

# REVISING THE TxDOT UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

## *CATEGORY 3:*

### *Urban Area (Non-TMA) Corridor Projects*

## *RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT*

*April 2003*

*Submitted for Review to*  
**TxDOT Executive Management**  
*and the*  
**Texas Transportation Commission**

---



*Prepared by*  
*Texas Transportation Institute*



*In Cooperation with the*  
*Texas Department of Transportation*



*and the*  
*Association of Texas Metropolitan*  
*Planning Organizations*

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A statewide panel of experts from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and urban area metropolitan planning organizations (MPO) have convened several workshops since July 2002 to establish a statewide list of prioritized corridor projects in the seventeen urban areas with populations between 50,000 and 200,000. Panel members discussed strengths and weaknesses of the current project selection process, considered various criteria to use in the new category, and proposed solutions for a more fair and equitable statewide process. After extensive deliberation, the workgroup has recommended a new methodology for Category 3.

### **Category 3 - Urban Area (Non-TMA) Corridor Projects**

This methodology entails each urban area independently ranking its corridor projects using locally developed criteria. The workgroup will then create a statewide list of projects using three five-increment segments, each increment representing one year's worth of anticipated funding. This allocation of projects ensures each urban area will have its most important project(s) let within the first segment.

Six criteria are used to establish funding targets for planning purposes for the urban areas. The criteria used are:

- On and Off-System Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
- On-System Truck VMT
- Population (MPO Planning Boundary)
- On-System Centerline Miles
- On-System Lane Miles
- Fatal and Incapacitating Accident Rate (MVMT)
- Percent of Population Under the Federal Poverty Level

The percentages for each criterion adopted by consensus for this category are:

- Total VMT            22%
- Truck VMT           15%
- Population            26%
- Centerline Miles     6%
- Lane Miles            11%
- Accident Rate        11%
- Poverty Level         9%

The percentages were computed to three decimals are rounded to achieve a sum of 100.

The workgroup was provided with a planning figure of \$1.7 billion over the 15 increments. The six criteria were used to determine an urban area's individual funding target within the 15 increments. The funding targets were then divided by 3 in order to plan within three 5-increment segments.

The result of the workgroup's efforts is a statewide list of projects covering the 15 increments of anticipated available funding. Each of the seventeen urban areas represented in this group has at least one project within each five-increment segment.

## THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Efforts were made to ensure both an MPO member and TxDOT district staff member represented each urban area. At least one MPO or TxDOT district member represented each of the seventeen urban areas in Texas.

The seventeen urban areas (non-TMA) are:

- Abilene MPO
- Amarillo MPO
- Brownsville MPO
- Bryan-College Station MPO
- Harlingen-San Benito MPO
- Killeen-Temple MPO
- Laredo MPO
- Longview MPO
- Midland-Odessa MPO
- San Angelo MPO
- Sherman-Denison MPO
- Southeast Texas Regional Planning Commission (Beaumont)
- Texarkana MPO
- Tyler MPO
- Victoria MPO
- Waco MPO
- Wichita Falls MPO

Several other TxDOT divisions and offices also had representation on the workgroup. In addition to the voting members of the work group, each area was allowed to have other appropriate staff from local entities participate in discussions and provide necessary information. Voting members were also allowed to have proxies represent them in their absence. The entire work group membership is listed below.

Ross L. Jones  
MPO Policy Committee  
Abilene MPO

Harold McDaniel  
MPO Director  
Amarillo MPO

Bob Dickinson  
MPO Director  
Southeast Texas Regional Planning Commission

Mark Lund  
MPO Director  
Brownsville MPO

Mauro Avilez  
MPO Director  
Harlingen-San Benito MPO

The Hon. Mary Gauer  
Mayor, Harker Heights  
Killeen-Temple MPO

Gabriel Del Bosque  
MPO Director  
Laredo MPO

Ajay Shakyaver  
Midland-Odessa MPO

J.D. Reyes  
Asst. to City Manager  
San Angelo MPO

Wally Johnson  
Sherman-Denison MPO

Brad McCaleb  
Study Director  
Texarkana MPO

Bill Morales  
Director of Planning  
City of Tyler

Hugh McNeely  
MPO Director  
Waco MPO

Steve Seese  
MPO Director  
Wichita Falls MPO

Blair Haynie  
TxDOT TP&D  
Abilene District

Mark Tomlinson  
District Engineer  
Amarillo District

Steve Juneau  
Area Engineer-Marshall  
Atlanta District

Steven Stafford  
Transportation Planning Engineer  
Beaumont District

Bob Appleton  
TxDOT TP&D  
Bryan District

JoAnn Garcia  
TxDOT TP&D  
Laredo District

Gary Law  
TxDOT TP&D  
Odessa District

Steve Ekstrom  
TxDOT TP&D  
Paris District

Walter McCullough  
District Engineer  
San Angelo District

Danny Aylor  
Transportation Planning Engineer  
Tyler District

Reggie Richardson  
TxDOT TP&D  
Waco District

John Barton  
TxDOT TP&D  
Wichita Falls District

Randy Bena  
Area Engineer  
Yoakum District

Maria Burke  
TxDOT Design Division

Mark Cross  
TxDOT Public Information Office

Howard Lyons  
TxDOT TP&P Programming and Scheduling

Tim Juarez  
TxDOT TP&P System Planning

A charge was developed for the workgroup prior to their first meeting. The Statewide Corridor Guidelines Workgroup (CGWG) met in April and May 2002 to develop charges for the Category 2, 3, and 4 workgroups. The charge to the Category 3 is presented below:

**Charge to Category 3  
Urban Area Corridor Prioritization Work Group**

The Statewide Corridor Guidelines Work Group proposed criteria for prioritizing corridor projects in the urban areas across the state. This process assumes that projects already prioritized will not be affected by the application of these criteria. Projects in the FY 2002 Unified Transportation Program (UTP) will not be affected by this process. In keeping with the Commission's desire to simplify TxDOT's procedures, we have categorized the criteria for the corridors while attempting to keep the criteria condensed, universal and to the point. Weighting of each element in the criteria is being left to your discretion. Your group shall consider all of the criteria proposed.

Corridors in the Urban Areas serve both local urban and statewide transportation. Therefore there are access, operations, and connectivity issues.

1. Identify and review existing and currently proposed priority corridors within urban areas.
2. Apply weighting factors to the corridor selection criteria as developed by the Statewide Corridor Guidelines Task Force. It is recognized that improvements which address current economic development are significantly more important than those which stimulate future economic growth and this understanding should be addressed in criteria rating.
3. Document the rationale for the weights of all criteria.
4. Review projects referred by TxDOT and MPOs in the urban area category to determine which corridor projects are eligible for consideration for prioritization.
5. Score each eligible priority corridor project by using the weighted criteria.
6. Rank prioritized eligible projects in urban areas based upon scores developed in 5 above.
7. Prioritize eligible mobility projects that fit the Statewide Connectivity Corridor.
8. Review regional funds distribution and highway system distribution to assure that goals of funding projects across the entire state and the entire highway system have been met as much as practical. Equitable consideration should also be given to mobility on the Texas Farm-to-Market Road system as well as Hurricane Evacuation Routes.
9. Prepare draft report of recommendations for review and final approval by the Texas Transportation Commission.

## **WORKSHOPS**

The workgroup met eight times from July 2002 to March 2003. All meetings were held at the Thompson Conference Center on the campus of the University of Texas at Austin. TTI staff facilitated each meeting. An attendance summary is provided in Appendix A.

The first meeting was mainly devoted to understanding the charge to the group, establishing the definition of a corridor segment, and initial discussion of criteria. The workgroup decided to use the list of criteria suggested by the CGWG as a starting point for discussion. A summary of the each workshop discussion is provided in Appendix B.

The second meeting continued the discussion of criteria, including other TxDOT personnel aiding the group in understanding concepts and measurements. The group categorized and prioritized four categories of criteria: Traffic Engineering, Financial, Connectivity, and Special Significance. Subcommittees for each category were formed and asked to report at the next meeting.

Workgroup members attempted to establish fair and equitable criteria that were applicable to the urban areas in the state. Each criterion was analyzed with that goal in mind. Discussion and debate within the group was vigorous and sustained in each workshop. Consistent use of straw polls and consensus votes during discussion allowed the group to maintain progress towards completion. Between meetings, discussion of issues amongst members continued through e-mail with numerous topics taken up and debated. This process allowed for more efficient workshops.

The third meeting continued the discussion and evaluation of criteria. Aided by subcommittee reports, the workgroup arrived at consensus weightings for individual criteria using a 100-point scale for all categories combined. Formulas for computing values of individual criteria were developed.

The fourth meeting continued the discussion on criteria with a focus on financial variables. The fifth meeting finalized criteria selection, weighting, and formulas to derive their values. By consensus, the workgroup chose fourteen criteria for use and determined scores and formulas to compute the scores for each one. These draft formulas are provided in Appendix C.

The interval between meetings five and six was devoted to gathering data for each of the 14 criteria in each urban area. Once this data was compiled for several areas and entered into the formulae, it became apparent that the formulae, as determined, would allow for only ten projects across six urban areas. In addition, comments made by the commission at their December hearing led to greater deadline pressure for the group.

At the sixth meeting in January 2003, the group discussed the problems with the initial criteria formulas and the increased deadline pressure. The group considered the small number of projects in a limited number of urban areas to be unfeasible. After further debate and discussion, the workgroup decided to adopt the methodology created by the UTP Category 2 workgroup, but with criteria percentages unique to Category 3.

