	15%
28. Oglala Sioux (SD)	471	15%
29. Northern Cheyenne (MT)	176	15%

3.3.7 Aggregate Mobility Dependent Populations

The preceding subsections of this chapter have ranked Indian reservations based upon the percentage size of several transit dependent subpopulations. As discussed earlier, it is inappropriate to sum related populations since many individuals may be a part of two or more subgroups.

However, in an attempt to develop an aggregate rank all reservations, SURTC researchers summed the percentage size of each of the five subgroups discussed in the preceding pages and divided the resulting total by five. The resulting percentage is considered a reasonable proxy of each reservation's mobility-dependent population and provides a valid means of comparing one reservation with another.

Table 3.7 presents the findings of this analysis. In addition to identifying, in order, the top 25 reservations, this table also includes the size of each reservation's small urban and rural population.

Table 3.7 Aggregate Mobility Dependent Populations – Percentage-Based Rank

Rank	Reservation (State)	SUR Population
1.	Havasupai Tribe (AZ)	503
2.	Tohono O'odham Nation (AZ)	9,192
2.	Crow Creek Sioux Tribe (SD)	2,225
4.	White Mountain Apache Tribe (AZ)	12,429
4.	San Carlos Apache Tribe (AZ)	9,385
6.	Gila River Indian Community (AZ)	11,226
7.	Oglala Sioux (SD)	14,068
7.	Cocopah Tribe (AZ)	1,019
7.	Navajo Nation (AZ, NM, & UT)	155,214
10.	Lower Brule Sioux Tribe (SD)	1,353
10.	Hopi Tribe (AZ)	6,815
10.	Sac & Fox Tribe of the Mississippi (IA)	616
10.	Rosebud Sioux Tribe (SD)	9,050
14.	Zuni Tribe (NM)	7,758
14.	Northern Cheyenne (MT)	4,470
14.	Hualapai Indian Tribe (AZ)	1,353
17.	Quechan Tribe of Fort Yuma (AZ & CA)	1,810
17.	Mescalero Apache Tribe (NM)	3,156
17.	Chippewa Cree Tribe (MT)	1,605
17.	Pala Band of Luiseno Mission Indians (CA)	1,573
17.	Yurok Tribe (CA)	1,103
17.	Red Lake Band of Chippewa (MN)	5,162
17.	Yavapai-Apache Nation (AZ)	743
17.	Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians (MS)	4,311
17.	Pueblo of Santo Domingo (MN)	3,166
17.	Santa Rosa Indian Community (CA)	517
17.	Cheyenne River Sioux (SD)	8,466
17.	Spirit Lake Tribe (ND)	4,435
17.	Fort Mojave Indian Tribe (AZ, CA, & NV)	1,043
17.	Turtle Mountain Chippewa (ND)	5,815
17.	Passamaquoddy Tribe (Pleasant Point – MA)	640

As discussed at the beginning of this chapter, this percentage-based ranking is only one means of comparing the relative transit needs of reservations. A similar comparison may be done based on actual total small urban and rural populations.

Table 3.8 identifies the nation's most populous reservations as well as the size of each reservation's mobility-dependent subpopulation. As this data indicates and as discussed earlier, there is a strong correlation between total population and the size of various mobility dependent sub-populations.

Table 3.8 Total Population vs. Mobility Dependent Sub-Populations

<u>Indian Tribal Entities (State)</u>	<u>Total Population</u>	<u>Seniors</u>	<u>Disabled</u>	<u>School Aged</u>	<u>Poverty</u>	<u>NVH</u>
Muscogee (Creek) Nation (OK)	704565	117282	43385	141744	79426	20434
Cherokee Nation (OK)	462327	84033	31983	102179	75434	12924
Chickasaw Nation (OK)	277416	57629	19417	56754	41622	7369
Choctaw Nation (OK)	224472	45938	18402	46006	44358	7670
Apache Tribe (OK)	193260	30977	10127	41246	29796	5239
Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes (OK)	157869	27609	7988	33848	19993	3042
Navajo Nation (AZ, NM, & UT)	155214	17934	12817	50811	65001	7648
Citizen Potawatomi Nation (OK)	106624	16393	6563	23287	10281	1442
Jena Band of Choctaw Indians (LA)	59984	9860	4661	12912	9747	1923
Sac & Fox Nation (OK)	55690	11342	4036	11493	8218	1804
Osage Tribe (OK)	44437	7930	2888	9635	5651	1050
Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians (IN & MI)	35415	6616	2268	7382	4260	1244
Samish Indian Tribe (WA)	33265	8601	1399	5936	2662	688
Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation (WA)	31646	3606	2626	9231	8744	658
Kaw Nation (OK)	27821	5977	1961	5582	4162	786
Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation (MT)	26172	4915	940	6212	5203	478
Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe (MI)	25822	3606	1213	5208	3214	453
Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation (WY)	23245	3800	883	5461	4743	464
Seminole Nation (OK)	22792	4912	2016	4807	4631	767
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation (CA)	21358	10310	1985	1657	2229	861
Oneida Tribe of Indians (WI)	21319	2109	666	5439	1081	144
Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah & Ouray Reservation (UT)	19182	2469	715	5673	3808	274
Kickapoo Tribe (OK)	18544	2818	1199	3794	2886	310
Nez Perce Tribe (ID)	17959	3955	778	3703	2452	364

Given the high correlation that exists between total population and the size of various mobility dependent subgroups, ranking reservations by total population would result in a list that would largely mirror a list of the most needy reservations in terms of the aggregate number of actual residents in each need category. Table 3.9 presents such a list and identifies the size of each reservation’s small urban and rural, non-metropolitan population.

Table 3.9 Aggregate Mobility-Dependent Populations – Population-Based Rank

Rank	Reservation (State)	SUR Population
1.	Cherokee Nation (OK)	383,491
2.	Chickasaw Nation (OK)	277,416
3.	Muscogee-Creek Nation (OK)	230,486
4.	Choctaw Nation (OK)	222,381
5.	Navajo Nation (AZ, NM, & UT)	155,214
6.	Cheyenne-Arapaho (OK)	122,874
7.	Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Fort Sill Apache OTSA (OK)	103,704
8.	Citizen Potawatomi-Absentee Shawnee OTSA (OK)	88,335
9.	Sac & Fox Nation (OK)	55,690
10.	Osage Tribe (OK)	38,842
11.	Jena Band of Choctaw Indians (LA)	35,356
12.	Samish Indian Tribe (WA)	33,265
13.	Confederated Tribes and Bands of Yakama (WA)	30,942
14.	Kaw-Ponca OTSA (OK)	27,821
15.	Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes (MT)	26,172
16.	Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe (MI)	25,822
17.	Arapahoe-Shoshone Tribes (Wind River – WY)	23,245
18.	Seminole Nation (OK)	22,792
19.	Ute Indian Tribe (UT)	18,582
20.	Kickapoo Tribe (OK)	18,544
21.	Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians (MI & IN)	18,444
22.	Nez Perce Tribe (ID)	17,959
23.	Pawnee Nation (OK)	16,509
24.	Caddo-Wichita-Delaware OTSA (OK)	14,638
25.	Oglala Sioux (SD)	14,068

There is a striking difference between the listings in Tables 3.7 and 3.9. Only one reservation, the Navajo Nation in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah, shows up in both lists. There is, therefore, a stark difference in outcomes if need determinations are based on aggregate populations or on a percentage of population basis. It may, therefore, be appropriate to give consideration to both approaches. These discussions are the topic of Chapter 4.

4. COMPARISONS – DEMOGRAPHIC NEED INDICATORS VS TRIBAL TRANSIT GRANT RECIPIENTS

4.1 Introduction

Identifying and quantifying the need for transit services is an art and not a science. Contributing determinants may include census data, citizen and user surveys, and interviews with advocacy groups and social agencies, etc. Researchers use all related data and input in an attempt to assess actual needs and to convert expressed needs into related transit service plans.

The preceding chapter focused on census data that is traditionally used as a proxy determinant for transit needs. In many respects, this data may be one of the most quantifiable measures of need. As discussed above, however, it certainly is not the only measure of need. Therein lies the artful nature of determining actual need, designing transit systems and services to address these needs, and making responsive grant awards.

This chapter focuses on the most transit needy reservations as identified at the end of Chapter 3 and compares related lists (population and percentage based) to the list of recipients of first-year tribal transit funding. These comparisons are certainly not the final word concerning the appropriateness of these grant awards. They may, however, help identify various demographic factors that may be worthy of consideration as future years' grant applications are reviewed, rated, and selected for funding.

4.2 Chapter Highlights

- Many of the most need-intensive reservations, based on demographic data, received first year 5311c tribal transit funding.
- Several tribes and reservations with very small non-metropolitan populations received 5311c funding.
- Funding determinations may be based on numerous factors, only one of which involves census-based need indicators.
- Demographic based need assessments may, however, be worthy of consideration in the grant review, rating, and selection process.

4.3 Needy Reservations vs. Grant Recipients

Tables 3.7 and 3.9 at the end of Chapter 3 listed what may be the reservations with the greatest mobility needs based strictly on the size of their mobility-dependent sub-populations. Table 3.7 listed those reservations with the largest related populations, as a percentage of their total population, while Table 3.9 was based on total actual populations. As explained in Chapter 3, most of the underlying, percentage-based calculations were limited to reservations that had at least 500 residents living in non-metropolitan, small urban and rural areas.

Table 4.1 identifies all the tribes that submitted first-year grant applications for 5311c tribal transit funding. The table categorizes these applicants based on their aggregate, percentage-based need ranking as discussed near the end of Chapter 3 and identifies if their application was funded, the purpose of the grant, and the size of each applicant's small urban and rural population.

As indicated in Chapter 3, the census data used to develop these comparisons reflect on-reservation populations. In some instances, however, tribes have trust lands that are located off their reservation. In some cases these trust lands are near the reservation, but in other instances they may be located hundreds of miles away. A case-by-case analysis would be required to identify the location of these lands. In instances where these lands are located near the reservation and where they have a significant number of residents, including these populations in the population numbers presented below could have an impact of a reservation's resulting ranking. Related information is presented in Table 3.1 and its corresponding narrative.

Table 4.1's list of reservations does not coincide with the list presented in Table 3.7. The reason for this variance lies with the fact that not all the tribes identified as being potentially transit needy actually submitted applications for 5311c tribal transit funding. Table 4.1 includes only those tribes and reservations that actually submitted related grant applications. This table's ranking numbers coincide with those in Table 3.7 but go beyond listing only the top 25. It should also be noted, however, that Table 4.1 gives some applicants an unranked designation. This designation relates to the fact that the reservation has a small urban and rural, non-metropolitan population of less than 500 residents. In a few instances, this designation related to the fact that no census data is available concerning that reservation.

Table 4.1 2006 Tribal Transit Applicants – Ranked By Percentage-Based Estimate of Need

(Bold = Funded; Italics = Planning Grant; Not Bold = Not Funded)

Rank	Reservation (State)	SUR Population
2.	<i>White Mountain Apache (AZ)</i>	<i>12,429</i>
4.	San Carlos Apache Tribe (AZ)	9,385
7.	Navajo Nation (AZ)	155,214
7.	Oglala Sioux Tribe (SD)	14,068
7.	Cocopah Tribe (AZ)	1,019
10.	Lower Brule Sioux Tribe (SD)	1,353
14.	Northern Cheyenne (MT)	4,470
14.	Hualapai Indian Tribe (AZ)	1,353
17.	Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa (ND)	5,815
17.	Red Lake Band of Chippewa (MN)	5,162
17.	<i>Spirit Lake Tribe (ND)</i>	<i>4,435</i>
17.	Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians (MS)	4,311
17.	Mescalero Apache Tribe (NM)	3,156
17.	Chippewa Cree Tribe (MT)	1,605
17.	Yurok Tribe (CA)	1,103
17.	<i>Yavapai-Apache Nation (AZ)</i>	<i>743</i>
32.	Standing Rock Sioux (ND & SD)	8,250
32.	Yankton Sioux Tribe (SD)	6,500
32.	Menominee Indian Tribe (WI)	3,216
32.	Fort Belknap Indian Community (MT)	2,959
42.	Blackfeet Tribe (MT)	10,100
42.	Ponca Tribe (OK)	2,284
42.	<i>Santee Sioux (NE)</i>	<i>878</i>
52.	Confederated Tribes & Bands of Yakama (WA)	30,942
52.	Seminole Nation (Seminole OTSA – OK)	22,792
	(Creek-Seminole OTSA, SUR Pop. 2,102, Ranked 52)	

Table 4.1 continued

52.	Caddo Nation (OK) - (Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Ft. Sill Apache-Caddo-Wichita-Delaware OTSA) (Caddo, Wichita, Delaware OTSA, SUR Population 14,638, Ranked 103)	11,855
52.	Comanche Nation (OK) - (Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Ft. Sill Apache-Caddo-Wichita-Delaware OTSA) (Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Fort Sill Apache OTSA, SUR Population 103,704, Ranked 125)	11,855
52.	Seneca Nation (Allegany Reservation – NY) (Cattaraugus Res., SUR Pop. 2,412, Ranked 66)	6,804
52.	Pueblo of Laguna (NM)	3,815
52.	Muscogee Nation (Creek-Seminole OTSA - OK) (Creek OTSA, SUR Pop. 230,486, Ranked 100)	2,102
52.	Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa (WI)	1,411
52.	Quinault Tribe (WA)	1,370
58.	Menominee Indian Tribe (WI)	3,216
66.	Choctaw Nation (OK)	222,381
66.	Sisseton Wahpeton Oyate (SD)	10,408
66.	Leech Lake Band of Ojibwa (MN)	10,205
66.	Mille Lacs Band of Chippewa (MN)	4,548
66.	Lac Courte Oreilles Tribe (WI)	2,886
66.	Winnebago Tribe (NE)	2,588
66.	Skokomish Indian Tribe (WA)	730
86.	White Earth Band of Chippewa (MN)	9,188
86.	Eastern Band of Cherokee (NC)	8,092
86.	Confederated Tribes of Colville (WA)	7,582
86.	Quapaw Tribe (OK)	7,455
86.	Lac du Flambeau Chippewa (WI)	2,995
100.	Cherokee Nation (OK)	383,491
100.	Chickasaw Nation (OK)	277,416
100.	Kaw Nation (Kaw Ponca OTSA - OK) (Kaw OTSA, SUR Population 6,123, Ranked 125)	27,821
100.	Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes (MY)	26,172
100.	Paiute-Shoshone Tribe (Fallon Reservation – NV)	620
125.	Osage Nation (OK)	38,842
125.	Pokagon Band of Potawatomi (MI)	18,444
125.	Nez Perce Reservation (ID)	17,959
125.	North Central Regional Transit District - Pueblos of Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, Santa Clara, Okay Owingeh, and Tesuque (weighted average – NM)	15,700
125.	Coeur D'Alene Tribe (ID)	6,551
125.	Iowa Tribe (OK)	6,148
125.	Lummi Tribe (WA)	4,193
125.	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla (OR)	2,927
125.	Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe (NY)	2,699
125.	Stockbridge Munsee Community (WI)	1,527

Table 4.1 continued

125. Grand Portage Band of Chippewa (MN)	557
153. Citizen Potawatomi Nation (OK)	88,335
153. Prairie Band Potawatomi (KS)	1,238
161. <i>Suquamish Tribe (WA)</i>	4,082
Unranked Tribes - Low Small Urban & Rural Population or No Census Data:	
Blue Lake Rancheria (CA)	78
<i>Burns Paiute Tribe (OR)</i>	167
Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde (OR)	0
<i>Coquille Tribe (OR)</i>	258
Cowlitz Indian Tribe (WA)	No Census Data
<i>Hannahville Indian Community (MI)</i>	295
Houlton Band of Maliseet (MA)	136
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe (WA)	9
Kalispel Tribe (WA)	206
<i>Lower Sioux Indian Community (MN)</i>	335
<i>Narragansett Indian Tribe (RI)</i>	60
Poarch Band of Creek Indians (AL)	156
<i>Ponca Tribe (NE)</i>	????
<i>Pueblo of Santa Ana (NM)</i>	59
<i>Sac & Fox Nation (KS)</i>	217
Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa (MI)	354
<i>Shoalwater Bay Tribe (WA)</i>	69
Snoquamile Tribe (WA)	No Census Data
<i>Squaxim Island Tribe (WA)</i>	0
Stillaguamish Tribe (WA)	102
Susanville Indian Rancheria (CA)	298
<i>Upper Sioux Community (MN)</i>	57
United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee (OK)	No Census Data
<i>Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (MA)</i>	91

As Table 4.1 indicates, many of the tribes and reservations that were found to be potentially in need of transit services, based on the percentage size of what are traditionally mobility dependent subpopulations, did, in fact, receive first-year 5311c funding. It may also be noted that many of the first year recipients were unranked because of their small non-metropolitan populations. In at least two instances, census data indicates that grantee tribes have reservations with no non-metropolitan residents.