This methodology entails each urban area independently ranking its corridor projects using locally developed criteria. The workgroup then created a statewide list of projects using three segments of five increments, each increment representing one year's worth of anticipated funding. This allocation ensures each urban area will have at least one project let within the first segment.

### *CRITERIA*

Seven criteria are used to establish funding targets for planning purposes for the urban areas. The criteria and their data sources are:

- On and Off-System Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)<sup>1,3</sup>
- On-System Truck VMT<sup>1,3</sup>
- Population (MPO Planning Boundary)<sup>1,3</sup>
- On-System Centerline Miles<sup>1,3</sup>
- On-System Lane Miles<sup>1,3</sup>
- Fatal and Incapacitating Accident Rate (MVMT)<sup>2,4</sup>
- Percent of Population Under the Federal Poverty Level<sup>2,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Data captured within MPO Planning Boundary.

<sup>2</sup> Data captured within county(ies) which the MPO resides.

<sup>3</sup> Data provided by the TP&P Division- Traffic Analysis Section.

<sup>4</sup> Data provided by the Traffic Operations Division.

<sup>5</sup> Data obtained from the 2000 U.S. Census.

The criteria reflect aspects of the road system that are relevant to the development of corridors in urban areas. They address citizens, vehicular activity, safety, and the infrastructure of the system. All of the criteria are not static and will allow the developed methodology to reflect the changing status of Texas roads over time.

### *PERCENTAGES*

Each workgroup member submitted his or her preferred percentage distribution for each criterion. The numbers were averaged for each criterion and presented to the group. The initial distribution was discussed and modified at the seventh meeting. The percentages for each criterion adopted by consensus for this category are:

- |                    |     |
|--------------------|-----|
| • Total VMT        | 22% |
| • Truck VMT        | 15% |
| • Population       | 26% |
| • Centerline Miles | 6%  |
| • Lane Miles       | 11% |
| • Accident Rate    | 11% |
| • Poverty Level    | 9%  |

The percentages were computed to three decimals and are rounded here to achieve a sum of 100.



The workgroup was provided with a planning figure of \$1.7 billion, representing 15 years of anticipated Category 3 construction dollars. The seven criteria were used to determine an urban area's individual funding target within the 15 years. The funding targets were then divided by 3 in order to plan within three 5-increment segments. Workgroup members, in consultation with their MPOs and districts, prioritized corridor projects in their urban areas under their own criteria within the established funding targets and increments.

The eighth workshop was devoted to calibrating the prioritized projects between the districts over the three segments. In order to stay within the funding targets, members reordered and reprioritized the projects among the urban areas. Some projects were moved forward, some placed in a later increment. The overall goal of ensuring at least one project let in the first 5-increment segment was maintained. The results of this effort are presented in Appendices D and E.

#### *WORKGROUP MEMBER COMMENTS*

As the process of restructuring UTP Category 3 was completed, some workgroup members developed a critical view of the process and its resulting methodology. Vigorous attention and discussion was given in the workshops to the concerns of those members. Nevertheless, the representatives from Texarkana MPO and Waco MPO have declared their organization's lack of support for the final outcome of this process. Their comments are presented in Appendix F.

The remaining 29 members of the workgroup stand by the final results of the restructuring process and submit this report accordingly.

## Appendix A – Attendance Summary

UTP Category 3 Workshop Attendance								
Member	Workshop							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Ross Jones	X		X	X	X		X	
Harold McDaniel	X	X	X		X	X		X
Bob Dickinson	X	X			X	X		
Paul Tiley - Alt.								X
Mark Lund	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Mauro Avilez	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Michelle Leftwich								X
Mary Gauer	X	X	X					X
Ethan Ham – Alt.		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Molly Bosley – Alt.			X					
Gabriel Del Bosque	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Greg Davies	X	X	X		X	X		
Karen Owen							X	X
Freddie Gardner	X							
Ajay Shakyaver	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
J.D. Reyes	X	X		X		X	X	
Wally Johnson	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Brad McCaleb	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jeff Austin	X							
William Morales	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Hugh McNeely		X	X	X	X	X		
Dick Fletcher – Alt.	X							
Christopher Evilia – Alt.		X						X
Steve Seese	X	X	X	X		X		X
Blair Haynie	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mark Tomlinson	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Steve Juneau	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Steven Stafford	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Scott Rollins – Alt.						X		
Bob Appleton	X	X	X	X	X			X
JoAnn Garcia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Gary Law			X	X	X	X	X	X
Steve Ekstrom		X		X			X	X
Walter McCullough	X	X	X			X		X
Gary Enos – Alt.					X		X	
Danny Aylor	X	X		X		X	X	X
Dale Spitz – Alt.				X	X			

Reggie Richardson	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
John Barton	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Randy Bena	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Jefferson Grimes								
Maria Burke	X			X	X	X	X	X
Mark Cross	X							
Gabriela Garcia – Alt.		X						
Howard Lyons	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Tim Juarez								
Andrew Canon – Alt.	X	X						

## **Appendix B – Meeting Notes**

**UTP Restructuring Workshop  
Category 3  
Workshop 1  
Thompson Conference Center  
Austin, TX  
July 23-24, 2002**

### **Notes**

*Statements reported in these notes are not direct quotes, but reflect the general idea of the questions or comments made by each individual. Statements are not in exact chronological order as they occurred during the meeting. They have been arranged in order according to the topics that were discussed.*

The first meeting of the urban area corridor workgroup was held July 23-24, 2002 in the Thompson Conference Center located in Austin, Texas.

Todd Carlson, TTI, moderated the group. He began the session with introductions, opening remarks regarding the process, and ground rules for the workshop. He stated that the goal is to seek open discussion, free deliberation, and ultimate consensus regarding a prioritized list of corridor segments for urban areas. Carlson then reviewed the charge for Category 3 (Tab 2 of the notebook).

### **General Discussion of Process**

At several points in the course of the workshop, participants discussed the general UTP restructuring process and the responsibilities of the workgroup.

Carlson provided an overall comment that this is a major effort, but not impossible. The group needs to create a prioritized list of corridor segments for the next 10 to 20 years. While segments need to be identified and evaluated at this time, but the status and ranking will not be final. The list created will be reevaluated again in future years.

Brad McCaleb, Texarkana MPO, asked whether the corridors under discussion have been already been determined? Carlson responded no saying that the corridors were to be identified by the workgroup.

Steven Stafford, TxDOT Beaumont, reminded of Max Proctor's, TxDOT TPP, comments from the previous day, corridor guidelines are all up for grabs. Stafford feels that, from what he sees in the CGWG's work, we don't have the course laid out. He sees this group needing to lay out some broad structure and going with that.

Jo Ann Garcia, TxDOT Laredo, asked how far out are we looking? Is this beyond projects already included in listing provided to TPP? Howard Lyons, TxDOT TPP, responded that the group is looking beyond 2013. He added the commission already has made commitments to many projects beyond 2006, but we need to consider projects and needs beyond those already committed.

Bob Appleton, TxDOT Bryan, suggested that the group needs to work within existing funding constraints.

Harold McDaniel, Amarillo MPO stated that if we knew what projects already programmed, out through 2013, we would know what is included and what is not.

Howard Lyons thought the group's hardest part is developing the criteria, for corridor evaluation, ranking, such as VMT, which of itself is not a meaningful factor.

Brad McCaleb raised a general concern about the process we're involved in. He stated that he has not been authorized to prioritize projects, let alone corridors that would very likely affect the local MPO project scheme. Then, as part of this process, he may have to explain to his executive committee, tech advisory group, or even constituents what he may have been party to. This is looking more like a back door process for top down prioritizing rather than a bottom up process, as it is being laid out. Maria Burke, TxDOT Design, responded that members may need to get with their leadership groups to get their position, direction, and delegated authority to represent them in this process. She added that every area, from all 25 districts, needs to be involved and their input received. Mark Lund, Brownsville MPO, said he doesn't feel the work and results of this group to be binding, since the commission may or may not accept our work. Bob Appleton stated that he has an appreciation for the position each of the committee members is experiencing, in that certain projects may or may not receive the priority that local officials think it should, but to not participate in this process may cause TxDOT to make the decision for the local area by default.

Howard Lyons stated that if the process has not worked in the past for a given area, then this is an attempt to improve on the past. Steven Stafford added that what may be critical or vital for one area may not apply in other areas, so there has to be a lot of give and take in this process. Lyons added that we want to arrive at something that can be equitable. For example, the CEI was very micro and was not always equitable. The efforts and results of the group are to give strong recommendations and to represent the concerns of all areas as best as possible.

Bob Dickinson, Beaumont-Port Arthur MPO, asked if this process could assure that every area gets some projects. Howard Lyons responded that it is possible available, but there's not enough money to reach the greatest needs statewide. Needs must be the driver in the process. Carlson reiterated that system and geographic representation is a factor with some bearing for the commission.

Jeff Austin III, Tyler MPO, noted that looking at the various criteria and charge, lots of the results in the past were pure politics. Now we have a chance to lay out the needs based on rational criteria and technical expertise.

Bob Appleton asked if these projects benefit the statewide mobility? Reggie Richardson, TxDOT Waco, responded that the group needs to make some kind of determination of what we're doing: segments or corridors?

Harold McDaniel suggested the most important charge really is number 6 from his experience as a member of the CGWG. Then, the other charges follow. Blair Haynie, TxDOT Abilene, was under the impression that Category 3B (Trunk System) would be dealt with by the Category 4 group. He thought the only projects this group was charged with those that fall within Non-TMA areas.