Table 3.8 at the conclusion of Chapter 3 also ranked reservations based on the actual size of their mobility dependent subpopulations. Table 4.2 identifies all of the tribes that submitted first year grant applications for 5311c tribal transit funding and categorizes these applicants based on the actual size of each reservation's small urban and rural, non-metropolitan population.

As was the case with Table 4.1, this table also identifies if the application was funded, the purpose of the grant, and the size of each applicant's small urban and rural population. Table 4.2 also shows each applicant's previously discussed percentage-based ranking as presented in Table 4.1. NR designations relate to the fact that a reservation had a small urban and rural, non-metropolitan population of less than 500. In a few instances, this designation related to the fact that no census data is available concerning that reservation.

Table 4.2 2006 Tribal Transit Applicants – Ranked by Small Urban & Rural Population

(Bold = Funded; Italics = Planning Grant; Not Bold = Not Funded)

Rank	Reservation (State)	SUR Pop.	% Based Rank	FTA Grant
1.	<i>Cherokee Nation (OK)</i>	383,491	100	\$ 25,000
2.	Chickasaw Nation (OK)	277,416	100	\$349,164
3.	Muscogee Nation (Creek OTSA - OK) (Creek-Seminole OTSA, SUR Population 2,102)	230,486	52	\$ 0
4.	Choctaw Nation (OK)	222,381	66	\$158,000
5.	Navajo Nation (AZ)	155,214	7	\$500,000
7.	Comanche Nation (Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Fort Sill Apache OTSA - OK) (Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Ft. Sill Apache-Caddo-Wichita-Delaware OTSA, Rural Population 11,855)	103,704	52	\$ 0
8.	Citizen Potawatomi Nation (OK)	88,335	153	\$285,000
10.	Osage Nation (OK)	38,842	125	\$ 0
13.	Confederated Tribes & Bands of Yakama (WA)	30,942	52	\$490,890
14.	<i>Kaw Nation (Kaw OTSA – OK)</i> <i>(Kaw Ponca OTSA, SUR Population 6,123)</i>	27,821	100	\$ 25,000
15.	Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes (MT)	26,172	100	\$373,274
18.	Seminole Nation (OK)	22,792	52	\$145,000
21.	<i>Pokagon Band of Potawatomi (MI)</i>	18,444	125	\$ 25,000
22.	North Central Regional Transit District - Pueblos of Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, Santa Clara, Okay Owingeh, and Tesuque (NM)	15,700	125	\$ 0
23.	Nez Perce Reservation (ID)	17,959	125	\$ 0
24.	<i>Caddo Nation (Caddo, Wichita, Delaware OTS - OK)</i> <i>(Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Ft. Sill Apache-Caddo-Wichita-Delaware OTSA, SUR Population 11,855)</i>	14,638	52	\$ 25,000
25.	Oglala Sioux Tribe (SD)	14,068	7	\$327,869
26.	<i>White Mountain Apache (AZ)</i>	12,429	2	\$ 25,000
32.	Sisseton Wahpeton Oyate (SD)	10,408	66	\$ 0
34.	<i>Leech Lake Band of Ojibwa (MN)</i>	10,205	66	\$ 25,000
35.	Blackfeet Tribe (MT)	10,100	42	\$ 0
37.	San Carlos Apache Tribe (AZ)	9,385	4	\$ 0
40.	White Earth Band of Chippewa (MN)	9,188	86	\$ 0
43.	Standing Rock Sioux (ND & SD)	8,250	32	\$ 0
44.	Eastern Band of Cherokee (NC)	8,092	86	\$100,000
47.	Confederated Tribes of Colville (WA)	7,582	86	\$156,000
48.	<i>Quapaw Tribe (OK)</i>	7,455	86	\$ 25,000
51.	<i>Seneca Nation, (Allegany Reservation – NY)</i> <i>(Cattaraugus Reservation, SUR Pop. 2,412)</i>	6,804	52	\$ 25,000
53.	Coeur D'Alene Tribe (ID)	6,551	125	\$ 0
54.	Yankton Sioux Tribe (SD)	6,500	32	\$ 0
56.	<i>Iowa Tribe (OK)</i>	6,148	125	\$ 25,000
59.	Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa (ND)	5,815	17	\$ 0
62.	Red Lake Band of Chippewa (MN)	5,162	17	\$199,817
65.	Mille Lacs Band of Chippewa (MN)	4,548	66	\$ 0

Table 4.2 continued

67.	Northern Cheyenne (MT)	4,470	14	\$400,000
68.	<i>Spirit Lake Tribe (ND)</i>	4,435	17	\$ 25,000
71.	Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians (MS)	4,311	17	\$ 0
72.	Lummi Tribe (WA)	4,193	125	\$306,500
75.	<i>Suquamish Tribe (WA)</i>	4,082	161	\$ 25,000
77.	<i>Pueblo of Laguna (NM)</i>	3,815	52	\$ 25,000
83.	Menominee Indian Tribe (WI)	3,216	58	\$270,002
86.	Mescalero Apache Tribe (NM)	3,156	17	\$ 0
87.	<i>Lac du Flambeau Chippewa (WI)</i>	2,995	86	\$ 25,000
88.	Fort Belknap Indian Community (MT)	2,959	32	\$ 0
89.	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla (OR)	2,927	125	\$ 0
90.	Lac Courte Oreilles Tribe (WI)	2,886	66	\$ 0
94.	<i>Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe (NY)</i>	2,699	125	\$ 25,000
97.	Winnebago Tribe (NE)	2,588	66	\$457,580
99.	Ponca Tribe (OK)	2,284	42	\$207,836
111.	Chippewa Cree Tribe (MT)	1,605	17	\$ 0
114.	Stockbridge Munsee Community (WI)	1,527	125	\$ 0
119.	Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa (WI)	1,411	52	\$ 0
120.	<i>Quinault Tribe (WA)</i>	1,370	52	\$ 25,000
122.	Hualapai Indian Tribe (AZ)	1,353	14	\$ 0
123.	Lower Brule Sioux Tribe (SD)	1,353	10	\$ 0
125.	Prairie Band Potawatomi (KS)	1,238	153	\$360,000
127.	Yurok Tribe (CA)	1,103	17	\$164,484
130.	Cocopah Tribe (AZ)	1,019	7	\$208,000
133.	<i>Santee Sioux (NE)</i>	878	42	\$ 13,800
141.	<i>Yavapai-Apache Nation (AZ)</i>	743	17	\$ 25,000
143.	<i>Skokomish Indian Tribe (WA)</i>	730	66	\$ 25,000
153.	<i>Paiute-Shoshone Tribe (Fallon Reservation – NV)</i>	620	100	\$ 25,000
159.	Grand Portage Band of Chippewa (MN)	557	125	\$ 60,000
178.	Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa (MI)	354	NR	\$ 0
181.	<i>Lower Sioux Indian Community (MN)</i>	335	NR	\$ 25,000
182.	<i>Washoe Tribe (combined communities - NV & CA)</i>	299	NR	\$ 25,000
183.	Susanville Indian Rancheria (CA)	298	NR	\$ 99,253
190.	<i>Hannahville Indian Community (MI)</i>	295	NR	\$ 25,000
196.	<i>Coquille Tribe (OR)</i>	258	NR	\$ 25,000
202.	<i>Sac & Fox Nation (KS)</i>	217	NR	\$ 25,000
204.	Kalispel Tribe (WA)	206	NR	\$167,547
216.	<i>Burns Paiute Tribe (OR)</i>	167	NR	\$ 25,000
220.	Poarch Band of Creek Indians (AL)	156	NR	\$ 75,139
225.	Houlton Band of Maliseet (ME)	136	NR	\$ 99,171
238.	Stillaguamish Tribe (WA)	102	NR	\$ 0
244.	<i>Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (MA)</i>	91	NR	\$ 25,000
251.	Blue Lake Rancheria (CA)	78	NR	\$ 0
259.	<i>Shoalwater Bay Tribe (WA)</i>	69	NR	\$ 24,797
266.	<i>Narragansett Indian Tribe (RI)</i>	60	NR	\$ 25,000
267.	<i>Pueblo of Santa Ana (NM)</i>	59	NR	\$ 25,000
271.	<i>Upper Sioux Community (MN)</i>	57	NR	\$ 21,368

Table 4.2 continued

304.	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe (WA)	9	NR	\$	0
320.	Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde (OR)	0	NR	\$	\$247,340
320.	<i>Squaxim Island Tribe (WA)</i>	0	NR	\$	\$ 25,000
NR	Cowlitz Indian Tribe (WA)	No Census Data	NR	\$	0
NR	Snoquamile Tribe (WA)	No Census Data	NR	\$	\$274,169
NR	United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee (OK)	No Census Data	NR	\$	0

As was the case with Table 4.1, Table 4.2 illustrates that many of the reservations that were identified as being potentially in need of transit services, based upon the actual size of what are traditionally mobility-dependent sub-populations, did in fact receive funding during the first year of the 5311c tribal transit program. Conversely, many of the recipients were ranked well down on the list and had very small or non-existent non-metropolitan populations.

It must be reiterated, however, that demographic data is not a perfect indicator or proxy for actual transit needs. Related grant awards appropriately must consider other indicators of needs and each applicant's plan for addressing these needs. The demographic-based assessments presented in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 may, however, be worthy of consideration as future years' grant applications are reviewed, rated, and selected for funding.

5. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Comparing Indian reservations with one another is like comparing states with one another. It becomes immediately obvious that they are very dissimilar. Reservations vary greatly in terms of their geographic size, their populations, and their population densities.

In terms of size, several reservations are larger than some states, but many cover less than one square mile. Some reservations have over 100,000 residents, but the vast majority have fewer than 5,000 residents. Reservation population densities vary greatly, but many of the most densely populated reservations are geographically small. Some reservations are located in or at least partially within metropolitan areas, but most are predominantly non-metropolitan.

As is the case with land areas and populations, it is impossible to stereotype reservation transit needs. Identifying and quantifying these needs is an art and not a science. Researchers and transit planners consider census data and input generated from citizen and user surveys and interviews with advocacy groups and social agencies in an attempt to assess actual needs and then to convert expressed needs into related transit service plans.

This study focuses on census data and attempts to interpret and compare data related to population subgroups that are traditionally mobility dependent. These subgroups include senior citizens, disabled and low income individuals, school-age youth, and households without vehicles. A review of this data may provide valuable insights into the aggregate mobility needs of individual reservations and a comparison of the needs of one reservation versus another.

These demographic based assessments may be made based on both the actual size of related populations and on the percentage size of each subgroup compared to a reservation's total population. Comparing population-based and percentage-based rankings shows stark differences. It may, therefore, be appropriate to consider both approaches when attempting to make actual assessments of an individual reservation's transit needs or when attempting to compare the needs of one reservation with those of others.

These population and percentage-based rankings may be compared to the list of tribes and reservations that received first-year funding in the new tribal transit program. All related rankings should, however, be based on non-metropolitan populations since the focus of that program is on small urban and rural areas. It may also be appropriate to limit related comparisons to reservations that have a critical mass of non-metropolitan residents. Such a mass might be necessary to warrant the provision of transit services.

Chapter 3 develops the type rankings described in the preceding paragraphs and Chapter 4 compares these rankings with FTA grant awards during the first year of the new tribal transit program. Given the subjective nature of related assessments, it would be inappropriate to discredit the FTA for not funding applications from highly-ranked tribes or for funding applications related to low-ranked tribes. Related discrepancies may, however, illustrate that it may be appropriate to consider related demographic data when making future assessments. It may be especially appropriate to give considerable weight to each reservation's small urban and rural, non-metropolitan population during the review process since that is, in fact, the focus of the 5311c program.

APPENDIX A. TRIBES WITH NO CENSUS DATA AVAILABLE

Tribe	Tribal Headquarters
Alabama-Quassarte Tribal Town	Henrietta, Oklahoma
Buena Vista Rancheria – Me-Wuk Indians	Ione, California
California Valley Miwok Tribe / Sheep Valley Rancheria	Stockton, California
Cloverdale Rancheria of Pomo Indians	Santa Rosa, California
Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Longview, Washington
Death Valley Timbi-Sha Shoshone Indians	Death Valley, California
Elko Band of Te-Moah Western Shoshone	Nevada
Federated Indians / Graton Rancheria	Santa Rosa, California
Keweenaw Bay Indian Community	Baraga, Michigan
Kialagee Tribal Town	Wetumka, Oklahoma
Lower Lake Rancheria – Koi Nation	Oakland, California
Lytton Rancheria	Santa Rosa, California
Match-e-be-nash-she-wish Band of Pottawatomi Indians	Dorr, Michigan
Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians	Orland, California
Pinoleville Rancheria of Pomo Indians	California
Potter Valley Tribe / Potter Valley Rancheria	Ukiah, California
Redding Rancheria	California
San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe	Tuba City, Arizona
Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians	Lakeport, California
Shawnee Tribe	Oklahoma
Tholpthocco Tribal Town	Okemah, Oklahoma
United Auburn Indian Community / Auburn Rancheria	Newcastle, California
United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee	Tahlequah, Oklahoma
Yavapai-Prescott Tribe	Arizona

APPENDIX B. DEMOGRAPHIC DATABASE

Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Citizen Potawatomi Nation-Absentee Shawnee OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.11
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,116.9	Population Density:	95
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	77,279	Seniors:	16,393	15%
Small Urban:	11,056	Disabled:	6,563	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	88,335	School-Age:	23,287	22%
Urban:	18,289	Poverty:	10,281	10%
Total:	106,624	No Vehicle Households:	1,442	4%

Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Agua Caliente Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.17
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	48.9	Population Density:	437
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	991	Seniors:	10,310	48%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	1,985	9%
Small Urban and Rural:	991	School-Age:	1,657	8%
Urban:	20,367	Poverty:	2,229	10%
Total:	21,358	No Vehicle Households:	861	7%

Ak Chin Indian Community of the Maricopa (Ak Chin) Indian Reservation, Arizona			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Maricopa (Ak Chin) Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.18
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	32.9	Population Density:	23
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	742	Seniors:	47	6%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	33	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	742	School-Age:	216	29%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	198	27%
Total:	742	No Vehicle Households:	55	25%