Steven Stafford thinks the very first step is to decide what kind of corridors we are talking about. We need to pick the overall corridors statewide, and then let the corridor segments follow. Jeff Austin III added that, for example, somebody needs to tell us which and how segment projects in Abilene relate to the corridor it is part of. We should do scattered project segments, as we have in the past. Carlson noted that this is a philosophical matter that needs to be resolved or clarified.

Howard Lyons observed that the list of corridor projects provided to the group may not be the best place to start for true statewide consideration.

Bob Appleton stated that whatever we do here today will only be preliminary at best. The group must develop a fairly crude scheme of what might be the statewide corridors and then take them to our policy boards, decision-makers and get their reactions. Then bring that back to this group for further integration into the larger process.

Jeff Austin observed from the presentations yesterday, we see that there are a lot of specialized initiatives already underway: I- 69, Ports-to-Plains, etc. How are we going to balance out all these various cross-state corridors?

#### **Category 4 Relationship**

A few members of the workgroup suggested that knowledge of Category 4 efforts was required to effectively carry out the charge for this group.

Mark Tomlinson, TxDOT Amarillo, asked if, as stated in charge number 7, do these corridors (considered in Cat 3) have to mesh with urban connectivity corridors that may be addressed in Category 4? Maria Burke suggested we need to know what Category 4 is considering. She stated that this group is going to be looking at segments that in urban areas will be vital to effectively linking the inter-city corridors. Reggie Richardson agreed but believed that once we go through some basic concepts and criteria, then we can tweak it down the road. Todd Carlson reminded members the current process is not near final. It will be iterative.

#### **Data Needs**

Mark Lund asked about the turnaround time for feedback on iterations if data must be provided from other entities. How long is it going to take? It seems to him it will take around two weeks. Just doing the math and running the iterations will take considerable time. Lund added that members would need some time to review results of iterations. The group may need to look at geographic differences.

Brad McCaleb asked if for some of the criteria already listed, does TxDOT have the data available for this new corridor context. What kind of turnaround will there be to get this? Reggie Richardson suggested the group needs to put all the projects in the “hopper” which may take some time to get all the data and results and rankings shaken out.

Howard Lyons stated that the iterations could be run and the results e-mailed for your evaluation.

Blair Haynie asked how can data that is collected for segment description be adjusted for corridor application? Howard Lyons responded that he is confident that the traffic analysis section staff will be able to apply their expertise based on segment-generated data.

Ajay Shakyaver, TxDOT Odessa, suggested the group needs to use established criteria, while adhering to accepted concepts, such as recognizing the federally defined functional classifications.

### **Corridor Segments**

The workgroup spent a large amount of time in the workshop clarifying the concept of corridor segment, eventually achieving consensus on the type of segments they will consider.

Jeff Austin III noted that the definition of corridors was intentionally left broad enough by the CGWG to allow for all sorts of considerations, economic development, etc.

Danny Aylor, TxDOT Tyler, suggested clarification was needed. He thinks we are to designate corridors in the workshops, but we don't have these already available to us. Blair Haynie felt that the issue was one of corridor vs. corridor segment.

Howard Lyons reminded the group that urban corridors don't necessarily end at MPO boundaries.

Mark Lund noted that, in the end, much of the future work to complete corridors will still have to be planned and constructed as segments. Maps may not show much of the links in the urban areas.

Jeff Austin III stated that workgroup has to consider the source and destination of the traffic as a way to look at corridors.

Jo Ann Garcia noted that several of the criteria would require us to look at ranges of data. We may find ourselves putting dissimilar projects unfairly competing. Perhaps the group should only compare common type projects.

Steven Stafford suggested the group needs to find the variables that bring in the best factors that reflect traffic, capacity, and facility condition. Traffic volume, length of project, safety, LOS, all are important.

Reggie Richardson would like to see viable interchange projects to compete fairly with roadway projects. He thinks all potential criteria need to be included at this time and then shake it all out later.

John Barton, TxDOT Wichita Falls, thinks this is why the corridor concept has been advanced. We need to come up with a way to look at the corridor as a whole, whether it's an interchange project, bridge, or longer segment. Barton added that the group seems to be hung up on the individual project segment again. He stated that the workgroup really needs to adopt the true corridor concept as desired by the commission. The district should identify corridors to compete. Once approved for funding, then the district makes the actual pick and sequencing of which project should go to letting/construction.

Mark Tomlinson added that he sees the workgroup still struggling with a way to compare common factors and criteria.

Reggie Richardson feels it's the district's responsibility to identify projects in corridor contexts in the future, not individual projects as in the past. Once a corridor

segment is approved for funding, the district would make the actual sequencing of the projects for design and construction. If I have 7 corridors in the district, then I have to know what their relative standing is in the larger statewide funding posture.

Mark Lund pointed out that criteria such as “Closing system gaps” would help distinguish among corridor needs.

Maria Burke feels that in the end we’re really concerned about how a project is funded.

Gabriel Del Bosque observed this could turn out to be similar to the process used for project selection in the Trunk System. Doesn’t think we want a process that will tie our hands over too long a period, with a chance to re-compete on a regular basis.

Steven Stafford observed this requires a new way of thinking for many of us, after operating a certain way for many years. We’re entering a new way of doing business. We have to resolve what fundamentally is the real focus of our effort: corridors or corridor segments. Cost effective corridors may very different from most critical, significant projects to the state as a whole. Our approach may need to be similar to the process used in the Trunk System program. The criteria were laid out in broad concept levels. Cost was not a factor.

Bob Appleton thinks we should look at corridor segments. All of us have needs in various corridors to assure mobility not only in the urban area, but statewide as well.

Brad McCaleb stated that each district might identify their corridors in some rank order of need and then brings it to the state-level competition. Once a corridor earns any funding, then the district makes the choice of how to stage the progression of design and construction.

Blair Haynie recapped what happened in the Trunk System process, and suggested we need to do a similar approach. He can’t see doing a lot of pieces of corridors and not being real systematic. We need to address entire corridors to achieve completion on something.

Danny Aylor noted his district has several corridors with varying needs. He can’t see building out entire corridors without addressing other critical needs on other corridors. John Barton responded if you’re fortunate enough to get sufficient funding, then it will address the entire corridor. There may be lesser competitive corridors in each district that go begging.

Howard Lyons observed that some of this discussion is hung up on programming, rather than the actual prioritizing the needs. We’re not going to get the optimal process, but we need to try our best to come as close as we can. We are probably being too idealistic.

Maria Burke responded that lots of critical segment of corridors in any given urban area might go unattended, because it doesn’t compete well in the whole state competition. Her concern is that some lesser corridor, vital to the immediate urban area, may never get funding if it has to compete statewide. Maybe the definition needs to reflect the function the corridor serves, whether it’s truly local, regional, and other special needs.

Steve Juneau, TxDOT Atlanta, sees us losing sight of our charge. We are being asked for a way to bring in all identified corridors.



Brad McCaleb thinks we have to provide consideration for what will be in the urbanized area through 20 years out, which takes us beyond the scope of projects currently in the UTP.

Howard Lyons thinks a lot of the segments can be treated as part of a larger corridor standpoint.

Blair Haynie thinks that most folks here could select the major corridors through all our urban areas.

Mark Tomlinson stated that we need to get away from the old individual project way of seeking project selection. He thinks the process used in the Trunk System is the way to go. Larger corridor needs selected first; then the individual projects on the selected corridor go to design and construction. He believes it is meant to be a two-phased process.

Harold McDaniel stated that we're still not clear on what constitutes bona fide corridors to compete statewide, for example loops. If we had maps of the key corridors in each urban area, it would be helpful.

Reggie Richardson noted we haven't dealt with the "connectivity-type" corridors versus those more local and regional corridors. John Barton suggested we need a graphical way to portray corridors and distinguish among them. Several members responded affirmatively.

Mark Lund observed that we have been bogged down on nomenclature. We need to put these on the table or board and then shoot at a target. Not kill the entire concept but refine the finer points of the concept.

Todd Carlson placed the current corridor descriptions on the board for clarification:

- Corridor
- Corridor Segment
- Corridor projects
- Corridor – leading into – Projects

John Barton goes to the board to draw a hypothetical sketch of what's been discussed, to attempt to show the distinctions among the type links under consideration:

Harold McDaniel expressed a need to handle urban corridors such as a loop.

John Barton noted that a segment has "independent utility." Stepping into this broadly, there are still corridors that have statewide significance.

Reggie Richardson observed if using the TTC map sets the stage for what constitutes major statewide corridors, then there are lots of corridor segments that would have to be dealt with. Then, once the corridor has priority, the actual segments and projects can be determined and worked on by the district(s) involved.

Mark Lund suggests enumerating the list on the board:

1. Urban Corridors: 0
2. Corridor Segments: 15
3. Corridor Projects: 0
4. Corridor –[arrow]—Projects:0
5. Corridor –[arrow]—Segments (of Independent Utility), as prioritized according to a criteria:

(Restated and revoted on below)

Maria Burke thinks there was a definite, intended meaning in the use of the concept “Corridor.”

Mark Tomlinson think we need to realize we’re changing the definition of corridor, and I think we should, similar to what John laid out, particularly the specific term for segment. Can we agree to accept this refined term?

Todd Carlson placed the remaining options on the board:

2. Identify Urban Corridors and Prioritize Urban Corridor Segments of Independent

Utility (Projects by Consensus)

6. Identify and Prioritize Urban Corridors, then Prioritize Urban Corridor Segments of Independent Utility (Projects by Consensus)

Process number 2 was chosen by a solid consensus.