Alabama-Coushatta Tribes of Texas			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Alabama-Coushatta Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	7.1	Population Density:	67
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	480	Seniors:	63	13%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	40	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	480	School-Age:	118	25%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	106	22%
Total:	480	No Vehicle Households:	23	14%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Alturas Indian Rancheria, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Alturas Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.10</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	56
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2	Seniors:	1	50%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	2	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	2	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Apache Tribe of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Fort Sill Apache OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	6,359.8	Population Density:	30
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	68,571	Seniors:	30,977	16%
Small Urban:	35,133	Disabled:	10,127	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	103,704	School-Age:	41,246	21%
Urban:	89,556	Poverty:	29,796	15%
Total:	193,260	No Vehicle Households:	5,239	8%
<i>Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Ft. Sill Apache-Caddo-Wichita-Delaware joint use area OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	193.0	Population Density:	61
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	6,037	Seniors:	2,261	19%
Small Urban:	5,818	Disabled:	793	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	11,855	School-Age:	2,803	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3,020	25%
Total:	11,855	No Vehicle Households:	478	11%
Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Wind River Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	3,465.4	Population Density:	7
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	12,813	Seniors:	3,800	16%
Small Urban:	10,432	Disabled:	883	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	23,245	School-Age:	5,461	23%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	4,743	20%
Total:	23,245	No Vehicle Households:	464	6%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Aroostook Band of Micmac Indians of Maine			FTA Region: 1	
<i>Aroostook Band of Micmac TDSA</i>			<i>Composite Need: 0.17</i>	
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	6.5	Population Density: 1,510	
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,990		Seniors: 2,347	24%
Small Urban:	7,766		Disabled: 750	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	9,756		School-Age: 1,748	18%
Urban:	0		Poverty: 1,768	18%
Total:	9,756	No Vehicle Households:	683	16%
Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Montana			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Fort Peck Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need: 0.18</i>	
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	3,289.0	Population Density: 3	
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	4,066		Seniors: 1,374	13%
Small Urban:	6,255		Disabled: 344	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	10,321		School-Age: 2,980	29%
Urban:	0		Poverty: 3,566	35%
Total:	10,321	No Vehicle Households:	287	9%
Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Augustine Reservation, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Augustine Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need: 0.00</i>	
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.0	Population Density: 0	
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0		Seniors: 0	0%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled: 0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0		School-Age: 0	0%
Urban:	0		Poverty: 0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians of the Bad River Reservation, Wisconsin **FTA Region: 5**

<i>Bad River Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	192.1	Population Density:	7
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,411		Seniors:	136 10%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	39 3%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,411		School-Age:	460 33%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	342 24%
Total:	1,411	No Vehicle Households:	61	13%

Barona Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians of the Barona Reservation, California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Barona Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	9.3	Population Density:	58
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	536		Seniors:	38 7%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	29 5%
Small Urban and Rural:	536		School-Age:	158 29%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	92 17%
Total:	536	No Vehicle Households:	8	5%

Battle Mountain Band of the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Battle Mountain Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.18</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.0	Population Density:	119
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	53		Seniors:	23 19%
Small Urban:	71		Disabled:	13 10%
Small Urban and Rural:	124		School-Age:	31 25%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	35 28%
Total:	124	No Vehicle Households:	5	9%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Bay Mills Indian Community, Michigan			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Bay Mills Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	3.5	Population Density:	175
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	605	Seniors:	59	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	15	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	605	School-Age:	167	28%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	117	19%
Total:	605	No Vehicle Households:	31	13%
Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Rohnerville Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.18</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	1,486
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	61	Seniors:	12	12%
Small Urban:	37	Disabled:	11	11%
Small Urban and Rural:	98	School-Age:	37	38%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	9	9%
Total:	98	No Vehicle Households:	5	19%
Berry Creek Rancheria of Maidu Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Berry Creek Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	7	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Big Lagoon Rancheria, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Big Lagoon Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.29</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	680
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	24	Seniors:	1	4%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	1	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	24	School-Age:	8	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	25	104%
Total:	24	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Big Pine Band of Owens Valley Paiute Shoshone Indians of the Big Pine Reservation, California FTA Region: 9

<i>Big Pine Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.4	Population Density:	1,079
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	462	Seniors:	71	15%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	22	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	462	School-Age:	87	19%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	84	18%
Total:	462	No Vehicle Households:	26	17%

Big Sandy Rancheria of Mono Indians of California FTA Region: 9

<i>Big Sandy Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.25
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.4	Population Density:	250
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	98	Seniors:	11	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	18	18%
Small Urban and Rural:	98	School-Age:	28	29%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	22	22%
Total:	98	No Vehicle Households:	21	44%

Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians of the Big Valley Rancheria, California FTA Region: 9

<i>Big Valley Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.31
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	1,205
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	15	7%
Small Urban:	225	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	225	School-Age:	108	48%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	144	64%
Total:	225	No Vehicle Households:	19	35%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation of Montana			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Blackfeet Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.18</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	2,371.3	Population Density:	4
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	5,583		Seniors:	926 9%
Small Urban:	4,517		Disabled:	341 3%
Small Urban and Rural:	10,100		School-Age:	3,129 31%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	3,371 33%
Total:	10,100	No Vehicle Households:	346	12%

Blue Lake Rancheria, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Blue Lake Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.16</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	1,586
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	78		Seniors:	18 23%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	3 4%
Small Urban and Rural:	78		School-Age:	20 26%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	10 13%
Total:	78	No Vehicle Households:	5	14%

Bois Forte Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Bois Forte Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.18</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	199.6	Population Density:	3
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	657		Seniors:	90 14%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	16 2%
Small Urban and Rural:	657		School-Age:	197 30%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	201 31%
Total:	657	No Vehicle Households:	34	14%

Bridgeport Paiute Indian Colony of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Bridgeport Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.20</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	655
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	43		Seniors:	5 12%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	0 0%
Small Urban and Rural:	43		School-Age:	8 19%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	18 42%
Total:	43	No Vehicle Households:	5	29%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Burns Paiute Tribe of the Burns Paiute Indian Colony of Oregon	FTA Region: 10
--	----------------

<i>Burns Paiute Colony</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.21
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.3	Population Density:	131
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	103		Seniors:	19 11%
Small Urban:	64		Disabled:	1 1%
Small Urban and Rural:	167		School-Age:	60 36%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	56 34%
Total:	167	No Vehicle Households:	11	22%

Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, California	FTA Region: 9
---	---------------

<i>Cabazon Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.17
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	3.0	Population Density:	266
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	35		Seniors:	92 11%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	68 8%
Small Urban and Rural:	35		School-Age:	198 25%
Urban:	771		Poverty:	248 31%
Total:	806	No Vehicle Households:	15	8%

Cachil DeHe Band of Wintun Indians of the Colusa Indian Community of the Colusa Rancheria, California	FTA Region: 9
---	---------------

<i>Colusa Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.20
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.4	Population Density:	210
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	77		Seniors:	9 12%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	6 8%
Small Urban and Rural:	77		School-Age:	15 19%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	35 45%
Total:	77	No Vehicle Households:	4	14%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Caddo Nation of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Ft. Sill Apache-Caddo-Wichita-Delaware joint use area OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	193.0	Population Density:	61
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	6,037	Seniors:	2,261	19%
Small Urban:	5,818	Disabled:	793	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	11,855	School-Age:	2,803	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3,020	25%
Total:	11,855	No Vehicle Households:	478	11%
<i>Caddo-Wichita-Delaware OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,026.3	Population Density:	14
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	14,638	Seniors:	2,901	20%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	869	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	14,638	School-Age:	3,389	23%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2,426	17%
Total:	14,638	No Vehicle Households:	272	5%
Cahto Indian Tribe of the Laytonville Rancheria, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Laytonville Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.27</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.3	Population Density:	619
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	188	Seniors:	19	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	11	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	188	School-Age:	60	32%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	100	53%
Total:	188	No Vehicle Households:	20	33%
Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians of the Cahuilla Reservation, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Cahuilla Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.23</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	28.9	Population Density:	5
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	154	Seniors:	16	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	12	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	154	School-Age:	59	38%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	62	40%
Total:	154	No Vehicle Households:	8	16%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Campo Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the Campo Indian Reservation, California FTA Region: 9

<i>Campo Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.26
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	25.8	Population Density:	14
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	351	Seniors:	26	7%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	12	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	351	School-Age:	160	46%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	151	43%
Total:	351	No Vehicle Households:	35	32%

Capitan Grande Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of California FTA Region: 9

<i>Capitan Grande Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.00
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	24.9	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Catawba Indian Nation FTA Region: 4

<i>Catawba Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.1	Population Density:	446
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	494	Seniors:	66	13%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	49	10%
Small Urban and Rural:	494	School-Age:	142	29%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	112	23%
Total:	494	No Vehicle Households:	13	8%

Cayuga Nation of New York FTA Region: 2

<i>Cayuga Nation TDSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.12
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	106.0	Population Density:	101
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	8,474	Seniors:	1,986	19%
Small Urban:	2,233	Disabled:	384	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	10,707	School-Age:	2,290	21%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	980	9%
Total:	10,707	No Vehicle Households:	216	5%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Cedarville Rancheria, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Cedarville Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.18
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	754
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	26	Seniors:	2	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	26	School-Age:	8	31%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	14	54%
Total:	26	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Chemehuevi Indian Tribe of the Chemehuevi Reservation, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Chemehuevi Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.22
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	48.1	Population Density:	7
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	345	Seniors:	108	31%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	41	12%
Small Urban and Rural:	345	School-Age:	69	20%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	100	29%
Total:	345	No Vehicle Households:	27	17%

Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Trinidad Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.19
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	576
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	52	Seniors:	10	19%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	52	School-Age:	15	29%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	24	46%
Total:	52	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Cherokee OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	6,701.6	Population Density:	69
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	226,897	Seniors:	84,033	18%
Small Urban:	156,594	Disabled:	31,983	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	383,491	School-Age:	102,179	22%
Urban:	78,836	Poverty:	75,434	16%
Total:	462,327	No Vehicle Households:	12,924	7%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of the Cheyenne River Reservation, South Dakota **FTA Region: 8**

<i>Cheyenne River Reservation</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>		<i>0.20</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	4,260.1	Population Density:	2
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	8,466	Seniors:	949	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	592	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	8,466	School-Age:	2,691	32%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3,229	38%
Total:	8,466	No Vehicle Households:	287	11%

Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma **FTA Region: 6**

<i>Cheyenne-Arapaho OTSA</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>		<i>0.12</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	8,121.8	Population Density:	19
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	64,845	Seniors:	27,609	17%
Small Urban:	58,029	Disabled:	7,988	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	122,874	School-Age:	33,848	21%
Urban:	34,995	Poverty:	19,993	13%
Total:	157,869	No Vehicle Households:	3,042	5%

Chickasaw Nation, Oklahoma **FTA Region: 6**

<i>Chickasaw OTSA</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>		<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	7,285.0	Population Density:	38
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	175,338	Seniors:	57,629	21%
Small Urban:	102,078	Disabled:	19,417	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	277,416	School-Age:	56,754	20%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	41,622	15%
Total:	277,416	No Vehicle Households:	7,369	7%

Chicken Ranch Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians of California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Chicken Ranch Rancheria</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>		<i>0.18</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	166
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	9	Seniors:	4	36%
Small Urban:	2	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	11	School-Age:	6	55%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	11	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Chippewa-Cree Indians of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, Montana			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Rocky Boy's Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.20
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	88.3	Population Density:	18
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,605	Seniors:	185	12%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	50	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,605	School-Age:	562	35%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	593	37%
Total:	1,605	No Vehicle Households:	63	15%

Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Chitimacha Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.12
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.4	Population Density:	1,000
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	409	Seniors:	39	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	21	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	409	School-Age:	91	22%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	64	16%
Total:	409	No Vehicle Households:	15	9%

Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Choctaw OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	10,613.0	Population Density:	21
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	150,417	Seniors:	45,938	20%
Small Urban:	71,964	Disabled:	18,402	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	222,381	School-Age:	46,006	20%
Urban:	2,091	Poverty:	44,358	20%
Total:	224,472	No Vehicle Households:	7,670	9%

Citizen Potawatomi Nation, Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Citizen Potawatomi Nation-Absentee Shawnee OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.11
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,116.9	Population Density:	95
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	77,279	Seniors:	16,393	15%
Small Urban:	11,056	Disabled:	6,563	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	88,335	School-Age:	23,287	22%
Urban:	18,289	Poverty:	10,281	10%
Total:	106,624	No Vehicle Households:	1,442	4%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Cocopah Tribe of Arizona			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Cocopah Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.23
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	10.0	Population Density:	102
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,019	Seniors:	484	47%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	108	11%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,019	School-Age:	130	13%
Urban:	6	Poverty:	330	32%
Total:	1,025	No Vehicle Households:	44	11%
Coeur D'Alene Tribe of the Coeur D'Alene Reservation, Idaho			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Coeur d'Alene Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.13
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	523.8	Population Density:	13
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	5,661	Seniors:	1,218	19%
Small Urban:	890	Disabled:	250	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	6,551	School-Age:	1,493	23%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,022	16%
Total:	6,551	No Vehicle Households:	109	4%
Cold Springs Rancheria of Mono Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Cold Springs Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.23
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	1,210
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	193	Seniors:	25	13%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	10	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	193	School-Age:	118	61%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	32	17%
Total:	193	No Vehicle Households:	11	21%
Colorado River Indian Tribes of the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Arizona and California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Colorado River Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	432.2	Population Density:	21
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	4,574	Seniors:	1,818	20%
Small Urban:	4,627	Disabled:	498	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	9,201	School-Age:	2,155	23%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,939	21%
Total:	9,201	No Vehicle Households:	231	7%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Comanche Nation, Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Fort Sill Apache OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	6,359.8	Population Density:	30
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	68,571	Seniors:	30,977	16%
Small Urban:	35,133	Disabled:	10,127	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	103,704	School-Age:	41,246	21%
Urban:	89,556	Poverty:	29,796	15%
Total:	193,260	No Vehicle Households:	5,239	8%
<i>Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Ft. Sill Apache-Caddo-Wichita-Delaware joint use area OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	193.0	Population Density:	61
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	6,037	Seniors:	2,261	19%
Small Urban:	5,818	Disabled:	793	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	11,855	School-Age:	2,803	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3,020	25%
Total:	11,855	No Vehicle Households:	478	11%
Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Flathead Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,938.1	Population Density:	14
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	21,925	Seniors:	4,915	19%
Small Urban:	4,247	Disabled:	940	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	26,172	School-Age:	6,212	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	5,203	20%
Total:	26,172	No Vehicle Households:	478	5%
Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Yakama Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	2,153.0	Population Density:	15
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	13,448	Seniors:	3,606	11%
Small Urban:	17,494	Disabled:	2,626	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	30,942	School-Age:	9,231	29%
Urban:	704	Poverty:	8,744	28%
Total:	31,646	No Vehicle Households:	658	8%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation, Washington FTA Region: 10

<i>Chehalis Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	7.0	Population Density:	98
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	691	Seniors:	54	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	22	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	691	School-Age:	213	31%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	160	23%
Total:	691	No Vehicle Households:	5	3%

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Washington FTA Region: 10

<i>Colville Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.15</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	2,116.6	Population Density:	4
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	6,819	Seniors:	1,152	15%
Small Urban:	763	Disabled:	338	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	7,582	School-Age:	1,907	25%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2,023	27%
Total:	7,582	No Vehicle Households:	150	6%

Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians of Oregon FTA Region: 10

<i>Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.29</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	349
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	6	55%
Small Urban:	11	Disabled:	3	27%
Small Urban and Rural:	11	School-Age:	7	64%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	11	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation, Nevada and Utah FTA Region: 8,9

<i>Goshute Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	177.4	Population Density:	1
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	105	Seniors:	10	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	7	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	105	School-Age:	27	26%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	34	32%
Total:	105	No Vehicle Households:	4	13%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Grand Ronde Community</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.00
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	15.7	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Reservation, Oregon			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Siletz Reservation and Off-Reservation Trust Land</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.18
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	5.8	Population Density:	53
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	308	Seniors:	24	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	15	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	308	School-Age:	83	27%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	62	20%
Total:	308	No Vehicle Households:	29	30%

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation, Oregon			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Celilo Village</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.21
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	276
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	44	Seniors:	5	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	6	14%
Small Urban and Rural:	44	School-Age:	12	27%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	18	41%
Total:	44	No Vehicle Households:	2	11%

Umatilla Reservation			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Umatilla Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.13
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	271.0	Population Density:	11
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,927	Seniors:	476	16%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	99	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,927	School-Age:	734	25%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	458	16%
Total:	2,927	No Vehicle Households:	52	5%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Warm Springs Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,010.8	Population Density:	3
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	3,311	Seniors:	219	7%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	219	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	3,311	School-Age:	1,080	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	910	27%
Total:	3,311	No Vehicle Households:	57	7%
Coquille Tribe of Oregon			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Coquille Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.13
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.7	Population Density:	153
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	251	Seniors:	16	6%
Small Urban:	7	Disabled:	15	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	258	School-Age:	21	8%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	67	26%
Total:	258	No Vehicle Households:	12	16%
Cortina Indian Rancheria of Wintun Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Cortina Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.08
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.2	Population Density:	16
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	19	Seniors:	4	21%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	19	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	4	21%
Total:	19	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Coushatta Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.17
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.1	Population Density:	23
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	25	Seniors:	7	28%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	4	16%
Small Urban and Rural:	25	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	4	16%
Total:	25	No Vehicle Households:	4	27%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians of Oregon			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Cow Creek Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.04
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.0	Population Density:	22
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	22	Seniors:	4	18%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	22	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	22	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Coyote Valley Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.18
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	1,046
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	4	4%
Small Urban:	104	Disabled:	1	1%
Small Urban and Rural:	104	School-Age:	12	12%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	21	20%
Total:	104	No Vehicle Households:	13	54%

Crow Creek Sioux Tribe of the Crow Creek Reservation, South Dakota			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Crow Creek Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.26
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	421.7	Population Density:	5
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,225	Seniors:	181	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	372	17%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,225	School-Age:	729	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,220	55%
Total:	2,225	No Vehicle Households:	83	15%

Crow Tribe of Montana			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Crow Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	3,562.2	Population Density:	2
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	6,887	Seniors:	696	10%
Small Urban:	7	Disabled:	465	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	6,894	School-Age:	2,027	29%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2,059	30%
Total:	6,894	No Vehicle Households:	106	6%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Delaware Nation, Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Caddo-Wichita-Delaware OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,026.3	Population Density:	14
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	14,638	Seniors:	2,901	20%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	869	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	14,638	School-Age:	3,389	23%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2,426	17%
Total:	14,638	No Vehicle Households:	272	5%
<i>Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Ft. Sill Apache-Caddo-Wichita-Delaware joint use area OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	193.0	Population Density:	61
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	6,037	Seniors:	2,261	19%
Small Urban:	5,818	Disabled:	793	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	11,855	School-Age:	2,803	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3,020	25%
Total:	11,855	No Vehicle Households:	478	11%
Dry Creek Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Dry Creek Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.23</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	425
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	53	Seniors:	6	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	1	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	53	School-Age:	22	42%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	15	28%
Total:	53	No Vehicle Households:	5	33%
Duckwater Shoshone Tribe of the Duckwater Reservation, Nevada			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Duckwater Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.18</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	6.2	Population Density:	24
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	149	Seniors:	23	15%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	19	13%
Small Urban and Rural:	149	School-Age:	52	35%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	26	17%
Total:	149	No Vehicle Households:	6	10%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians of North Carolina			FTA Region: 4	
<i>Eastern Cherokee Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	82.6	Population Density:	98
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	8,092	Seniors:	910	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	677	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	8,092	School-Age:	1,974	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,714	21%
Total:	8,092	No Vehicle Households:	290	11%

Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Eastern Shawnee OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.10
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	20.4	Population Density:	32
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	661	Seniors:	125	19%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	6	1%
Small Urban and Rural:	661	School-Age:	134	20%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	61	9%
Total:	661	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Elem Indian Colony of Pomo Indians of the Sulphur Bank Rancheria, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Sulphur Bank Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.30
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	919
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	69	Seniors:	5	7%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	15	22%
Small Urban and Rural:	69	School-Age:	23	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	32	46%
Total:	69	No Vehicle Households:	6	40%

Elk Valley Rancheria, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Elk Valley Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.20
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	552
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	16	21%
Small Urban:	77	Disabled:	6	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	77	School-Age:	20	26%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	19	25%
Total:	77	No Vehicle Households:	6	19%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Elko Band of the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Elko Colony</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.3	Population Density:	2,519
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	53	7%
Small Urban:	729	Disabled:	15	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	729	School-Age:	202	28%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	171	23%
Total:	729	No Vehicle Households:	19	7%

Ely Shoshone Tribe of Nevada **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Ely Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.09</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	811
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	15	11%
Small Urban:	133	Disabled:	7	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	133	School-Age:	26	20%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	8	6%
Total:	133	No Vehicle Households:	2	4%

Enterprise Rancheria of Maidu Indians of California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Enterprise Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.80</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	15
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1	Seniors:	1	100%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	1	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3	300%
Total:	1	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Cuyapaipe Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	7.9	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe of South Dakota			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Flandreau Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	4.0	Population Density:	102
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	408	Seniors:	28	7%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	7	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	408	School-Age:	131	32%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	50	12%
Total:	408	No Vehicle Households:	12	10%

Fond du Lac Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesote			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Fond du Lac Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	153.3	Population Density:	24
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	3,533	Seniors:	523	14%
Small Urban:	195	Disabled:	159	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	3,728	School-Age:	980	26%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	522	14%
Total:	3,728	No Vehicle Households:	80	6%

Forest County Potawatomi Community, Wisconsin			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Forest County Potawatomi Community</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	19.5	Population Density:	27
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	524	Seniors:	40	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	12	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	524	School-Age:	178	34%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	49	9%
Total:	524	No Vehicle Households:	22	14%

Fort Belknap Indian Community of the Fort Belknap Reservation of Montana			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Fort Belknap Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.19</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	968.9	Population Density:	3
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,959	Seniors:	283	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	103	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,959	School-Age:	982	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,142	39%
Total:	2,959	No Vehicle Households:	88	11%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Fort Bidwell Indian Community of the Fort Bidwell Reservation of California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Fort Bidwell Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.24</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	5.1	Population Density:	21
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	108	Seniors:	20	19%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	4	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	108	School-Age:	29	27%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	48	44%
Total:	108	No Vehicle Households:	13	29%

Fort Independence Indian Community of Paiute Indians of the Fort Independence Reservation, California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Fort Independence Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.09</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.6	Population Density:	153
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	86	Seniors:	14	16%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	86	School-Age:	13	15%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	4	5%
Total:	86	No Vehicle Households:	3	9%

Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribes of the Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation, Nevada and Oregon **FTA Region: 10**

<i>Fort McDermitt Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.23</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	54.6	Population Density:	6
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	309	Seniors:	50	16%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	29	9%
Small Urban and Rural:	309	School-Age:	110	36%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	99	32%
Total:	309	No Vehicle Households:	22	21%

<i>Fort McDermitt Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.23</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	54.6	Population Density:	6
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	309	Seniors:	50	16%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	29	9%
Small Urban and Rural:	309	School-Age:	110	36%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	99	32%
Total:	309	No Vehicle Households:	22	21%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, Arizon			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Fort McDowell Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	38.5	Population Density:	21
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	824	Seniors:	47	6%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	20	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	824	School-Age:	274	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	144	17%
Total:	824	No Vehicle Households:	32	14%
Fort Mojave Indian Tribe of Arizona, California & Nevada			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Fort Mojave Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.20
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	51.9	Population Density:	16
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	462	Seniors:	206	25%
Small Urban:	581	Disabled:	36	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,043	School-Age:	246	30%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	228	28%
Total:	813	No Vehicle Households:	33	10%
Fort Sill Apache Tribe of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Ft. Sill Apache-Caddo-Wichita-Delaware joint use area OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.17
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	193.0	Population Density:	61
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	6,037	Seniors:	2,261	19%
Small Urban:	5,818	Disabled:	793	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	11,855	School-Age:	2,803	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3,020	25%
Total:	11,855	No Vehicle Households:	478	11%
<i>Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Fort Sill Apache OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.13
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	6,359.8	Population Density:	30
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	68,571	Seniors:	30,977	16%
Small Urban:	35,133	Disabled:	10,127	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	103,704	School-Age:	41,246	21%
Urban:	89,556	Poverty:	29,796	15%
Total:	193,260	No Vehicle Households:	5,239	8%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Gila River Indian Community of the Gila River Indian Reservation, Arizona FTA Region: 9

<i>Gila River Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.24</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	583.7	Population Density:	19
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	11,226	Seniors:	936	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	561	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	11,226	School-Age:	3,754	33%
Urban:	31	Poverty:	5,625	50%
Total:	11,257	No Vehicle Households:	649	24%

Grand Portage Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota FTA Region: 5

<i>Grand Portage Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	74.3	Population Density:	7
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	557	Seniors:	65	12%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	22	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	557	School-Age:	104	19%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	115	21%
Total:	557	No Vehicle Households:	28	12%

Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians, Michigan FTA Region: 5

<i>Grand Traverse Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Greenville Rancheria of Maidu			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Greenville Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.13
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	178
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	22	Seniors:	14	64%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	22	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	22	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Grindstone Indian Rancheria of Wintun-Wailaki Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Grindstone Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.27
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	1,435
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	162	Seniors:	10	6%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	162	School-Age:	50	31%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	66	41%
Total:	162	No Vehicle Households:	23	55%
Guidiville Rancheria of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Guidiville Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.00
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Upper Lake Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.11
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.7	Population Density:	115
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	82	Seniors:	7	9%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	4	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	82	School-Age:	11	13%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	13	16%
Total:	82	No Vehicle Households:	3	11%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Hannahville Indian Community, Michigan			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Hannahville Community</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.19
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	5.7	Population Density:	52
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	295	Seniors:	17	6%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	11	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	295	School-Age:	98	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	111	38%
Total:	295	No Vehicle Households:	10	12%
Havasupai Tribe of the Havasupai Reservation, Arizona			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Havasupai Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.32
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	276.1	Population Density:	2
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	503	Seniors:	26	5%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	21	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	503	School-Age:	149	30%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	223	44%
Total:	503	No Vehicle Households:	97	77%
Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Ho-Chunk Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.19
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.3	Population Density:	480
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	638	Seniors:	78	12%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	23	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	638	School-Age:	210	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	164	26%
Total:	638	No Vehicle Households:	33	18%
Hoh Indian Tribe of the Hoh Indian Reservation, Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Hoh Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.7	Population Density:	137
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	102	Seniors:	4	4%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	102	School-Age:	29	28%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	42	41%
Total:	102	No Vehicle Households:	2	7%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Hoopa Valley Tribe, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Hoopa Valley Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.18
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	141.1	Population Density:	19
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,633	Seniors:	315	12%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	68	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,633	School-Age:	780	30%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	849	32%
Total:	2,633	No Vehicle Households:	116	14%
Hopi Tribe of Arizona			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Hopi Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.22
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	2,531.5	Population Density:	3
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	5,943	Seniors:	901	13%
Small Urban:	872	Disabled:	388	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	6,815	School-Age:	1,859	27%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2,702	40%
Total:	6,815	No Vehicle Households:	456	24%
Hopland Band of Pomo Indians of the Hopland Rancheria, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Hopland Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.39
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	118
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	14	Seniors:	13	93%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	14	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	14	No Vehicle Households:	7	100%
Hualapai Indian Tribe of the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Arizona			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Hualapai Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.21
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,590.7	Population Density:	1
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,353	Seniors:	93	7%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	112	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,353	School-Age:	424	31%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	462	34%
Total:	1,353	No Vehicle Households:	87	25%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Huron Potawatomi, Inc., Michigan			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Huron Potawatomi Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.02
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	54
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	11	Seniors:	1	9%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	11	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	11	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Inaja Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the Inaja and Cosmit Reservation, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Inaja and Cosmit Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.00
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.3	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Ione Band of Miwok Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Ione Band of Miwok TDSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.10
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.8	Population Density:	9
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	8	Seniors:	4	50%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	8	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	8	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska			FTA Region: 7	
<i>Iowa Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	19.6	Population Density:	9
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	168	Seniors:	29	17%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	17	10%
Small Urban and Rural:	168	School-Age:	56	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	16	10%
Total:	168	No Vehicle Households:	2	3%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Iowa OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	357.7	Population Density:	17
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	6,148	Seniors:	1,135	18%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	491	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	6,148	School-Age:	1,454	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	741	12%
Total:	6,148	No Vehicle Households:	97	4%
Jackson Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Jackson Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.10</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.5	Population Density:	4
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2	Seniors:	1	50%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	2	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	2	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe of Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Jamestown S'Klallam Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.22</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	291
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	9	Seniors:	3	67%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	9	School-Age:	4	44%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	9	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Jamul Indian Village of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Jamul Indian Village</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	51
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	1	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	1	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Jena Band of Choctaw Indians, Louisiana			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Jena Band of Choctaw TDSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	706.8	Population Density:	85
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	31,903	Seniors:	9,860	16%
Small Urban:	3,453	Disabled:	4,661	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	35,356	School-Age:	12,912	22%
Urban:	24,628	Poverty:	9,747	16%
Total:	59,984	No Vehicle Households:	1,923	9%
Jicarilla Apache Nation, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Jicarilla Apache Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,364.0	Population Density:	2
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,755	Seniors:	181	7%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	118	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,755	School-Age:	872	32%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	770	28%
Total:	2,755	No Vehicle Households:	78	10%
Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians of the Kaibab Indian Reservation, Arizona			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Kaibab Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.18
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	188.8	Population Density:	1
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	196	Seniors:	8	4%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	8	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	196	School-Age:	64	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	75	38%
Total:	196	No Vehicle Households:	10	12%
Kalispel Indian Community of the Kalispel Reservation, Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Kalispel Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	7.3	Population Density:	28
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	206	Seniors:	13	6%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	5	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	206	School-Age:	59	29%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	41	20%
Total:	206	No Vehicle Households:	5	10%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Karuk Tribe of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Karuk Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.37
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	1,994
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	57	Seniors:	25	44%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	57	School-Age:	18	32%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	41	72%
Total:	57	No Vehicle Households:	6	35%
Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of the Stewarts Point Rancheria, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Stewarts Point Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.28
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	847
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	57	Seniors:	11	19%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	2	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	57	School-Age:	24	42%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	26	46%
Total:	57	No Vehicle Households:	5	31%
Kaw Nation, Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Kaw-Ponca joint use area OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	108.8	Population Density:	256
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,830	Seniors:	5,977	21%
Small Urban:	24,991	Disabled:	1,961	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	27,821	School-Age:	5,582	20%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	4,162	15%
Total:	27,821	No Vehicle Households:	786	7%
<i>Kaw OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.13
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	475.3	Population Density:	13
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	6,123	Seniors:	1,317	22%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	360	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	6,123	School-Age:	1,355	22%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	719	12%
Total:	6,123	No Vehicle Households:	128	5%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Keweenaw Bay Indian Community, Michigan			FTA Region: 5	
<i>L'Anse Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	92.0	Population Density:	38
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	3,538	Seniors:	744	21%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	248	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	3,538	School-Age:	757	21%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	431	12%
Total:	3,538	No Vehicle Households:	132	9%
<i>Ontonagon Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	3.8	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Kickapoo Traditional Tribe of Texas			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Kickapoo (TX) Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.31</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	2,267
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	420	Seniors:	30	7%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	36	9%
Small Urban and Rural:	420	School-Age:	152	36%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	330	79%
Total:	420	No Vehicle Households:	26	24%
Kickapoo Tribe of Indians of the Kickapoo Reservation in Kansas			FTA Region: 7	
<i>Kickapoo (KS) Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.15</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	236.4	Population Density:	19
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	4,419	Seniors:	1,019	23%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	320	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	4,419	School-Age:	1,018	23%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	668	15%
Total:	4,419	No Vehicle Households:	96	6%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Kickapoo OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.12</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	251.3	Population Density:	74
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	11,420	Seniors:	2,818	15%
Small Urban:	7,124	Disabled:	1,199	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	18,544	School-Age:	3,794	20%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2,886	16%
Total:	18,544	No Vehicle Households:	310	5%
Kiowa Indian Tribe of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Ft. Sill Apache-Caddo-Wichita-Delaware joint use area OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	193.0	Population Density:	61
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	6,037	Seniors:	2,261	19%
Small Urban:	5,818	Disabled:	793	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	11,855	School-Age:	2,803	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3,020	25%
Total:	11,855	No Vehicle Households:	478	11%
Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Fort Sill Apache OTSA			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Fort Sill Apache OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	6,359.8	Population Density:	30
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	68,571	Seniors:	30,977	16%
Small Urban:	35,133	Disabled:	10,127	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	103,704	School-Age:	41,246	21%
Urban:	89,556	Poverty:	29,796	15%
Total:	193,260	No Vehicle Households:	5,239	8%
Klamath Tribes, Oregon			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Klamath Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.04</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.5	Population Density:	19
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	9	Seniors:	2	22%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	9	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	9	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Kootenai Tribe of Idaho			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Kootenai Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.09
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	2,537
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	75	Seniors:	8	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	75	School-Age:	18	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	8	11%
Total:	75	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