## **Criteria Definitions**

The workgroup reviewed the criteria definitions provided in the Corridor Guidelines Workgroup report. The report was provided in the notebook.

Mark Lund noted that when the CGWG selected the whole shopping list of potential criteria, we weren’t dictating any of them. We didn’t know how each of the Category 2, 3, 4 groups would deal with them. Also, the group is not required to only use these. There may some other ways to handle our task.

Brad McCaleb feels that access management is too broad and not quantifiable. Mark Lund responded that from the CGWG perspective, this is an area that needs to be dealt with in a more systematic way. Steve Seese wondered if this couldn’t be included and addressed in traffic counts, and other measures.

Brad McCaleb asked how can we ever factor in or afford areas that do not now reflect good access management. Gabriel Del Bosque suggested maybe we should exclude this as a factor since it is currently under consideration by the commission for full policy determination.

Maria Burke thinks we are still getting too hung up on the big distinctions between segment and corridor. A corridor is just a sequencing of related segments in a given corridor. We are looking at just the urban area corridors. We still need some definitive way to distinguish between projects in two separate, but comparable districts. So, access management needs to factored in.

Mark Lund noted some districts are further along than others in dealing with and factoring in access management. Ajay Shakyaver observed that access management is really a local issue, but feels it will be difficult to factor in statewide. This should be addressed in the project development.

Mark Tomlinson stated that the access management issue has to be resolved before the group can go on and be effective in its work.

Reggie Richardson stated that LOS has nothing to do with capacity. He feels capacity needs to be considered separately.

Brad McCaleb feels peak period volume needs to be considered separately.

Jeff Austin III thinks capacity in terms of LOS may not be valid in the urban context over time.

Jo Ann Garcia stated that traffic by lane might be a better measure. LOS is a range, not a fixed or accurate measure.

The rest of the criteria definitions were reviewed. Discussion and clarification of the definitions was minimal. Members of the workgroup understood each criterion.

### **Ajay Shakyaver's Presentation**

Ajay Shakyaver provided an initial attempt at a formula for prioritizing corridor segments. He presented to the group through a short PowerPoint presentation. Through his methodology, he proposes evaluating each corridor project in two parts: a Cumulative Significance Factor (CSF) and a Cumulative Needs Index (CNI). Added points would be provided for Special Significance, such as international traffic, port of entry, etc.

The general reaction of the group was positive. It could provide a framework, but still needs to have economic development factored in.

### **Economic Development Criteria**

The use of an economic development criterion for prioritization of corridor segments was approved by consensus of the workgroup. The group wished to further study the quantification of the factor.

Walter McCullough noted that TxDOT has done considerable research to determine the impact of economic development. This might be factored in a scoring system of 1,2,3, etc.

Reggie Richardson does not feel TxDOT should be in the business of directly benefiting economic development. This should be a by-product, not an additive factor from the front end.

Jeff Austin III noted that we have to look at economic development as a source of traffic, such as retail, manufacturing, whether regional or local in impact. It needs to be factored in.

Wally Johnson, Sherman-Denison MPO, observed that we're attempting to deal with this from a technical angle, but we know in the end economic development is a political element. It's a reality, and it should be a criteria we incorporate.

Mark Tomlinson sees our task is to look farther down the road, rather than the short term in that most economic development items arise all of a sudden to investment moves in the private sector.

Howard Lyons agreed with Mark as he is very leery of numbers brought in at the front end as to jobs created, income generated, economic impact in the near years. Let this come in as a leverage matter to the commission.

Mark Lund strongly urged the group to keep it, even if fairly low scored. There are some economic development projects that have a long-range horizon. We need to make some provision for this in the transportation equation.

Steven Stafford asked if we choose to keep it in, would we be able to appropriately quantify it? We should not just keep it in as token consideration. Stafford also observed that if a project is going to happen, it's going to happen whether it gets the

transportation project or not. There are a lot of other sources of incentives and enhancements available for attracting or ensuring an economic development project comes about.

Danny Aylor stated that economic development is a political reality. It usually has a local impact. Category 3 money should not be used for local impact only, but beyond that to the urban corridor. Need to differentiate between local and corridor impact. We have to be able to show public officials and the legislature that it was considered important. Otherwise, the legislature may weigh it in other ways.

John Barton noted that there are other ways to reflect economic development potential. We should make it a component, but not the largest component – like a tiebreaker.

Jo Ann Garcia noted that in the end, economic development should be reflected in the traffic numbers, if they do what they are supposed to.

Steve Seese noted that economic development should be included, even if largely a political element. Things like the functional class should come in through the city planning process, land management, etc. MPOs have less involvement in this area.

Dick Fletcher, Waco MPO, sees a little bit of a conflict. At one time, it seemed the commission was discouraging economic development when it tried to eliminate the frontage roads.

Bob Appleton observed that as part of the urban area issue, we probably have no choice but to reflect the economic development factor. We should have land use plans that give us some sense of future needs, expansion balanced against pop growth, etc.

Brad McCaleb doesn't see that economic development as a criteria will work very well. It will be hard to differentiate among similar opportunities. It is very difficult to quantify. We don't know how to differentiate among competing road projects, whether economic development is present or not. If someone can bring a method to quantify this factor, similar to the other valid factors, then we can use it.

## **Leveraging/Tolls**

The workgroup agreed by consensus that a modified leveraging factor would be used in prioritizing corridor segments. It is designated as *external leveraging*. Tolls were rejected as a criterion.

Steven Stafford asked if we are prioritizing corridors or projects. He sees this factor as relevant to projects, not for corridors. Brad McCaleb expressed agreement.

Steve Seese asked what is the whole realm of leveraging? ROW donations, etc. It becomes a big game. Where does it stop? At what point would TPP consider this viable if the process is highly dynamic.

Jeff Austin III stated we need to separate the issues. Use of leveraging needs to be handled in an open, fair arena, not in the background or behind the scenes mechanism.

John Barton added we have to maximize the support for increased public-private partnerships. The group has to provide for this reality in some way.

Gabriel Del Bosque noted that some cities or areas would not have favorable funding basis for competing. Lots of economically disadvantaged areas exist. We need to include leveraging as separate factor, similar to economic development.

Danny Aylor thinks most areas won't know where the leveraged opportunities exist 10 years or more out. Several members expressed disagreement. Howard Lyons noted the need to recognize that there is standing legislation that treats disadvantaged counties differently.

Mark Tomlinson observed that there needs to be concern that with the leveraging factor, we are talking about significant projects, not just a left turn lane for Wal-Mart. Steve Seese noted that in reality many of the joint participation projects turn into more like 60/40 rather than a 80/20 split.

Jeff Austin III suggested that we have to be careful that use of leveraging represents the impact of real money, not just rough estimates. We need to give proper credit to the benefit to the state and making more of the limited funds goes further.

Brad McCaleb asked how long will the leveraging factor remain effective? Jo Ann Garcia responded that it should work at the front end of the evaluation/competition/prioritizing process.

Steve Stafford noted a need to recognize that there are different types and sources of leveraging, internal or external. John Barton agreed. Howard Lyons noted the different types and forms of leveraging reflected in the past. Reggie Richardson observed that we've had some projects that received special sources of federal funding, but was not treated as a leveraged project.

Jo Ann Garcia asked how do you handle projects that could be advanced by shifting it to a toll facility? John Barton responded that toll-viable projects should be considered separately.

Tolls were rejected as a criterion, but consensus of the group was to note that toll viability was an increasingly important issue and that in future years it may have to be considered as a factor.

## **Benefit/Cost**

The workgroup agreed by consensus that a benefit/cost factor should be included as a criterion when prioritizing corridor segments.

Steven Stafford stated that we have to consider that this comes into play in the other areas.

Mark Lund noted we don't have cost factored in anywhere else.

Steven Stafford wondered if we should bring all the various costs, such as delay cost, into this one B/C factor?

Reggie Richardson suggested we should just use "Cost" as a factor, cost analysis? He likes the term "Cost Factors," which allows for a broad treatment of cost.

Steve Seese noted that there are lots of ways to arrive at cost in a project. There also lots of ways to look at the benefits, some go beyond the local area.

Mark Lund observed there seems to be a place for the inclusion of a classic B/C as a basis of comparison.

Brad McCaleb noted that it was mentioned that all projects have been adjusted through FY 2006 for the time value of money. What safeguard is available to ensure that estimates are computed the same among all districts?

Reggie Richardson noted that there is a new factor, a letting commitment.

John Barton observed that we've been advised to use a B/C factor, but not the only factor, as it was almost the absolute single factor in the past.

Gabriel Del Bosque stated that it is tempting to look at the different approaches to B/C, such as for air quality impacts. He believes that B/C is valid, but we have to arrive at a common concept and methodology.

### **Traffic Engineering Criteria**

No consensus was reached on traffic engineering criteria, but discussion was initiated. Walter McCullough, TxDOT San Angelo, suggested Peak Hour Traffic Jo Ann Garcia questioned which measure is most meaningful for traffic volume: ADT x Lanes.

Ajay Shakyaver remarked on peak hour volume that the statewide peak hour volume might not have much meaning. ADT might be better. VMT may bring in some apples/oranges, but it does not differentiate functional class of highways.

Jo Ann Garcia said centerline alone may not tell you size of facility. VMT per lane might be better.