La Jolla Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the La Jolla Reservation, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>La Jolla Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.12
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	13.5	Population Density:	29
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	390	Seniors:	43	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	5	1%
Small Urban and Rural:	390	School-Age:	107	27%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	67	17%
Total:	390	No Vehicle Households:	6	5%

La Posta Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the La Posta Indian Reservation, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>La Posta Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.37
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	6.4	Population Density:	3
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	18	Seniors:	2	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	18	School-Age:	14	78%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	17	94%
Total:	18	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa
Indians of Wisconsin

FTA Region: 5

Lac Courte Oreilles Reservation

Composite Need: 0.16

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 106.9 Population Density: 27

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,886	Seniors:	447	15%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	88	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,886	School-Age:	799	28%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	644	22%
Total:	2,886	No Vehicle Households:	91	9%

Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians
of the Lac du Flambeau Reservation of Wisconsin

FTA Region: 5

Lac du Flambeau Reservation

Composite Need: 0.15

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 108.1 Population Density: 28

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,995	Seniors:	663	22%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	136	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,995	School-Age:	707	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	469	16%
Total:	2,995	No Vehicle Households:	85	8%

Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians,
Michigan

FTA Region: 5

Lac Vieux Desert Reservation

Composite Need: 0.23

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 0.5 Population Density: 263

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	135	Seniors:	11	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	2	1%
Small Urban and Rural:	135	School-Age:	53	39%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	65	48%
Total:	135	No Vehicle Households:	8	17%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Las Vegas Tribe of Paiute Indians of the Las Vegas Indian Colony, Nevada **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Las Vegas Colony</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	6.2	Population Density:	17
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	44		Seniors: 8	7%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled: 2	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	44		School-Age: 24	22%
Urban:	64		Poverty: 31	29%
Total:	108	No Vehicle Households:	4	12%

Leech Lake Band of Chippewa of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota **FTA Region: 5**

<i>Leech Lake Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.16</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	972.4	Population Density:	10
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	10,205		Seniors: 1,808	18%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled: 685	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	10,205		School-Age: 2,606	26%
Urban:	0		Poverty: 2,168	21%
Total:	10,205	No Vehicle Households:	310	9%

Little River Band of Ottawa Indians, Michigan **FTA Region: 5**

<i>Little River Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.10</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.3	Population Density:	7
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2		Seniors: 1	50%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled: 0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	2		School-Age: 0	0%
Urban:	0		Poverty: 0	0%
Total:	2	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians, Michigan **FTA Region: 5**

<i>Little Traverse Bay Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0		Seniors: 0	0%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled: 0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0		School-Age: 0	0%
Urban:	0		Poverty: 0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla & Cupeno Indians of the Los Coyotes Reservation, California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Los Coyotes Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.18
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	39.2	Population Density:	2
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	70		Seniors:	7 10%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	5 7%
Small Urban and Rural:	70		School-Age:	15 21%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	35 50%
Total:	70	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Lovelock Paiute Tribe of the Lovelock Indian Colony, Nevada **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Lovelock Colony</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.24
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	2,978
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	103		Seniors:	22 21%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	15 15%
Small Urban and Rural:	103		School-Age:	27 26%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	41 40%
Total:	103	No Vehicle Households:	7	20%

Lower Brule Sioux Tribe of the Lower Brule Reservation, South Dakota **FTA Region: 8**

<i>Lower Brule Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.22
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	338.7	Population Density:	4
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,353		Seniors:	95 7%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	20 1%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,353		School-Age:	442 33%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	653 48%
Total:	1,353	No Vehicle Households:	82	23%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Lower Elwha Tribal Community of the Lower Elwha Reservation, Washington FTA Region: 10

<i>Lower Elwha Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.22
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.7	Population Density:	372
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	260	Seniors:	22	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	14	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	260	School-Age:	95	37%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	98	38%
Total:	260	No Vehicle Households:	15	19%

Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota FTA Region: 5

<i>Lower Sioux Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.10
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	2.7	Population Density:	124
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	335	Seniors:	28	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	8	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	335	School-Age:	92	27%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	30	9%
Total:	335	No Vehicle Households:	2	2%

Lummi Tribe of the Lummi Reservation, Washington FTA Region: 10

<i>Lummi Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.13
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	21.0	Population Density:	200
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	4,193	Seniors:	589	14%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	194	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	4,193	School-Age:	1,035	25%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	758	18%
Total:	4,193	No Vehicle Households:	80	5%

Makah Indian Tribe of the Makah Indian Reservation, Washington FTA Region: 10

<i>Makah Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	46.9	Population Density:	29
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,356	Seniors:	117	9%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	37	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,356	School-Age:	387	29%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	415	31%
Total:	1,356	No Vehicle Households:	56	12%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Manchester-Point Arena Rancheria, California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Manchester-Point Arena Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.22
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.6	Population Density:	334
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	197	Seniors:	30	15%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	24	12%
Small Urban and Rural:	197	School-Age:	60	30%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	62	31%
Total:	197	No Vehicle Households:	12	21%

Manzanita Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the Manzanita Reservation, California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Manzanita Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.09
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	5.6	Population Density:	12
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	69	Seniors:	6	9%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	7	10%
Small Urban and Rural:	69	School-Age:	4	6%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3	4%
Total:	69	No Vehicle Households:	3	14%

Mashantucket Pequot Tribe of Connecticut **FTA Region: 1**

<i>Mashantucket Pequot Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.10
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	2.1	Population Density:	148
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	315	Seniors:	33	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	13	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	315	School-Age:	69	22%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	15	5%
Total:	315	No Vehicle Households:	6	7%

Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico Rancheria, California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Mechoopda TDSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.3	Population Density:	2,475
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	203	6%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	239	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	793	25%
Urban:	3,198	Poverty:	638	20%
Total:	3,198	No Vehicle Households:	109	10%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin **FTA Region: 5**

Menominee Reservation *Composite Need: 0.19*

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 353.8 Population Density: 9

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	3,216	Seniors:	267	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	101	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	3,216	School-Age:	1,136	35%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,150	36%
Total:	3,216	No Vehicle Households:	89	11%

Menominee/Stockbridge-Munsee joint use area *Composite Need: 0.16*

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 2.0 Population Density: 148

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	295	Seniors:	24	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	33	11%
Small Urban and Rural:	295	School-Age:	46	16%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	80	27%
Total:	295	No Vehicle Households:	9	20%

Mesa Grande Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the Mesa Grande Reservation, California **FTA Region: 9**

Mesa Grande Reservation *Composite Need: 0.21*

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 1.4 Population Density: 54

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	75	Seniors:	4	5%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	2	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	75	School-Age:	23	31%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	28	37%
Total:	75	No Vehicle Households:	5	29%

Mescalero Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, New Mexico **FTA Region: 9**

Mescalero Reservation *Composite Need: 0.20*

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 719.1 Population Density: 4

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	3,156	Seniors:	175	6%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	160	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	3,156	School-Age:	1,089	35%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,109	35%
Total:	3,156	No Vehicle Households:	185	22%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Miami Tribe of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Miami-Peoria joint use area OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	12.4	Population Density:	351
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	157	Seniors:	1,039	24%
Small Urban:	4,184	Disabled:	480	11%
Small Urban and Rural:	4,341	School-Age:	913	21%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	799	18%
Total:	4,341	No Vehicle Households:	194	10%
<i>Miami OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.15</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	27.7	Population Density:	10
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	271	Seniors:	40	15%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	2	1%
Small Urban and Rural:	271	School-Age:	64	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	95	35%
Total:	271	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida			FTA Region: 4	
<i>Miccosukee Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	128.3	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Middletown Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.23</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	379
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	73	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	2	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	73	School-Age:	25	34%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	37	51%
Total:	73	No Vehicle Households:	5	28%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Mille Lacs Band of Chippewa of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota **FTA Region: 5**

<i>Mille Lacs Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	95.8	Population Density:	47
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	4,548		Seniors:	1,188 26%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	256 6%
Small Urban and Rural:	4,548		School-Age:	999 22%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	664 15%
Total:	4,548	No Vehicle Households:	175	10%

Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, Mississippi **FTA Region: 4**

<i>Mississippi Choctaw Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.20
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	24.8	Population Density:	174
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	4,217		Seniors:	410 10%
Small Urban:	94		Disabled:	338 8%
Small Urban and Rural:	4,311		School-Age:	1,448 34%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	1,502 35%
Total:	4,311	No Vehicle Households:	159	14%

Moapa Band of Paiute Indians of the Moapa River Indian Reservation, Nevada **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Moapa River Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.21
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	112.0	Population Density:	2
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	206		Seniors:	20 10%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	12 6%
Small Urban and Rural:	206		School-Age:	54 26%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	61 30%
Total:	206	No Vehicle Households:	25	32%

Modoc Tribe of Oklahoma **FTA Region: 6**

<i>Modoc OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.12
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	6.2	Population Density:	36
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	228		Seniors:	22 10%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	15 7%
Small Urban and Rural:	228		School-Age:	53 23%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	43 19%
Total:	228	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Mohegan Indian Tribe of Connecticut			FTA Region: 1	
<i>Mohegan Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.00
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.7	Population Density:	3
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	2	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	2	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Mooretown Rancheria of Maidu Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Mooretown Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.19
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	2,164
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	10	6%
Small Urban:	166	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	166	School-Age:	58	35%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	51	31%
Total:	166	No Vehicle Households:	13	24%

Morongo Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Morongo Reservation, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Morongo Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	49.1	Population Density:	19
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	954	Seniors:	114	12%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	32	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	954	School-Age:	327	34%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	163	17%
Total:	954	No Vehicle Households:	17	6%

Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the Muckleshoot Reservation, Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Muckleshoot Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	6.1	Population Density:	590
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	828	Seniors:	546	15%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	167	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	828	School-Age:	929	26%
Urban:	2,769	Poverty:	573	16%
Total:	3,597	No Vehicle Households:	103	8%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Muscogee (Creek) Nation, Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Creek OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.12</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	4,647.9	Population Density:	152
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	138,708	Seniors:	117,282	17%
Small Urban:	91,778	Disabled:	43,385	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	230,486	School-Age:	141,744	20%
Urban:	474,079	Poverty:	79,426	11%
Total:	704,565	No Vehicle Households:	20,434	7%
<i>Creek-Seminole joint use area OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	65.1	Population Density:	32
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,637	Seniors:	492	23%
Small Urban:	465	Disabled:	163	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,102	School-Age:	504	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	424	20%
Total:	2,102	No Vehicle Households:	68	9%
Narragansett Indian Tribe of Rhode Island			FTA Region: 1	
<i>Narragansett Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.10</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	3.4	Population Density:	18
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	60	Seniors:	8	13%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	2	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	60	School-Age:	11	18%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	9	15%
Total:	60	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Navajo Nation, Arizona, New Mexico & Utah			FTA Region: 6,8,9	
<i>Navajo Nation Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.23</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	22,173.6	Population Density:	7
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	126,210	Seniors:	17,934	12%
Small Urban:	29,004	Disabled:	12,817	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	155,214	School-Age:	50,811	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	65,001	42%
Total:	155,214	No Vehicle Households:	7,648	19%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Nez Perce Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.13
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,195.1	Population Density:	15
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	14,152	Seniors:	3,955	22%
Small Urban:	3,807	Disabled:	778	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	17,959	School-Age:	3,703	21%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2,452	14%
Total:	17,959	No Vehicle Households:	364	5%
Nisqually Indian Tribe of the Nisqually Reservation, Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Nisqually Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	8.0	Population Density:	74
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	588	Seniors:	51	9%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	27	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	588	School-Age:	182	31%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	107	18%
Total:	588	No Vehicle Households:	21	12%
Nooksack Indian Tribe of Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Nooksack Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.00
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Northern Cheyenne Tribe of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Montana			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Northern Cheyenne Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.21
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	697.1	Population Density:	6
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	4,470	Seniors:	319	7%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	230	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	4,470	School-Age:	1,502	34%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2,025	45%
Total:	4,470	No Vehicle Households:	176	15%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Northfork Rancheria of Mono Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>North Fork Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	74
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	9	Seniors:	1	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	9	School-Age:	6	67%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	9	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Northwestern Band of Shoshoni Nation of Utah (Washakie)			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Northwestern Shoshoni Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.00
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.3	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Oglala Sioux			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Pine Ridge Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.23
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	3,158.9	Population Density:	4
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	11,063	Seniors:	1,132	8%
Small Urban:	3,005	Disabled:	749	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	14,068	School-Age:	4,911	35%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	7,234	51%
Total:	14,068	No Vehicle Households:	471	15%
Omaha Tribe of Nebraska			FTA Region: 7	
<i>Omaha Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	307.5	Population Density:	17
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	5,194	Seniors:	942	18%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	138	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	5,194	School-Age:	1,476	28%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,158	22%
Total:	5,194	No Vehicle Households:	155	9%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Oneida Nation of New York			FTA Region: 2	
<i>Oneida (NY) Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.21
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	379
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	26	Seniors:	10	38%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	26	School-Age:	17	65%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	26	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Oneida (WI) Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.09
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	102.3	Population Density:	208
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	7,764	Seniors:	2,109	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	666	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	7,764	School-Age:	5,439	26%
Urban:	13,555	Poverty:	1,081	5%
Total:	21,319	No Vehicle Households:	144	2%
Onondaga Nation of New York			FTA Region: 2	
<i>Onondaga Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.10
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	9.3	Population Density:	159
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	808	Seniors:	61	4%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	15	1%
Small Urban and Rural:	808	School-Age:	536	36%
Urban:	665	Poverty:	110	7%
Total:	1,473	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Osage Tribe, Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Osage Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.13
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	2,250.8	Population Density:	20
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	26,589	Seniors:	7,930	18%
Small Urban:	12,253	Disabled:	2,888	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	38,842	School-Age:	9,635	22%
Urban:	5,595	Poverty:	5,651	13%
Total:	44,437	No Vehicle Households:	1,050	6%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Otoe-Missouria Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Otoe-Missouria OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	192.3	Population Density:	4
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	778	Seniors:	146	19%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	62	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	778	School-Age:	171	22%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	166	21%
Total:	778	No Vehicle Households:	33	12%
Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Ottawa OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.17
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	23.5	Population Density:	264
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,226	Seniors:	1,180	19%
Small Urban:	4,978	Disabled:	636	10%
Small Urban and Rural:	6,204	School-Age:	1,316	21%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,228	20%
Total:	6,204	No Vehicle Households:	362	15%
Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Paiute (UT) Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.22
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	51.0	Population Density:	5
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	217	Seniors:	11	4%
Small Urban:	53	Disabled:	21	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	270	School-Age:	89	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	149	55%
Total:	270	No Vehicle Households:	9	12%
Paiute-Shoshone Indians of the Bishop Community of the Bishop Colony, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Bishop Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.4	Population Density:	1,060
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	164	11%
Small Urban:	1,441	Disabled:	51	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,441	School-Age:	400	28%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	334	23%
Total:	1,441	No Vehicle Households:	50	10%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