Reggie Richardson thinks we need traffic as part of formula. He recommends traffic per travel lane. He disagrees with definition in CGWG report as written.

Mark Lund stated that there was no real debate in the CGWG. Looking at statewide, long distance corridors, but not so much short segments. Traffic per lane may be appropriate.

John Barton suggested the group needs to reflect volume of traffic and LOS. Need to look at what has the greatest need: how many people are affected and what is the condition of the facility. All are critical to distinguishing between the best investment and ROI.

### **Maps**

It was decided that the urban areas would produce maps with identified corridor segments for use in discussions in the workshops. Harold Lyons suggested that the maps only include those corridors that need work, not those already funded for construction. Several members suggested that it would be important to see what is already approved so as to see what is going to be on the ground by 2013. Howard Lyons agreed to develop a format for the maps and distribute the information to the group.

### **Economic Development Quantification Subcommittee**

A subcommittee was created to consider ways to quantify the economic development criteria chosen by consensus. Mark Lund agreed to head the sub committee. The other members were Maria Burke, Jeff Austin III, and Brad McCaleb.

### **Next meeting**

The next meeting of the workgroup is scheduled for August 12-13 at 9:00 a.m. at the Thompson Center.

**UTP Restructuring Workshop**  
**Category 3**  
**Workshop 2**  
**Thompson Conference Center**  
**Austin, TX**  
**August 12-13, 2002**

**Notes**

*Statements reported in these notes are not direct quotes, but reflect the general idea of the questions or comments made by each individual. Statements are not in exact chronological order as they occurred during the meeting. They have been arranged in order according to the topics that were discussed.*

The second meeting of the urban area corridor workgroup was held August 12-13, 2002 from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the Thompson Conference Center located in Austin, Texas.

Todd Carlson, TTI, moderated the group.

Carlson provided some opening remarks and began a reintroduction of workshop participants. He then passed out notes from Meeting 1 and discussed various points and features. He asked that anyone that found some major error or omission to please bring up to his attention. Carlson then covered the following topics:

- A review of the overall purpose of the process and specific charge for this work group.
- Reiteration of the basic goal: to arrive at a prioritized list of corridor segments Urban Areas statewide.
- A broad review of last meeting, major issues addressed, and basic points and conclusions.
- He mentioned that Maria Burke, TxDOT Design, not present, felt strongly about the need to coordinate the work and major results of this work group closely with the Category 4 work group.
- Data needs: Strong case made for that at the last meeting and we'll deal with that today.
- Corridor Segments – Did not include John Barton's, TxDOT Wichita Falls, drawing from the last meeting in the notes, but we'll probably ask him to briefly present that again.
- Maps – Hopefully all of you brought maps with your proposed segments clearly identified. We'll try to come up with a good way to have each of you present your candidate corridors, and integrate them on a master map.
- Todd Carlson thanked Mark Lund, Brownsville MPO, for his strong insistence for the maps.
- The main consensus for corridor segments reached at the first meeting was to identify the urban corridors and then prioritize them through the prism of the criteria.

- Criteria definitions – Access management seemed to be one of the toughest to nail down clearly for everyone.
- Thanks to Ajay Shakyaver, TxDOT Odessa, for his presentation at the last meeting. Carlson suggests his proposals be considered and used as a basis of comparison for other criteria and formulas raised later in this meeting's deliberation.
- Leveraging and Tolls – Jeff Austin III, Tyler MPO, asked that this be held for future consideration, but mention that it was considered.

The group began a general discussion of the criteria and the tasks ahead.

Hugh McNeely, Waco MPO, noted that he did not see some of the key terms defined in the notes, such as Corridor and Corridor Segments. Blair Haynie, TxDOT Abilene, responded that these were addressed and established at the end of the last meeting, and is in the notes near the end.

Hugh McNeely understood that economic development was determined to be included in consideration for this category criterion. Lund responded economic development was relevant, but used more as a tiebreaker. Howard Lyons, TxDOT TPP, stated that economic development was kept as a factor on the table, but how to fully measure and weigh it are still to be determined.

Todd Carlson noted that we still have several criteria that need to be re-discussed and definitions and measures clearly established.

Bob Appleton, TxDOT BCS, observed that when we put our maps together, he feels it important that we're talking about statewide funds, and thus need to focus on projects/segments that truly have statewide impact and significance. He feels that criteria should reflect such statewide focus, as well. And he noted that there might still be corridors that haven't been formally raised and previously included. Hugh McNeely, agreed, noting as a player on the Statewide Corridor Workgroup, he felt the groups should focus and work should be to projects/ corridors that have statewide significance. Jo Ann Garcia, TxDOT Laredo, gathered that we are dealing only with projects/ corridors that are "On-System."

Mark Lund then began a discussion of the work attempted by the economic development sub-committee he headed. The subcommittee did very little to bridge the gaps. They looked at three different systems to arrive at a weighting/ scoring mechanism. Lund suggested that the criteria should be looked at and given weights, say a total of 100 points, by each of the major groups. He then provided a few examples.

Gabriel Del Bosque, Laredo MPO, suggested that you could start on the macro level (by groups of criteria) or start at the micro level, giving the specific criteria in each area and then group the weights.

Howard Lyons observed that the wild card in all this is cost/benefit. There are some other criteria that give you more direct impacts, and are less indirect or general. We could come up with some kind of Cost/Benefit multiplier. Traffic and VMT alone don't mean anything.

John Barton appreciated what some of the others are struggling with. We just concluded that all those criteria listed on the board are those that were raised for consideration, not whether or not, or to what weight. We should see these all as the tools



available, not that we need to use each one of them. Steven Stafford, TxDOT Beaumont, agreed. Ajay Shakyaver wanted to point out that the factors related to traffic probably need to be considered.

Danny Aylor, TxDOT Tyler, felt that some basic criteria, like ADT, needs to be considered and then we still need something to reflect the roadway condition. Then, you'd need to consider LOS, which also involves ADT. He suggested the group look at the basic, innate factors before looking at those that build on others.

Harold McDaniel, Amarillo MPO, stated that the group needs to look at those that have the greatest impact and then go to the lesser factors. We know there are several ways to count and factor in for traffic volume.

Jo Ann Garcia felt the group had not given due attention to safety, nor new location.

Walter McCullough, TxDOT San Angelo said he feels that some of the factors will fall out as we really consider each of them.

Steven Stafford asked Howard Lyons, what are the factors that are currently being used in the old categories that build into this new one?

Mark Lund considered a criterion like Access Management, which may have significance (driveway, curb cuts, etc.) on a given corridor, but are not comparable from one to the other. We need those factors that really start with those that deal with the big picture first, not mechanical nuances. Let the finer, more specialized considerations be looked at later down the road.

Todd Carlson warned that part of the problem is that we don't want to just rebuild the CEI.

Ajay Shakyaver suggested keeping economic development out of this at the initial level. Benefit/ cost may have some relevance earlier to assure that cost and benefits gets consideration earlier.

Jo Ann Garcia suggested that we count access points. We need to adhere to established standards.

Steven Stafford agreed that costs might not be appropriate at this early stage, but bring it in later. Gabriel Del Bosque thought that cost will not be such a strong driver in this process. Cost/benefit probably should not be a heavily weighted factor. Need it to have some value brought in, but this can be reflected in some of the other factors.

Walter McCullough commented that at this time the relative weights are not as critical as being sure we include the best or right criteria to start with.

The consensus of the group was to go down the list of criteria and discuss them individually. They agreed to place a limit of 15 minutes of discussion per criteria to avoid becoming bogged down. The group could go past 15 minutes if the discussion warranted.

## **Traffic**

The group quickly reached consensus that some form of traffic variable should be included as a criteria.

## **VMT**

---

The group quickly reached consensus that some form of traffic variable should not be included as a criteria.

## **Travel Time**

Jo Ann Garcia observed that lots of standards are available in this area, and it relates to LOS

Steven Stafford noted that delay, in how much you reduce it may be important, but in comparing one project to another with travel time is relevant in terms of change or improvement.

Reggie Richardson agreed that to use both, travel time and delay, may be redundant; LOS may be just one of the factors to consider. He suggested using LOS alone, and dropping both Travel Time and Delay

Mark Lund suggested keeping travel time in for now.

Brad McCaleb, Texarkana MPO, noted that collecting travel time data is very cumbersome and burdensome to the project development process. He also thinks LOS will provide the same meaning. Lots of people in the business and economic development areas understand LOS more.

Steve Seece noted when you look at system-wide comparisons, travel time can be misleading and we should use LOS.

Greg Davies also agrees that LOS is more widespread and used more among MPOs.

The consensus of the group was to drop travel time/delay as a criterion.

## **Level of Service**

Danny Aylor would like to see a “volume to capacity” ratio as a finer cut. He thinks that the “volume to capacity” would be more meaningful from logical termini to another.

Bob Appleton reminded the group that LOS is measured and defined differently for some different functional classes of roads

Mark Lund had trouble leaving volume over capacity alone. He always thought LOS gave us some other indicators as well, such as peak or 14<sup>th</sup> hours peak LOS. Feels we should use LOS along with “volume to capacity.”

Brad McCaleb felt that sometime LOS might be misleading from old facility to new facility. Steven Stafford responded to Brad saying we need to be clear what we’re comparing, past to past LOS, and then future to future

The consensus of the group was to use LOS as a criterion.

## **Capacity**

The full consensus of the group was to use capacity with volume as a criterion.

### **Access Management**

Mark Lund observed that some MPOs have done the state a favor by establishing some parameters for access. Some have done so for many years.

Brad McCaleb appreciated the discussion, but felt it would give more credit to those areas that already have access management policies and not give adequate opportunity to those areas that don't. He would hate to see one project get selected over another just because it recognized access management.

Reggie Richardson observed that we really consider it a design element.

Gabriel Del Bosque agreed with not including it here. Access management can be a project in of itself.

Mark Lund stated that it is difficult to measure. He doesn't agree with Brad that we reward bad behavior of the past. He thinks that there are cases where it will be much more relevant than for other projects. It also brings in the concept of land management.

Harold McDaniel stated it may only apply to a limited hierarchy of corridors, but feels access management would be applicable.

Jo Ann Garcia said it will be hard to use and what projects it will be applicable to.

Howard Lyons observed it may allow for very special cases. We may be trying to dictate what the commission alone should be addressing as policy.

Ajay Shakyaver stated access management is more project intrinsic. So it might be very difficult to address for different types of functional classes and standards.

All but one member was not in favor of using access management as a criterion. It was removed by consensus.

### **Safety**

Steven Stafford asked what type safety are we talking about?

Blair Haynie noted that the department uses HES money to address some of this.

Jo Ann Garcia observed that on a new location, we would have to go to some lengths to project the safety/ accident aspect.

Brad McCaleb suggested that we agree to include it. Although it is usually measured at a specific point, safety is an umbrella issue.

The consensus of the group was to include Safety as a criterion.

### **Percent Trucks**

Steve Seece noted it would be especially significant to the border projects.

Jo Ann Garcia thought it comes in as a Benefit/ Cost.

Walter McCullough thought it was very critical in term of damage from a car to truck ratio.

The consensus of the group was to include Percent Trucks as a criterion.

### **Closing System Gaps**

The group quickly came to consensus to include Closing System Gaps as a criterion.

### **Connecting with Principal Roadways from Adjacent States**

John Barton did not know if the Corridor Group dealt this with. There are lots of points of entry that might apply.

Walter McCullough asked if the project get higher weight for closing a gap going out of the state rather than with adjacent states?

Gabriel Del Bosque thinks this will get attention from other states in their project.

Blair Haynie wondered about this in terms of being a concern for improving mobility and connectivity between urban areas.

Mark Lund observed that the Corridor Workgroup looked at this but did not think it was a sufficient problem to address head on, but he does think this has to be something we should be concerned with.

Blair Haynie thought “closing system gaps” would handle this. Reggie Richardson reiterated this. Wally Johnson noted that in his area, we have several projects that would apply to both type factors, so he would like to have both criteria available.

Hugh McNeely noted that it was envisioned by some that this wouldn’t give you points but would take away points.

Steve Juneau thinks that this could be handled in the way a project is defined from termini to termini. Howard Lyons responded that some of this will also get addressed in the NHS consideration.

Walter McCullough observed that from the discussion, maybe we should just modify the criteria definition to just “Connect w/ Principal Roadways.”

Gabriel Del Bosque noted we should try to facilitate traffic and especially freight flow. The corridor should get separate treatment. Most areas would meet the criteria where traffic, especially freight traffic, gets extra credit.

Danny Aylor commented that just because another state has a lot of potholes, doesn’t mean we should put a bunch of potholes in ours. He really does think we should make this criteria really deal with connecting principal arterials.

Blair Haynie observed the discussion seems to be about traffic statewide on major arterials. He is not sure how this applies since we’re supposed to be dealing with urban connectivity.

Harold McDaniel suggested maybe this could or should be considered by the Category 4 group. John Barton responded that it does seem to apply to Category 3 where urban areas are adjacent to borders.

Mark Tomlinson thinks if a project is qualified, it will get due consideration under other criteria, such as capacity, percent trucks, etc. Brad McCaleb thinks maybe all these special items will get due and fair consideration under these other valid criteria.

John Barton noted that we’ve seen this happen where there are lots of promises from other states, and then they fall through when it comes to lack of funds. We can’t plan and commit on these passing whims.

Walter McCullough suggested moving this criterion up to putting it in Special Significance section.

Ajay Shakyaver thinks it still needs to get considered, to assure due concern.

The consensus of the group was to not use the criterion as written. The consensus was to use the criterion in modified form. The criterion is to be designated as Connect with Principal Roadways.

### **Intermodal Connectivity**

Steven Stafford asked for clarification on this criterion. The definition was read. Stafford then observed that this really relates to corridor segment, depending on the logical termini. Mark Lund responded there might be gaps into an intermodal facility, such as a port. John Barton noted that the segment has to have independent utility, when it's complete and can stand-alone.

Steve Eckstrom observed we would never try to build the Green Carpet Route as a single project, so we would build it in pieces that would create gaps which would give us added points.

Steve Seece suggested we might again seem to be looking outside Category 3.

Howard Lyons observed that the Commission would pick up closing a system gap, but these other spot projects could be picked up on the Commission Discretion projects.

John Barton suggested we could probably remove several of the special condition criteria, such as military, major freight routes, etc.; these type projects would probably get addressed through another major criteria. Steven Stafford agreed.

Mark Tomlinson noted that there might be some future connections to future intermodal facilities, such as a new port in Corpus Christi.

Blair Haynie observed the NHS and Trunk System was intended to connect communities and urban areas, but not all needed projects would necessarily fall into the NHS and Trunk System.

Hugh McNeely doesn't think we should just rest on overall criteria of NHS or Trunk System. We need a way to differentiate projects within these predetermined system designations.

Howard Lyons feels it's beneficial to use the NHS and Trunk System because it's already been determined to be equitable and defensible, and the commission can add to these systems any time a corridor meets the criteria or other circumstances dictate.

Mark Lund doesn't feel this umbrella approach is the way to go. He thought we were to identify applicable criteria and the most appropriate formula.

Ajay Shakyaver makes a case for using a way to use the system designation as just getting extra credit. Reggie Richardson agreed with Ajay. We should use these special needs/ conditions just to add credit for deserving vital project and corridor linkages.

The consensus of the group was in favor of Intermodal Connectivity as a criterion.

Brad McCaleb stated that he voted to keep Intermodal Connectivity as a criterion, but felt it important to include all appropriate special condition factors. Walter McCullough suggested we ought to just vote on keeping NHS and Trunk System. Bob

Appleton stated the reason he voted for this was for the same reason others voted against it, is to be sure to include all possible implicating factors.

John Barton noted the bigger part of this situation is that there are a lot of hard criteria and proof to qualify either at the federal or state defined systems. These are highly defensible criteria.

Mark Tomlinson stated that he felt he benefits from hearing all the different views about all these criteria. Even if we go full circle and combine several of these separate criteria under a larger common criteria or even the NHS/ Trunk System. Danny Aylor also felt we need to go through this exercise to assure others and ourselves that we considered each viable criteria rather than lumping them under big umbrellas too early.

### **Fits with Other TxDOT Development**

Gabriel Del Bosque observed for this to get funded, this has to be in the MPO's plan. It requires several urban areas to regionally coordinate and work out the project together before it moves forward.

Jo Ann Garcia commented that this is designed to let the small urbans get something. What happened to the other project that were in the old Cat 3A? John Barton responded most now fall in to Cat 11 and 12.

Mark Lund suggested when we say existing plans, it could be land use plans.

Hugh McNeely said he was not sure it should just be TxDOT plans; maybe it should include local plans.

Steve Eckstrom stated this requires the MPO to do what they should do, to identify the project through the proper process.

By unanimous consensus, the workgroup decided no to use the criteria.

### **Maximize Use of Existing System**

By unanimous consensus, the workgroup agreed to include this as a criterion.

### **System Classification**

This criterion was added as a separate criterion for consideration, based on the amount and depth of discussion.

Ajay Shakyaver suggested using it as a criteria: as to whether a corridor is part of another established system, such as IH, NHS, Trunk, or other, such as functional class.

Steve Juneau asked would we want to make provision for a corridor segment that might not qualify?

Howard Lyons responded that FMs will generally take care of themselves.

Hugh McNeely commented that this is tantamount to what the rules are for what kind of project can be raised or proposed.

Steve Juneau commented that he was not sure this is that clear, going from 4 to 6 lanes on IH. Shouldn't you get more credit for such an IH project?

Mark Lund was not sure how you would award points for projects on various levels of systems.

Ajay Shakyaver thinks it should carry some special weight as to whether or not the corridor segment is or is not on some existing designated system.

John Barton thinks that it should have merit, as to whether it is or not, and then what level type system. Also, it is a valid concern since it came up from the Corridor Workgroup.

Gabriel Del Bosque asked are we actually going to scale the weight based on which type system it is? Shakyaver responded that it would give official standing to the system the project would be part of.

John Barton sees this as relating to three systems: NHS, Trunk, and Hurricane. Hugh McNeely agreed. John Barton went on to explain that these three designated systems are established to provide for aggressive development. Also, each was established upon rigid, structured criteria.

Mark Lund commented that it may be more of getting greater weight for being part of these and not getting credit if not on one of these systems. Aren't most of the hurricane roadways also on the NHS or Trunk System? Howard Lyons responded he was not sure, but very likely.

Blair Haynie asked wouldn't most of these get addressed through the "Highway System Distribution."

By consensus, the criterion was narrowly rejected as a criterion.

### **International Traffic/Ports of Entry**

Todd Carlson reminded the group that based on the first workshop POE was wherever a U.S. customs facility is located.