**Paiute-Shoshone Indians of the Lone Pine Community of the FTA Region: 9
Lone Pine Reservation, California**

<i>Lone Pine Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.17
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.4	Population Density:	589
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	212	Seniors:	37	17%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	4	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	212	School-Age:	33	16%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	62	29%
Total:	212	No Vehicle Households:	17	20%

**Paiute-Shoshone Tribe of the Fallon Reservation and Colony, FTA Region: 9
Nevada**

<i>Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	12.8	Population Density:	49
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	620	Seniors:	92	15%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	29	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	620	School-Age:	165	27%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	146	24%
Total:	620	No Vehicle Households:	4	2%

<i>Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Colony</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	739
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	19	15%
Small Urban:	123	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	123	School-Age:	28	23%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	36	29%
Total:	123	No Vehicle Households:	3	8%

Pala Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Pala Reservation FTA Region: 9

<i>Pala Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.20
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	20.1	Population Density:	78
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,573	Seniors:	114	7%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	88	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,573	School-Age:	497	32%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	637	40%
Total:	1,573	No Vehicle Households:	66	17%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Pascua Yaqui Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.22
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.9	Population Density:	1,777
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	169	5%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	170	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	1,244	38%
Urban:	3,315	Poverty:	1,435	43%
Total:	3,315	No Vehicle Households:	125	17%
Passamaquoddy Tribe of Maine			FTA Region: 1	
<i>Indian Township Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.19
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	37.4	Population Density:	18
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	676	Seniors:	56	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	19	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	676	School-Age:	242	36%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	166	25%
Total:	676	No Vehicle Households:	52	21%
<i>Pleasant Point Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.20
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.5	Population Density:	1,376
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	640	Seniors:	63	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	36	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	640	School-Age:	178	28%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	238	37%
Total:	640	No Vehicle Households:	41	18%
Pauma Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Pauma & Yuima Reservation, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Pauma and Yuima Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.12
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	9.4	Population Density:	20
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	186	Seniors:	14	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	15	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	186	School-Age:	46	25%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	26	14%
Total:	186	No Vehicle Households:	3	7%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Pawnee OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	515.7	Population Density:	32
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	13,352		Seniors: 3,259	20%
Small Urban:	3,157		Disabled: 1,061	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	16,509		School-Age: 3,608	22%
Urban:	0		Poverty: 2,133	13%
Total:	16,509	No Vehicle Households:	332	5%

Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Pechanga Band of FTA Region: 9
Luiseno Mission Indians of the Pechanga Reservation,
California

<i>Pechanga Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.21</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	7.0	Population Density:	67
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	297		Seniors: 84	18%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled: 33	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	297		School-Age: 193	41%
Urban:	170		Poverty: 156	33%
Total:	467	No Vehicle Households:	9	6%

Penobscot Tribe of Maine FTA Region: 1

<i>Penobscot Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.16</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	7.8	Population Density:	72
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2		Seniors: 73	13%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled: 31	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	2		School-Age: 115	20%
Urban:	560		Poverty: 137	24%
Total:	562	No Vehicle Households:	41	19%

Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Peoria OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	39.3	Population Density:	123
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,070	Seniors:	1,316	27%
Small Urban:	3,770	Disabled:	251	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	4,840	School-Age:	800	17%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	521	11%
Total:	4,840	No Vehicle Households:	80	4%
<i>Miami-Peoria joint use area OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	12.4	Population Density:	351
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	157	Seniors:	1,039	24%
Small Urban:	4,184	Disabled:	480	11%
Small Urban and Rural:	4,341	School-Age:	913	21%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	799	18%
Total:	4,341	No Vehicle Households:	194	10%
Picayune Rancheria of Chukchansi Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Picayune Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	173
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	20	Seniors:	2	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	20	School-Age:	12	60%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	20	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Pinoleville Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Pinoleville Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.15</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	860
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	18	13%
Small Urban:	136	Disabled:	15	11%
Small Urban and Rural:	136	School-Age:	43	32%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	24	18%
Total:	136	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Pit River Tribe, California

FTA Region: 9

Lookout Rancheria *Composite Need:* 0.09

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 0.1 Population Density: 110

Population		Population		Percent
Rural:	7	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	7	School-Age:	3	43%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	7	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Pit River Trust Land *Composite Need:* 0.68

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 0.4 Population Density: 22

Population		Population		Percent
Rural:	9	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	9	School-Age:	7	78%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	19	211%
Total:	9	No Vehicle Households:	3	50%

XL Ranch *Composite Need:* 0.14

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 14.4 Population Density: 1

Population		Population		Percent
Rural:	14	Seniors:	7	50%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	14	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3	21%
Total:	14	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Big Bend Rancheria *Composite Need:* 0.00

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 0.1 Population Density: 0

Population		Population		Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

<i>Montgomery Creek Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.64</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	34

Population		Population		Percent
Rural:	5	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	5	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	11	220%
Total:	5	No Vehicle Households:	3	100%

<i>Likely Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	0

Population		Population		Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

<i>Roaring Creek Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.02</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	70

Population		Population		Percent
Rural:	9	Seniors:	1	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	9	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	9	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Poarch Band of Creek Indians of Alabama	FTA Region: 4
--	----------------------

<i>Poarch Creek Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.22</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.4	Population Density:	389

Population		Population		Percent
Rural:	156	Seniors:	25	16%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	19	12%
Small Urban and Rural:	156	School-Age:	29	19%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	66	42%
Total:	156	No Vehicle Households:	13	20%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians, Michigan and Indiana FTA Region: 5

<i>Pokagon Band of Potawatomi TDSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	129.0	Population Density:	274
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	9,375	Seniors:	6,616	19%
Small Urban:	9,069	Disabled:	2,268	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	18,444	School-Age:	7,382	21%
Urban:	16,971	Poverty:	4,260	12%
Total:	35,415	No Vehicle Households:	1,244	9%

Ponca Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma FTA Region: 6

<i>Ponca OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.18</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	163.6	Population Density:	14
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,284	Seniors:	400	18%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	165	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,284	School-Age:	605	26%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	765	33%
Total:	2,284	No Vehicle Households:	58	7%

<i>Kaw-Ponca joint use area OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	108.8	Population Density:	256
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,830	Seniors:	5,977	21%
Small Urban:	24,991	Disabled:	1,961	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	27,821	School-Age:	5,582	20%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	4,162	15%
Total:	27,821	No Vehicle Households:	786	7%

Port Gamble Indian Community of the Port Gamble Reservation, Washington FTA Region: 10

<i>Port Gamble Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.15</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.9	Population Density:	370
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	699	Seniors:	52	7%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	43	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	699	School-Age:	233	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	120	17%
Total:	699	No Vehicle Households:	18	9%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Prairie Band of Potawatomi Nation, Kansas			FTA Region: 7	
<i>Prairie Band Potawatomi Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.11</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	121.4	Population Density:	10
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,238	Seniors:	167	13%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	60	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,238	School-Age:	318	26%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	92	7%
Total:	1,238	No Vehicle Households:	6	2%
Prairie Island Indian Community in the State of Minnesota			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Prairie Island Indian Community</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.16</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.9	Population Density:	208
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	177	Seniors:	15	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	16	9%
Small Urban and Rural:	177	School-Age:	59	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	28	16%
Total:	177	No Vehicle Households:	9	14%
Pueblo of Acoma, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Acoma Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	411.3	Population Density:	7
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,802	Seniors:	337	12%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	120	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,802	School-Age:	788	28%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	827	30%
Total:	2,802	No Vehicle Households:	86	12%
Pueblo of Cochiti, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Cochiti Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	80.5	Population Density:	19
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,502	Seniors:	322	21%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	91	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,502	School-Age:	312	21%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	247	16%
Total:	1,502	No Vehicle Households:	30	6%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Pueblo of Isleta, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Isleta Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	330.8	Population Density:	10
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,411	Seniors:	406	13%
Small Urban:	120	Disabled:	221	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,531	School-Age:	845	27%
Urban:	1,635	Poverty:	582	18%
Total:	3,166	No Vehicle Households:	77	7%
Pueblo of Jemez, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Jemez Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	139.7	Population Density:	14
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,958	Seniors:	196	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	112	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,958	School-Age:	568	29%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	499	25%
Total:	1,958	No Vehicle Households:	78	17%
Pueblo of Laguna, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Laguna Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	774.4	Population Density:	5
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	3,815	Seniors:	543	14%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	270	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	3,815	School-Age:	1,021	27%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,008	26%
Total:	3,815	No Vehicle Households:	138	13%
Pueblo of Nambe, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Nambe Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	32.0	Population Density:	55
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	682	Seniors:	332	19%
Small Urban:	1,082	Disabled:	112	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,764	School-Age:	367	21%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	235	13%
Total:	1,764	No Vehicle Households:	44	6%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Pueblo of Picuris, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Picuris Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.17
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	27.4	Population Density:	66
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,801	Seniors:	342	19%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	151	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,801	School-Age:	399	22%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	453	25%
Total:	1,801	No Vehicle Households:	67	10%
Pueblo of Pojoaque, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Pojoaque Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.11
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	21.2	Population Density:	128
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	729	Seniors:	384	14%
Small Urban:	1,983	Disabled:	91	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,712	School-Age:	581	21%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	386	14%
Total:	2,712	No Vehicle Households:	25	2%
Pueblo of San Felipe, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>San Felipe Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	79.5	Population Density:	40
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	3,185	Seniors:	259	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	127	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	3,185	School-Age:	913	29%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	977	31%
Total:	3,185	No Vehicle Households:	70	10%
Pueblo of San Ildefonso, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>San Ildefonso Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.12
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	43.7	Population Density:	35
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	874	Seniors:	207	14%
Small Urban:	650	Disabled:	58	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,524	School-Age:	348	23%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	190	12%
Total:	1,524	No Vehicle Households:	28	5%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Pueblo of San Juan, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>San Juan Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	26.7	Population Density:	253
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,751	Seniors:	824	12%
Small Urban:	4,997	Disabled:	312	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	6,748	School-Age:	1,620	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,532	23%
Total:	6,748	No Vehicle Households:	131	6%
Pueblo of Sandia, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Sandia Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	39.0	Population Density:	113
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	520	Seniors:	509	12%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	772	17%
Small Urban and Rural:	520	School-Age:	1,091	25%
Urban:	3,894	Poverty:	783	18%
Total:	4,414	No Vehicle Households:	82	6%
Pueblo of Santa Ana, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Santa Ana Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	100.5	Population Density:	5
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	59	Seniors:	63	13%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	34	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	59	School-Age:	182	37%
Urban:	428	Poverty:	26	5%
Total:	487	No Vehicle Households:	12	10%
Pueblo of Santa Clara, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Santa Clara Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	76.7	Population Density:	139
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,701	Seniors:	1,672	16%
Small Urban:	7,957	Disabled:	763	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	10,658	School-Age:	2,389	22%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2,115	20%
Total:	10,658	No Vehicle Households:	376	9%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Pueblo of Santo Domingo, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Santo Domingo Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.20
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	106.2	Population Density:	30
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	146	Seniors:	261	8%
Small Urban:	3,020	Disabled:	285	9%
Small Urban and Rural:	3,166	School-Age:	966	31%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,225	39%
Total:	3,166	No Vehicle Households:	75	14%
Pueblo of Taos, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Taos Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	155.0	Population Density:	29
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	851	Seniors:	940	21%
Small Urban:	3,633	Disabled:	185	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	4,484	School-Age:	853	19%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,180	26%
Total:	4,484	No Vehicle Households:	207	11%
Pueblo of Tesuque, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Tesuque Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.12
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	26.5	Population Density:	30
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	806	Seniors:	93	12%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	15	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	806	School-Age:	182	23%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	151	19%
Total:	806	No Vehicle Households:	10	3%
Pueblo of Zia, New Mexico			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Zia Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.12
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	187.7	Population Density:	3
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	646	Seniors:	65	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	16	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	646	School-Age:	174	27%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	88	14%
Total:	646	No Vehicle Households:	11	8%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation, Washington **FTA Region: 10**

<i>Puyallup Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.11</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	28.5	Population Density:	1,449
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	94		Seniors:	4,742 11%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	2,001 5%
Small Urban and Rural:	94		School-Age:	9,475 23%
Urban:	41,241		Poverty:	5,018 12%
Total:	41,335	No Vehicle Households:	859	6%

Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of the Pyramid Lake Reservation, Nevada **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Pyramid Lake Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	553.9	Population Density:	3
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,147		Seniors:	269 16%
Small Urban:	587		Disabled:	53 3%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,734		School-Age:	435 25%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	311 18%
Total:	1,734	No Vehicle Households:	23	4%

Quapaw Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma **FTA Region: 6**

<i>Quapaw OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.15</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	86.4	Population Density:	86
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	4,671		Seniors:	1,442 19%
Small Urban:	2,784		Disabled:	643 9%
Small Urban and Rural:	7,455		School-Age:	1,563 21%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	1,358 18%
Total:	7,455	No Vehicle Households:	224	8%

Quartz Valley Indian Community of the Quartz Valley Reservation of California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Quartz Valley Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.21</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.0	Population Density:	131
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	126		Seniors:	29 23%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	4 3%
Small Urban and Rural:	126		School-Age:	44 35%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	45 36%
Total:	126	No Vehicle Households:	3	7%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation, California & Arizona **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Fort Yuma Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.20</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	68.8	Population Density:	35
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,810		Seniors:	357 15%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	184 8%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,810		School-Age:	696 29%
Urban:	566		Poverty:	810 34%
Total:	2,376	No Vehicle Households:	128	16%

Quileute Tribe of the Quileute Reservation, Washington **FTA Region: 10**

<i>Quileute Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.18</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.6	Population Density:	237
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	371		Seniors:	18 5%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	9 2%
Small Urban and Rural:	371		School-Age:	101 27%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	125 34%
Total:	371	No Vehicle Households:	27	23%