Mark Lund noted that we discussed many times the formal "crossing" is not actually accomplished along the Mexican border. The paperwork is often not fully completed until further from the border. The constraints of the paperwork lag, he feels, should be taken into consideration and treatment of this criterion.

Steve Seece commented that it seems we have to be a little more specific for application of this criteria.

Steve Eckstrom noted it is still the same traffic, whether in Laredo or in Texarkana.

Brad McCaleb sees where it's the same traffic, but it's not the same condition, such as the heavy truck congestion.

Jo Ann Garcia noted that some of our numbers have been different from the data TPP collects and maintains.

Hugh McNeely commented that with the feds establishing a Border-Corridor Program, it indicates that this traffic is treated differently.

Gabriel Del Bosque observed it's like a special generator of traffic. It's like the ports in Houston having an impact on Laredo.

Hugh McNeely commented that our state has to deal with it, because other states will come up with a way to address it, and then we'll be penalized.

Steven Stafford believes we need to be clear that we address the mobility and capacity issues and not delays due to customs delays.

Howard Lyons stated we throw all our money at the border, and then we face the problems further into the state. It seems it should be applicable to the whole corridor.

John Barton noted traffic counters are intentionally placed at the outer limits of urban areas and thus we have not had good intercity traffic.

Mark Lund commented we still have lots of ITS and Traffic Management money to help smooth and manage the flow from and to the border. Some border urban cities also have train related impacts that need to get addressed.

Steven Stafford believes it is our task to deal with the longer-term corridor issues. Then the commission can deal with the spot issues.

Howard Lyons noted TMS is not excluded from this category.

Gabriel Del Bosque commented that from a corridor perspective, we need to look at the complete corridor, from milepost to milepost. Maybe we shouldn't pass on to or expect the commission to readily deal with all the spot issues – they will have a lot of spot issues to handle.

John Barton said we should apply this criterion fairly strictly to the border and POEs. We were given this to deal with this since we know it has strong political implications.

Steve Seece thinks the freight aspect will get addressed through some of the other criteria, such as percent trucks in the rest of the state.

Howard Lyons suggests dropping the International Traffic part and keeping the POE.

By consensus, the workgroup decided not to use International Traffic.

By consensus, the group decided to retain Ports of Entry as a criterion.

### **Military and National Security Installation**

Steve Seece noted this has been in place since the beginning of the IH System in the 50s.

Reggie Richardson noted that we might still need such a criteria as a tiebreaker.

Walter McCullough stated that in looking at corridor segments, thinks we do need to provide for special considerations for military related needs.

Mary Gauer, Mayor of Harker Heights, definitely thinks Texas needs to give proper attention to the needs of the military, which has been aggressively provided for in California. We don't want to put our facilities at risk compared to California.

Hugh McNeely commented that things have changed a lot for military installations. Now access to/from military installations have been concentrated to few entry/exit points.

John Barton commented that we haven't done a really good job to enhance access and exit at most of the military installations in Texas. We do need to upgrade our corridors near to and around military, including major military travel routes for personnel and freight.

Blair Haynie observed that while the future needs will be critical, we need to just consider the present needs and deficiencies.

Howard Lyons noted that related to this discussion, there will be increased need for other law enforcement requirements.



Danny Aylor believes that this type of criteria needs to be considered and addressed, both for the present and in the future.

Blair Haynie commented that he is not sure we'll need 12 lanes in and out of military sites, but there will be some needs here.

Steve Eckstrom knows this is taken into consideration in the planning and gaming done by the military and elected officials. DOD will tell us when and where we need to do our projects.

Steve Seece stated that such projects will get due weight and consideration through many of the other criteria.

Walter McCullough thinks we need this as a separate criteria, for both military mobility and hazardous material.

By consensus, the workgroup decided to retain this criterion.

### **Tourism/Recreation Areas**

By unanimous consensus, the criterion was rejected by the workgroup. It was considered not to be an urban issue.

### **Major Freight Routes**

Walter McCullough thinks this would be redundant to using Percent Trucks.

John Barton commented that the attention given to freight is very weak.

Ajay Shakyaver believes this could be addressed through the designation of Freight and Trade Corridors.

Bob Appleton noted that this is included in the TxDOT mission statement.

Steve Seece thinks we should leave it in there, but try to quantify it later.

John Barton believes the movement of freight is an urban issue and where it goes (terminals/ intermodal transfers), but we need to make some provision for this level of impact. But it's still a statewide issue, which should be addressed by Category 4.

By unanimous consent, the workgroup decided to retain the criterion.

### ***Air Quality***

Steven Stafford commented that currently Beaumont is a Non-Attainment area. Adding capacity doesn't give you any positive credit. He recommends this item be dropped.

Jo Ann Garcia noted an area that is Non-Attainment doesn't get credit for any capacity improvement, but any adjacent area that makes such an improvement does get the credit.

Hugh McNeely noted we only have four designated Non-Attainment areas in urban areas: Victoria, Tyler, Beaumont, and Longview.

Bob Dickinson agreed with Steven Stafford that it ought to be dropped.

By full consensus, the criterion was rejected.

## **Hazardous Cargo Routes**

Mark Lund began the discussion by noting we've dealt with this on the border/customs issues and it's a very hard area to pin down: Shippers are very reluctant to share and release the data.

Gabriel Del Bosque noted there are some strict requirements for getting this designation established. It gives law enforcement added authority, but it is still difficult to detect and enforce.

Bob Dickinson noted with our huge number of refineries and shipments of hazardous cargo freight traffic, it seems it would be very difficult to quantify.

Mark Lund suggested this be put under Safety. Often, it is a matter of hours of operation. In other cases, it may be periodic shipments.

Hugh McNeely wouldn't be opposed to using it, there just needs to be assurance that we have taken this issue into consideration.

Brad McCaleb commented that just because something is close to being a Safety item, this doesn't seem to fit cleanly into Safety, because Safety is more a function of crashes and fatality data.

Gabriel Del Bosque noted this would be difficult to know and forecast with hard data.

Howard Lyons said we can leave it in there, but we can deal with it when we try to quantify the criteria and set formulas.

Gabriel Del Bosque concurs that it isn't really Safety.

Steve Eckstrom stated that if something is really Safety, it needs more immediate attention, which HES should address.

Gabriel Del Bosque suggested maybe we should just adjust the definition for Safety to encompass these type needs.

Blair Haynie suggests adding a lot of similar Safety-related items, such as POE, Military Installations, and Major Freight Routes.

Danny Aylor stated that for the Urban area category, Safety definitely needs to be addressed.

Ajay Shakyaver sees this as related to overall Infrastructure Safety, which should be addressed through the operational changes incorporated in long-range design.

Steven Stafford commented that many of these type needs may never get consideration through HES programs.

Howard Lyons warned to be careful what you ask for. This seems to be more project oriented than a corridor issue or need. The intent is to "fix" the critical needs at corridor levels.

Bob Appleton commented we have corridor segments that don't have specific safety identity, but this would allow us to address corridor segments with long standing safety concerns but never qualify directly for HES funding.

John Barton sees this as more of a rural problem.

Mark Lund stated that the Corridor Workgroup looked at Safety more in terms of improving overall safety in travel by upgrading all 2 lanes to a 4-lane roadway.

Blair Haynie agreed with John that this is more rural related and usually involves slower speeds.

Howard Lyons noted this is also more of a LOS issue, because the slower speeds will contribute to congestion.

Reggie Richardson agreed with Blair. When we get through with a project, it should satisfy the 4R safety standard. Maybe this should fit more an extra credit item, like POE, Freight Route, etc.

Bob Appleton stated we have a project that has poor safety standards throughout the corridor, and we already have it programmed for improvement. We've already addressed all the HES fixes that we could get.

Ajay Shakyaver commented this could just be one of several other operation special considerations that are very similar.

By consensus, the workgroup agreed to use Hazardous Cargo Routes as a Special Significance criterion.

By full consensus, the group agreed to make Hurricane Evacuation Routes as a separate special consideration.

### **Functional Classification**

This criteria was considered at the request of Danny Aylor, but by unanimous consensus it was rejected after a few minutes of discussion.

---

Blair Haynie returned to Safety and stated that by such a criteria designation before the fact, we put all our engineers in a potentially liable situation. And, most of these needs can be dealt with through HES.

Brad McCaleb doesn't think mere exposure should preclude doing what's right and needed.

Steven Stafford noted we usually are very aware of these needs and address them in the course of every project.

Blair Haynie noted that what we're talking about here, are safety issues that should be responded to quickly and this category can't do that.

Gabriel Del Bosque sees the standing liability from giving distinctly clear safety risks on a roadway. You're going to get a lot of public input on these needs, unless they are unknown.

Reggie Richardson sees where Blair is coming from, but we still need to be responsive and aggressive in addressing it. Identifying Safety as an issue is putting it into a more than 9-year window. The time element is key.

Bob Dickinson stated he can relate to what Blair is saying, but we need some way to address Safety.

Brad McCaleb stated we have several examples on fairly heavily trafficked roadways, with clear safety problems from periodic accidents. Most of these type projects and needs cannot wait for the limited HES money. There's not enough of it to go around.

Steven Stafford commented that keeping this Safety criteria would allow us to move up some projects/corridors that have known safety needs. Yet, I know that collecting the data and quantify the measure will be difficult.

Mark Tomlinson stated one of the things that have always concerned us is that they do tend to be erratic and unpredictable. We would like to be responsive, but we need to assess as to whether the roadway/ corridor is “correctable.”