Quinault Tribe of the Quinault Reservation, Washington **FTA Region: 10**

<i>Quinault Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	316.3	Population Density:	4
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,370		Seniors:	131 10%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	57 4%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,370		School-Age:	402 29%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	425 31%
Total:	1,370	No Vehicle Households:	38	9%

Ramona Band or Village of Cahuilla Mission Indians of California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Ramona Village</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.9	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0		Seniors:	0 0%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	0 0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0		School-Age:	0 0%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	0 0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Red Cliff Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	21.9	Population Density:	49
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,078	Seniors:	93	9%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	47	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,078	School-Age:	315	29%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	321	30%
Total:	1,078	No Vehicle Households:	36	10%

Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, Minnesota			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Red Lake Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.20
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	880.3	Population Density:	6
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	5,162	Seniors:	347	7%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	175	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	5,162	School-Age:	1,859	36%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2,024	39%
Total:	5,162	No Vehicle Households:	206	15%

Redwood Valley Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Redwood Valley Rancheria Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.13
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.4	Population Density:	634
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	105	Seniors:	37	14%
Small Urban:	158	Disabled:	19	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	263	School-Age:	103	39%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	8	3%
Total:	263	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, Nevada			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Reno-Sparks Colony</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	3.3	Population Density:	263
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	476	Seniors:	89	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	24	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	476	School-Age:	221	25%
Urban:	405	Poverty:	177	20%
Total:	881	No Vehicle Households:	42	15%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Resighini Rancheria, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Resighini Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.04
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.4	Population Density:	100
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	36	Seniors:	1	3%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	36	School-Age:	7	19%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	36	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Rincon Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Rincon Reservation, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Rincon Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	6.1	Population Density:	244
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,495	Seniors:	122	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	81	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,495	School-Age:	473	32%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	442	30%
Total:	1,495	No Vehicle Households:	23	6%
Robinson Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Robinson Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.18
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.3	Population Density:	478
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	138	Seniors:	13	9%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	20	14%
Small Urban and Rural:	138	School-Age:	42	30%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	39	28%
Total:	138	No Vehicle Households:	2	6%
Rosebud Sioux Tribe of the Rosebud Indian Reservation, South Dakota			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Rosebud Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.22
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,388.1	Population Density:	7
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	9,050	Seniors:	834	9%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	285	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	9,050	School-Age:	3,001	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	4,294	47%
Total:	9,050	No Vehicle Households:	399	16%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Round Valley Indian Tribes of the Round Valley Reservation, California	FTA Region: 9
--	---------------

<i>Round Valley Reservation</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	11.7	Population Density: 7
	Population		Population Percent
Rural:	82	Seniors:	38 46%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	5 6%
Small Urban and Rural:	82	School-Age:	7 9%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	16 20%
Total:	82	No Vehicle Households:	0 0%

Rumsey Indian Rancheria of Wintun Indians of California	FTA Region: 9
---	---------------

<i>Rumsey Rancheria</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.22
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.8	Population Density: 45
	Population		Population Percent
Rural:	36	Seniors:	0 0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	5 14%
Small Urban and Rural:	36	School-Age:	15 42%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	19 53%
Total:	36	No Vehicle Households:	0 0%

Sac & Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska	FTA Region: 7
---	---------------

<i>Sac and Fox Reservation</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.11
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	23.1	Population Density: 9
	Population		Population Percent
Rural:	217	Seniors:	32 15%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0 0%
Small Urban and Rural:	217	School-Age:	58 27%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	20 9%
Total:	217	No Vehicle Households:	2 3%

Sac & Fox Nation, Oklahoma	FTA Region: 6
----------------------------	---------------

<i>Sac and Fox OTSA</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	742.0	Population Density: 75
	Population		Population Percent
Rural:	25,192	Seniors:	11,342 20%
Small Urban:	30,498	Disabled:	4,036 7%
Small Urban and Rural:	55,690	School-Age:	11,493 21%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	8,218 15%
Total:	55,690	No Vehicle Households:	1,804 8%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Sac & Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa			FTA Region: 7	
<i>Sac and Fox/Meskwaki Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.22
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	5.4	Population Density:	113
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	616	Seniors:	104	17%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	30	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	616	School-Age:	214	35%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	288	47%
Total:	616	No Vehicle Households:	12	7%
Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Isabella Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.11
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	217.5	Population Density:	119
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	14,081	Seniors:	3,606	14%
Small Urban:	11,741	Disabled:	1,213	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	25,822	School-Age:	5,208	20%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3,214	12%
Total:	25,822	No Vehicle Households:	453	5%
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community of the Salt River Reservation, Arizona			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Salt River Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.19
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	81.0	Population Density:	79
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	3,300	Seniors:	1,072	17%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	326	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	3,300	School-Age:	1,859	29%
Urban:	3,105	Poverty:	1,923	30%
Total:	6,405	No Vehicle Households:	257	13%
Samish Indian Tribe, Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Samish TDSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.12
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	226.3	Population Density:	147
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	18,204	Seniors:	8,601	26%
Small Urban:	15,061	Disabled:	1,399	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	33,265	School-Age:	5,936	18%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2,662	8%
Total:	33,265	No Vehicle Households:	688	5%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

San Carlos Apache Tribe of the San Carlos Reservation, FTA Region: 9
Arizona

<i>San Carlos Reservation</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.25
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	2,910.7	Population Density: 3
	Population		Population Percent
Rural:	6,836	Seniors:	650 7%
Small Urban:	2,549	Disabled:	413 4%
Small Urban and Rural:	9,385	School-Age:	3,329 35%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	4,724 50%
Total:	9,385	No Vehicle Households:	598 27%

San Manuel Band of Serrano Mission Indians of the San FTA Region: 9
Manual Reservation, California

<i>San Manuel Reservation</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.22
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.1	Population Density: 70
	Population		Population Percent
Rural:	28	Seniors:	4 5%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	15 20%
Small Urban and Rural:	28	School-Age:	13 18%
Urban:	46	Poverty:	48 65%
Total:	74	No Vehicle Households:	1 4%

San Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of California FTA Region: 9

<i>San Pasqual Reservation</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.18
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	2.2	Population Density: 337
	Population		Population Percent
Rural:	752	Seniors:	69 9%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	29 4%
Small Urban and Rural:	752	School-Age:	222 30%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	245 33%
Total:	752	No Vehicle Households:	28 13%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Santa Rosa Reservation, California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Santa Rosa Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	17.1	Population Density:	4
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	65	Seniors:	8	12%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	1	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	65	School-Age:	10	15%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	11	17%
Total:	65	No Vehicle Households:	4	24%

Santa Rosa Indian Community of the Santa Rosa Rancheria, California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Santa Rosa Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.20</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.6	Population Density:	855
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	517	Seniors:	28	5%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	41	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	517	School-Age:	188	36%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	227	44%
Total:	517	No Vehicle Households:	7	6%

Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians of the Santa Ynez Reservation, California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Santa Ynez Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.18</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	716
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	22	18%
Small Urban:	122	Disabled:	5	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	122	School-Age:	53	43%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	16	13%
Total:	122	No Vehicle Households:	4	11%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

**Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Mission Indians of the Santa FTA Region: 9
Ysabel Reservation, California**

<i>Santa Ysabel Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.19
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	23.5	Population Density:	11
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	250	Seniors:	35	14%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	38	15%
Small Urban and Rural:	250	School-Age:	63	25%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	57	23%
Total:	250	No Vehicle Households:	18	18%

Santee Sioux Nation, Nebraska FTA Region: 7

<i>Santee Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.18
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	172.9	Population Density:	5
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	878	Seniors:	105	12%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	18	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	878	School-Age:	265	30%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	299	34%
Total:	878	No Vehicle Households:	28	10%

Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe of Washington FTA Region: 10

<i>Sauk-Suiattle Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.17
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	632
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	45	Seniors:	3	7%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	8	18%
Small Urban and Rural:	45	School-Age:	25	56%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2	4%
Total:	45	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Michigan FTA Region: 5

<i>Sault Ste. Marie Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.27
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.9	Population Density:	388
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	8	Seniors:	91	26%
Small Urban:	346	Disabled:	26	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	354	School-Age:	108	31%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	146	41%
Total:	354	No Vehicle Households:	36	32%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Seminole Nation of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Creek-Seminole joint use area OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	65.1	Population Density:	32
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,637	Seniors:	492	23%
Small Urban:	465	Disabled:	163	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,102	School-Age:	504	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	424	20%
Total:	2,102	No Vehicle Households:	68	9%
<i>Seminole OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.16</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	567.4	Population Density:	40
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	14,510	Seniors:	4,912	22%
Small Urban:	8,282	Disabled:	2,016	9%
Small Urban and Rural:	22,792	School-Age:	4,807	21%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	4,631	20%
Total:	22,792	No Vehicle Households:	767	9%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Seminole Tribe of Florida			FTA Region: 4	
<i>Big Cypress Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.15</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	82.0	Population Density:	2
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	142	Seniors:	19	13%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	11	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	142	School-Age:	29	20%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	50	35%
Total:	142	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
<i>Brighton Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.12</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	57.1	Population Density:	10
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	566	Seniors:	53	9%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	116	20%
Small Urban and Rural:	566	School-Age:	140	25%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	16	3%
Total:	566	No Vehicle Households:	5	3%
<i>Fort Pierce Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.20</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	20
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2	Seniors:	2	100%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	2	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	2	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
<i>Immokalee Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.0	Population Density:	169
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	32	Seniors:	10	6%
Small Urban:	143	Disabled:	8	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	175	School-Age:	69	39%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	30	17%
Total:	175	No Vehicle Households:	2	3%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Seneca Nation of New York			FTA Region: 2	
<i>Allegany Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	41.0	Population Density:	166
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	806	Seniors:	1,397	21%
Small Urban:	5,998	Disabled:	327	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	6,804	School-Age:	1,498	22%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,496	22%
Total:	6,804	No Vehicle Households:	469	17%
<i>Oil Springs Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.0	Population Density:	11
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	11	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	11	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	11	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
<i>Cattaraugus Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.16</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	33.7	Population Density:	72
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,351	Seniors:	269	11%
Small Urban:	61	Disabled:	141	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,412	School-Age:	617	26%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	709	29%
Total:	2,412	No Vehicle Households:	65	8%
Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Seneca-Cayuga OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	72.8	Population Density:	55
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	3,559	Seniors:	1,218	30%
Small Urban:	438	Disabled:	253	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	3,997	School-Age:	637	16%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	534	13%
Total:	3,997	No Vehicle Households:	66	4%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community of Minnesota			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.12
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.4	Population Density:	641
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	176	Seniors:	27	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	19	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	176	School-Age:	66	25%
Urban:	90	Poverty:	36	14%
Total:	266	No Vehicle Households:	3	3%

Sherwood Valley Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Sherwood Valley Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.18
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.6	Population Density:	322
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	30	Seniors:	7	4%
Small Urban:	149	Disabled:	18	10%
Small Urban and Rural:	179	School-Age:	68	38%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	59	33%
Total:	179	No Vehicle Households:	2	5%

Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, Shingle Springs Rancheria (Verona Tract), California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Shingle Springs Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.3	Population Density:	177
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	57	Seniors:	1	2%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	8	14%
Small Urban and Rural:	57	School-Age:	15	26%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	22	39%
Total:	57	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Shoalwater Bay Tribe of the Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservation, Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Shoalwater Bay Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.10
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.0	Population Density:	66
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	69	Seniors:	13	19%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	2	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	69	School-Age:	6	9%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	6	9%
Total:	69	No Vehicle Households:	2	9%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming FTA Region: 8

Wind River Reservation Composite Need: 0.14

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 3,465.4 Population Density: 7

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	12,813	Seniors:	3,800	16%
Small Urban:	10,432	Disabled:	883	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	23,245	School-Age:	5,461	23%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	4,743	20%
Total:	23,245	No Vehicle Households:	464	6%

Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation of Idaho FTA Region: 10

Fort Hall Reservation Composite Need: 0.14

Urbanized: Part Land Area (sq. miles): 814.4 Population Density: 7

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	5,760	Seniors:	603	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	207	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	5,760	School-Age:	1,560	27%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,339	23%
Total:	5,760	No Vehicle Households:	63	4%

Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation, Nevada FTA Region: 9,10

Duck Valley Reservation Composite Need: 0.18

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 450.4 Population Density: 3

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,265	Seniors:	139	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	64	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,265	School-Age:	482	38%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	353	28%
Total:	1,265	No Vehicle Households:	34	8%

Duck Valley Reservation Composite Need: 0.18

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 450.4 Population Density: 3

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,265	Seniors:	139	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	64	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,265	School-Age:	482	38%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	353	28%
Total:	1,265	No Vehicle Households:	34	8%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

**Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate of the Lake Traverse Reservation, FTA Region: 8
South Dakota**

<i>Lake Traverse Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,449.7	Population Density:	7
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	10,408		Seniors:	2,140 21%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	388 4%
Small Urban and Rural:	10,408		School-Age:	2,634 25%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	2,323 22%
Total:	10,408	No Vehicle Households:	302	8%

**Skokomish Indian Tribe of the Skokomish Reservation, FTA Region: 10
Washington**

<i>Skokomish Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	8.2	Population Density:	89
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	730		Seniors:	121 17%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	34 5%
Small Urban and Rural:	730		School-Age:	173 24%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	194 27%
Total:	730	No Vehicle Households:	23	10%

Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians of Utah FTA Region: 8

<i>Skull Valley Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	28.2	Population Density:	1
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	31		Seniors:	5 16%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	0 0%
Small Urban and Rural:	31		School-Age:	0 0%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	19 61%
Total:	31	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Smith River Rancheria, California FTA Region: 9

<i>Smith River Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.23
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	285
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	62		Seniors:	9 15%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	8 13%
Small Urban and Rural:	62		School-Age:	40 65%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	14 23%
Total:	62	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Soboba Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.16
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	9.1	Population Density:	58
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	304	Seniors:	31	6%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	34	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	304	School-Age:	186	36%
Urban:	218	Poverty:	94	18%
Total:	522	No Vehicle Households:	21	13%

Sokaogon Chippewa Community, Wisconsin			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Sokaogon Chippewa Community</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.20
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	2.5	Population Density:	119
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	298	Seniors:	31	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	10	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	298	School-Age:	106	36%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	119	40%
Total:	298	No Vehicle Households:	13	13%

South Fork Band of the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians			FTA Region: 9	
<i>South Fork Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.23
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	15.2	Population Density:	5
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	83	Seniors:	24	29%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	4	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	83	School-Age:	29	35%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	24	29%
Total:	83	No Vehicle Households:	6	17%

Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation, Colorado			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Southern Ute Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.11
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,058.8	Population Density:	11
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	11,159	Seniors:	1,405	13%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	339	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	11,159	School-Age:	2,674	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,185	11%
Total:	11,159	No Vehicle Households:	155	4%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Spirit Lake Tribe, North Dakota			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Spirit Lake Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.20
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	495.7	Population Density:	9
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	4,435	Seniors:	427	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	279	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	4,435	School-Age:	1,488	34%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,680	38%
Total:	4,435	No Vehicle Households:	144	11%
Spokane Tribe of the Spokane Reservation, Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Spokane Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	237.5	Population Density:	8
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,004	Seniors:	202	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	67	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,004	School-Age:	606	30%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	568	28%
Total:	2,004	No Vehicle Households:	31	5%
Squaxin Island Tribe of the Squaxin Island Reservation, Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Squaxin Island Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.00
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	2.3	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	34	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin			FTA Region: 5	
<i>St. Croix Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.21
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	2.9	Population Density:	164
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	481	Seniors:	40	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	21	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	481	School-Age:	251	52%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	159	33%
Total:	481	No Vehicle Households:	11	7%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

St. Regis Band of Mohawk Indians of New York			FTA Region: 2	
<i>St. Regis Mohawk Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	19.0	Population Density:	142
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,699	Seniors:	300	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	139	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,699	School-Age:	737	27%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	603	22%
Total:	2,699	No Vehicle Households:	13	1%
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of North Dakota & South Dakota			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Standing Rock Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.19</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	3,571.9	Population Density:	2
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	8,250	Seniors:	927	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	358	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	8,250	School-Age:	2,528	31%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3,256	39%
Total:	8,250	No Vehicle Households:	259	11%
Stillaguamish Tribe of Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Stillaguamish Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.0	Population Density:	3,362
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	102	Seniors:	8	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	2	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	102	School-Age:	33	32%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	13	13%
Total:	102	No Vehicle Households:	5	16%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Stockbridge Munsee Community, Wisconsin

FTA Region: 5

Stockbridge-Munsee Community *Composite Need: 0.13*

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 69.8 Population Density: 22

Population		Population		Percent
Rural:	1,527	Seniors:	312	20%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	69	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,527	School-Age:	364	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	131	9%
Total:	1,527	No Vehicle Households:	29	5%

Menominee/Stockbridge-Munsee joint use area *Composite Need: 0.16*

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 2.0 Population Density: 148

Population		Population		Percent
Rural:	295	Seniors:	24	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	33	11%
Small Urban and Rural:	295	School-Age:	46	16%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	80	27%
Total:	295	No Vehicle Households:	9	20%

Summit Lake Paiute Tribe of Nevada

FTA Region: 9

Summit Lake Reservation *Composite Need: 0.00*

Urbanized: No Land Area (sq. miles): 18.6 Population Density: 1

Population		Population		Percent
Rural:	15	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	15	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	15	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

Squamish Indian Tribe of the Port Madison Reservation, Washington

FTA Region: 10

Port Madison Reservation *Composite Need: 0.10*

Urbanized: Part Land Area (sq. miles): 11.7 Population Density: 559

Population		Population		Percent
Rural:	1,056	Seniors:	888	14%
Small Urban:	3,026	Disabled:	255	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	4,082	School-Age:	1,375	21%
Urban:	2,454	Poverty:	457	7%
Total:	6,536	No Vehicle Households:	63	2%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Susanville Indian Rancheria, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Susanville Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.24
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.3	Population Density:	1,063
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	27	9%
Small Urban:	298	Disabled:	15	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	298	School-Age:	104	35%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	165	55%
Total:	298	No Vehicle Households:	16	14%
Swinomish Indians of the Swinomish Reservation, Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Swinomish Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	12.1	Population Density:	220
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	506	Seniors:	936	35%
Small Urban:	2,158	Disabled:	127	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,664	School-Age:	434	16%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	344	13%
Total:	2,664	No Vehicle Households:	33	3%
Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Sycuan Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.18
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.0	Population Density:	33
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	33	Seniors:	4	12%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	7	21%
Small Urban and Rural:	33	School-Age:	9	27%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	8	24%
Total:	33	No Vehicle Households:	1	5%
Table Mountain Rancheria of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Table Mountain Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.02
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	50
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	11	Seniors:	1	9%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	11	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	11	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, North Dakota **FTA Region: 8**

<i>Fort Berthold Reservation</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>		<i>0.16</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,318.9	Population Density:	4
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	5,915	Seniors:	854	14%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	226	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	5,915	School-Age:	1,714	29%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,615	27%
Total:	5,915	No Vehicle Households:	129	7%

Tohono O'odham Nation of Arizona **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Tohono O'odham Reservation</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>		<i>0.26</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	4,453.2	Population Density:	2
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	9,192	Seniors:	1,147	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	1,246	12%
Small Urban and Rural:	9,192	School-Age:	3,138	30%
Urban:	1,291	Poverty:	4,742	45%
Total:	10,483	No Vehicle Households:	867	30%

Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians of New York **FTA Region: 2**

<i>Tonawanda Reservation</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>		<i>0.11</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	11.8	Population Density:	46
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	543	Seniors:	89	16%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	37	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	543	School-Age:	72	13%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	55	10%
Total:	543	No Vehicle Households:	9	7%

Tonkawa Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma **FTA Region: 6**

<i>Tonkawa OTSA</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>		<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	142.5	Population Density:	29
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	907	Seniors:	756	18%
Small Urban:	3,212	Disabled:	229	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	4,119	School-Age:	871	21%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	679	16%
Total:	4,119	No Vehicle Households:	98	7%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Tonto Apache Tribe of Arizona			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Tonto Apache Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.19
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	992
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	132	Seniors:	6	5%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	3	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	132	School-Age:	66	50%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	16	12%
Total:	132	No Vehicle Households:	5	11%
Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Torres-Martinez Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.19
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	34.2	Population Density:	121
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,269	Seniors:	199	5%
Small Urban:	1,877	Disabled:	437	11%
Small Urban and Rural:	4,146	School-Age:	1,107	27%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,698	41%
Total:	4,146	No Vehicle Households:	96	11%
Tulip Tribes of the Tulalip Reservation, Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Tulalip Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.11
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	35.3	Population Density:	262
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	4,627	Seniors:	1,388	15%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	418	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	4,627	School-Age:	2,220	24%
Urban:	4,619	Poverty:	930	10%
Total:	9,246	No Vehicle Households:	93	3%
Tule River Indian Tribe of the Tule River Reservation, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Tule River Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.19
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	84.5	Population Density:	7
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	566	Seniors:	34	6%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	19	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	566	School-Age:	185	33%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	187	33%
Total:	566	No Vehicle Households:	28	18%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Tunica-Biloxi Indian Tribe of Louisiana			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Tunica-Biloxi Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.6	Population Density:	137
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	9	10%
Small Urban:	89	Disabled:	10	11%
Small Urban and Rural:	89	School-Age:	35	39%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3	3%
Total:	89	No Vehicle Households:	2	6%
Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians of the Tuolumne Rancheria of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Tuolumne Rancheria</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.18
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.5	Population Density:	323
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	165	Seniors:	22	13%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	14	8%
Small Urban and Rural:	165	School-Age:	24	15%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	37	22%
Total:	165	No Vehicle Households:	21	33%
Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians of North Dakota			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Turtle Mountain Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.20
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	67.6	Population Density:	86
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	5,815	Seniors:	674	12%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	231	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	5,815	School-Age:	1,808	31%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2,165	37%
Total:	5,815	No Vehicle Households:	256	14%
Tuscarora Nation of New York			FTA Region: 2	
<i>Tuscarora Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.11
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	9.3	Population Density:	123
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,138	Seniors:	127	11%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	42	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,138	School-Age:	243	21%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	134	12%
Total:	1,138	No Vehicle Households:	17	5%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians of California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Twenty-Nine Palms Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.00
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.6	Population Density:	0
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	0	0%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	0	School-Age:	0	0%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	0	0%
Total:	0	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%
Upper Sioux Community, Minnesota			FTA Region: 5	
<i>Upper Sioux Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.29
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	2.0	Population Density:	29
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	57	Seniors:	17	30%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	2	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	57	School-Age:	12	21%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	25	44%
Total:	57	No Vehicle Households:	13	45%
Upper Skagit Indian Tribe of Washington			FTA Region: 10	
<i>Upper Skagit Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.22
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	1,379
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	238	Seniors:	16	7%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	4	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	238	School-Age:	88	37%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	121	51%
Total:	238	No Vehicle Households:	9	13%
Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah & Ouray Reservation, Utah			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Uintah and Ouray Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	6,767.9	Population Density:	3
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	15,188	Seniors:	2,469	13%
Small Urban:	3,394	Disabled:	715	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	18,582	School-Age:	5,673	30%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3,808	20%
Total:	19,182	No Vehicle Households:	274	5%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colorado, New Mexico & Utah **FTA Region: 6,9**

<i>Ute Mountain Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.19</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	889.1	Population Density:	2
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,687		Seniors: 106	6%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled: 44	3%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,687		School-Age: 507	30%
Urban:	0		Poverty: 692	41%
Total:	1,687	No Vehicle Households:	89	18%

Utu Utu Gwaitu Paiute Tribe of the Benton Paiute Reservation, California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Benton Paiute Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.21</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	221
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	50		Seniors: 5	10%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled: 0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	50		School-Age: 15	30%
Urban:	0		Poverty: 25	50%
Total:	50	No Vehicle Households:	2	13%

Viejas (Baron Long) Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians of the Viejas Reservation, California **FTA Region: 9**

<i>Viejas Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.15</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	2.5	Population Density:	156
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	394		Seniors: 47	12%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled: 14	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	394		School-Age: 157	40%
Urban:	0		Poverty: 54	14%
Total:	394	No Vehicle Households:	12	8%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Walker River Paiute Tribe of the Walker River Reservation, FTA Region: 9
Nevada

<i>Walker River Reservation</i>		<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.18</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	530.0	Population Density: 2
	Population	Population	Percent
Rural:	853	Seniors:	119 14%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	43 5%
Small Urban and Rural:	853	School-Age:	262 31%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	273 32%
Total:	853	No Vehicle Households:	27 9%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Washoe Tribe of Nevada & California

FTA Region: 9

<i>Woodfords Community</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.21</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.6	Population Density:	360

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	219	Seniors:	16	7%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	11	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	219	School-Age:	81	37%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	87	40%
Total:	219	No Vehicle Households:	10	17%

<i>Dresslerville Colony</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.18</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.2	Population Density:	263

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	41	Seniors:	42	13%
Small Urban:	274	Disabled:	3	1%
Small Urban and Rural:	315	School-Age:	98	31%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	131	42%
Total:	315	No Vehicle Households:	6	5%

<i>Carson Colony</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	1,151

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	62	Seniors:	30	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	19	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	62	School-Age:	83	29%
Urban:	224	Poverty:	72	25%
Total:	286	No Vehicle Households:	12	14%

<i>Stewart Community</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.13</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	4.8	Population Density:	41

	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	18	Seniors:	16	8%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	7	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	18	School-Age:	75	38%
Urban:	178	Poverty:	28	14%
Total:	196	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Wells Band of the Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada FTA Region: 9

<i>Wells Colony</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	428
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	54	Seniors:	5	9%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	54	School-Age:	11	20%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	22	41%
Total:	54	No Vehicle Households:	0	0%

White Earth Band of Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota FTA Region: 5

<i>White Earth Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.15
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,089.3	Population Density:	8
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	9,188	Seniors:	1,803	20%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	427	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	9,188	School-Age:	2,308	25%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	1,796	20%
Total:	9,188	No Vehicle Households:	210	6%

White Mountain Apache Tribe of the Fort Apache Reservation, Arizona FTA Region: 9

<i>Fort Apache Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.25
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	2,627.6	Population Density:	5
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	6,680	Seniors:	754	6%
Small Urban:	5,749	Disabled:	1,438	12%
Small Urban and Rural:	12,429	School-Age:	4,455	36%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	5,949	48%
Total:	12,429	No Vehicle Households:	759	25%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Wichita and Affiliated Tribes, Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Kiowa-Comanche-Apache-Ft. Sill Apache-Caddo-Wichita-Delaware joint use area OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	193.0	Population Density:	61
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	6,037	Seniors:	2,261	19%
Small Urban:	5,818	Disabled:	793	7%
Small Urban and Rural:	11,855	School-Age:	2,803	24%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3,020	25%
Total:	11,855	No Vehicle Households:	478	11%
<i>Caddo-Wichita-Delaware OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.14</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1,026.3	Population Density:	14
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	14,638	Seniors:	2,901	20%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	869	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	14,638	School-Age:	3,389	23%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2,426	17%
Total:	14,638	No Vehicle Households:	272	5%
Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska			FTA Region: 7	
<i>Winnebago Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.16</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	176.6	Population Density:	15
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2,588	Seniors:	352	14%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	91	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	2,588	School-Age:	752	29%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	731	28%
Total:	2,588	No Vehicle Households:	62	8%
Winnemucca Indian Colony of Nevada			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Winnemucca Colony</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.16</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.6	Population Density:	111
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	0	Seniors:	5	8%
Small Urban:	62	Disabled:	1	2%
Small Urban and Rural:	62	School-Age:	19	31%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	18	29%
Total:	62	No Vehicle Households:	3	13%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

Wiyot Tribe, California			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Table Bluff Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.21
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.1	Population Density:	655
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	81	Seniors:	8	10%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	0	0%
Small Urban and Rural:	81	School-Age:	21	26%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	28	35%
Total:	81	No Vehicle Households:	7	33%
Wyandotte Nation, Oklahoma			FTA Region: 6	
<i>Wyandotte OTSA</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.14
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	32.9	Population Density:	51
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,678	Seniors:	319	19%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	96	6%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,678	School-Age:	439	26%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	248	15%
Total:	1,678	No Vehicle Households:	42	6%
Yankton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota			FTA Region: 8	
<i>Yankton Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.19
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	665.7	Population Density:	10
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	6,500	Seniors:	1,248	19%
Small Urban:	0	Disabled:	228	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	6,500	School-Age:	1,691	26%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	2,217	34%
Total:	6,500	No Vehicle Households:	242	11%
Yavapai-Apache Nation of the Camp Verde Indian Reservation, Arizona			FTA Region: 9	
<i>Yavapai-Apache Nation Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	0.20
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	1.0	Population Density:	741
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	525	Seniors:	73	10%
Small Urban:	218	Disabled:	33	4%
Small Urban and Rural:	743	School-Age:	284	38%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	256	34%
Total:	743	No Vehicle Households:	27	13%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.

**Yerington Paiute Tribe of the Yerington Colony & Campbell FTA Region: 9
Ranch, Nevada**

<i>Campbell Ranch</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.17</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	2.6	Population Density:	173
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	446		Seniors:	24 5%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	12 3%
Small Urban and Rural:	446		School-Age:	295 66%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	32 7%
Total:	446	No Vehicle Households:	3	4%

Yomba Shoshone Tribe of the Yomba Reservation, Nevada FTA Region: 9

<i>Yomba Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.16</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	7.3	Population Density:	13
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	96		Seniors:	14 15%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	6 6%
Small Urban and Rural:	96		School-Age:	27 28%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	15 16%
Total:	96	No Vehicle Households:	4	13%

Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo of Texas FTA Region: 6

<i>Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.15</i>
Urbanized: Part	Land Area (sq. miles):	0.2	Population Density:	2,413
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	2		Seniors:	48 11%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	21 5%
Small Urban and Rural:	2		School-Age:	108 26%
Urban:	419		Poverty:	124 29%
Total:	421	No Vehicle Households:	4	4%

Yurok Tribe of the Yurok Reservation, California FTA Region: 9

<i>Yurok Reservation</i>			<i>Composite Need:</i>	<i>0.20</i>
Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	84.7	Population Density:	13
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	1,103		Seniors:	225 20%
Small Urban:	0		Disabled:	88 8%
Small Urban and Rural:	1,103		School-Age:	282 26%
Urban:	0		Poverty:	367 33%
Total:	1,103	No Vehicle Households:	64	14%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages. B-93

Zuni Tribe of the Zuni Reservation, New Mexico

FTA Region: 6,8

Zuni Reservation

Composite Need: 0.21

Urbanized: No	Land Area (sq. miles):	657.1	Population Density:	12
	Population		Population	Percent
Rural:	789	Seniors:	658	8%
Small Urban:	6,969	Disabled:	388	5%
Small Urban and Rural:	7,758	School-Age:	2,260	29%
Urban:	0	Poverty:	3,540	46%
Total:	7,758	No Vehicle Households:	352	19%

*Composite Need is the arithmetic average of the five subpopulation percentages.