Danny Aylor stated that by the amount of discussion on this topic/criteria, we affirm that it is a serious, important matter. It always gets a lot of attention at all levels – media, politicians, research, etc. He believes we can find a way for quantifying and identifying corridor level.

Howard Lyons suggested we could actually get ambushed on this in public hearing. This really involves fatalities. There’s still going to be a lot of emotionalism around this issue.

Blair Haynie stated that yesterday he voted for Hurricane Evacuation Routes as related to Safety. His concern is trying to quantify this without having the liability and exposure.

Brad McCaleb stated we’ll respond the way we always do: that we don’t have enough money.

Blair Haynie asked how will we handle this when we have incomparable projects in terms of safety and we think the one with less fatalities has greater need. How will we fend off the bad press and potential lawsuits?

Steven Stafford noted there probably isn’t that much difference among such projects.

Howard Lyons noted that he had never seen TxDOT publish such statistics and numbers. Other groups do, such as the National Safety Institute.

Reggie Richardson shares Blair’s concerns. In thinking about this whole mix of criteria, he placed Safety right up there as one of the top two critical criteria. We may be just jumping the gun at this point. Jo Ann Garcia noted that she used safety in picking a project in need, but have never had this backfired on this.

Steve Eckstrom argued for having any project with a big check mark for Safety in the DCIS, being moved ahead of any other project without such a distinct Safety Need designation.

Blair Haynie stated that regardless of all our rhetoric, this category is not and should not be the place to address such a critical matter. Maybe we should seek some guidance from our General Counsel on this before we go too much further.

John Barton said beyond what Blair suggests, we need to consult with our Traffic Ops Division.

Mark Tomlinson noted if we look into this further, we know that most accidents and fatalities are a function of human error, not engineering flaws or omissions. We will never avert every potential for crashes and fatalities. This really is a mobility category. And we will always address known and verified high potential crash areas.

The issue was tabled by the workgroup.

The group began a discussion addressing Percent Trucks and ways to quantify the criterion. As the discussion continued, it became clear to the group that they would rather prioritize the categories of criteria.

Workgroup members were asked to consider ranking the four categories in order of importance with 1 being the highest importance.

	Traffic Eng	Financial	Connectivity	Special Sig
Priority				
1 <sup>st</sup>	19	1	5	0
2 <sup>nd</sup>	5	3	17	0
3 <sup>rd</sup>	1	11	2	13
4 <sup>th</sup>	0	10	0	12

- 1 Traffic Engineering
- 2 Connectivity
- 3 Special Significance
- 3 Financial

Note: A revote was taken on the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> place boxes. So a revote on Special Considerations came out as: 3<sup>rd</sup>: 13 votes, and 4<sup>th</sup>: 12 votes. No re-vote was taken on Economic development.

Steve Eckstrom made the point that by virtue of the Financial criteria getting a combined 4 votes for 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup>, then it (as a box) should be ranked overall at 3<sup>rd</sup> overall. Added that to do less is to totally ignore his 1<sup>st</sup> place vote for that Economic development box.

Meg Moore addressed the workgroup concerning Safety criteria.

Meg Moore, TxDOT TRF stated the safety program helps to level out the playing field and identify the real critical hot spots. On the second page of the handout are the key factors and these help us to differentiate and set priorities, especially among locations. There are lots of ways for DPS and other officers to score the level of severity for the accident. Several thresholds also have been established for what to report, such as: damage at least \$1,000, number of vehicles involved, severity of injuries or fatalities. SII (Safety Improvement Index) codes more just for prioritizing needed spot improvements. SII also addresses the type of improvement that is considered appropriate, and addresses the “accident reduction” factor(s) involved.

Meg Moore further commented that the SII is not really helpful for mobility or capacity type projects. She explained the Accident Rate formula, and its application to various segments of roadway.

John Barton noted it could be used for a segment with several intersections.

Meg Moore stated the data does include frontage roads statistics. It often requires some manual analysis to really zero in on a specific interchange or point. We try to use this

data more for making comparison between facilities. Also, one needs to take into consideration the level of traffic control, such as 2 lane undivided vs. 4 lane divided. Each year the rates on projects addressed with HES projects are rising; now were at 3.0 and higher. We generally only code in 3 work types.

Steve Eckstrom noted that accident data is a 3 year average.

Meg Moore responded yes, but is updated every year. Although there are some pretty consistent trends, but still need the more current data to reflect new traffic features, such as new schools, developments, etc.

John Barton noted he is much more concerned about the quick changes in VMT or ADT.

Meg Moore noted, from seeing the Hazardous Cargo Route criteria on the board, that just signing it cannot designate these routes. It has to go through a very rigorous qualifying and lengthy process, including review and sign-off by the feds. In the end, the Commission makes that determination. There are some special circumstances where the feds can make unilateral determinations; it requires the Governor's approval.

Danny Aylor asked is there a listing of official hazardous cargo routes? Meg Moore responded yes, and it used to be on the Intranet site but was pulled after 9/11.

Todd Carlson asked could this group get the list? Meg Moore responded affirmatively.

The workgroup decided to give weighting to each of the four categories of criteria based on a 100-point system. Members were to distribute 100 points among the four categories. Members placed their weightings on a piece of paper and then entered into a spreadsheet. The total scores for each category were divided by the number of votes (21).

The resulting weighting of the categories was:

Traffic Engineering	46
Connectivity	28
Financial	13
Special Significance	13

The weightings are considered indicators and a starting point for deeper discussion within the workgroup.

In the course of discussions of the weightings, it was decided to accept volunteers for subcommittees that would address the individual categories and prepare a basis for discussion about the category of criteria for the next workshop.

## **Subcommittees**

Mark Lund felt there's a lot that can be gained from the subcommittee work.

Todd Carlson requested volunteers for subcommittees for each category of criteria. Remaining members provided their choices. Members that left early were asked to give their preferences before leaving and were considered.

Subcommittee assignments: (\* denotes Subcommittee Chair)

*Traffic Engineering*

Danny Aylor  
Jo Ann Garcia,  
Steven Stafford\*  
Wally Johnson  
Steve Seece  
Ajay Shakyaver  
Blair Haynie

Connectivity

John Barton  
Greg Davies  
Mark Lund\*  
Bob Appleton  
Steve Juneau  
Reggie Richardson

Financial

Steve Eckstrom  
Brad McCaleb\*  
Maria Burke  
Howard Lyons  
Mark Tomlinson

Special Significance

Hugh McNeely\*  
Gabriel Del Bosque  
Mauro Alvarez  
Harold McDaniel  
Howard Lyons  
Bob Dickinson

Discussion followed as to expectations of the subcommittees before the next workshop. Focus on units of measure, data needs and accessibility was decided as the main priorities.

Jo Ann Garcia thinks we still need to clean up some of the criteria within the major boxes, such as moving Intermodal Connectivity to Special Significance.

Steve Seece observed we're dealing with some weighty issues, even though several folks are not here.

Mark Lund stated we should not be bound to dealing with people outside the subcommittees to get additional expertise, views, etc. We should look at these criteria as more like performance measures rather than seeking a formula. We should look to where there is existing data and where the track record already exists, similar to the Accident Rates that Meg Moore discussed with us.

Todd Carlson noted we should also let anyone that has input they'd like considered by the subcommittee feel free to contact anyone on that subcommittee.

The workgroup then decided to prioritize the individual criteria within each category. Members were asked to determine which criteria ranked within the category.

<b>Category</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
-----------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------------

**Traffic**

- Traffic	1	-	4	7	4	4
- LOS	13	3	-	-	-	1
- Capacity	0	11	2	1	1	2
- Safety	2	1	7	3	3	3
- %Trucks	-	1	3	4	7	5

Howard Lyons suggested that LOS should be modified to make it "Minimum of some LOS."

**Financial**

- Econ Dev	-	1	15			2
- Lev	8	6	1			1 tie
- B/C	8	8	0			1 tie

**Connectivity**

- Sys Gaps	10	3	1	2		1
- Conn w Pr	3	4	4	5		3 tie
- Int'l Con	1	1	7	6		3 tie
- Max Exst	2	8	4	-		2



**Special Significance**

- POE	6	2	2	1	4	2
- Mil+N. Sec	1	1	7	5	3	3
- Haz Mat	1	4	1	6	4	4
- Hurr Evac	2	3	4	2	5	5
- Maj Freight	6	6	2	1	-	1

***Next meeting***

The next meeting of the workgroup is scheduled for August 26-27, 2002 at 9:00 a.m. at the Thompson Conference Center in Austin.

Workshop 4 is scheduled for September 23-24, 2002 at 9:00 a.m. at the Thompson Conference Center in Austin.

**UTP Restructuring Workshop  
Category 3  
Workshop 3  
Thompson Conference Center  
Austin, TX  
August 26-27, 2002**

**Notes**

*Statements reported in these notes are not direct quotes, but reflect the general idea of the questions or comments made by each individual. Statements are not in exact chronological order as they occurred during the meeting. They have been arranged in order according to the topics that were discussed.*

The third meeting of the urban area corridor workgroup was held August 26-27, 2002 in the Thompson Conference Center located in Austin, Texas.

Todd Carlson, TTI, reviewed the criteria developed at the previous workshops, and noted the work accomplished by the subcommittees in the interim. The subcommittees will report during this workshop.

The goal of this workshop will be to determine weightings and scorings for the criteria. The group should also have a sense of how to approach and determine data needs to weigh corridor segments to help TP&P know what data to gather in the month between this and next workshop.

Carlson noted that consistency is not required between the groups. It's how this group decides to evaluate the corridor segments and justify those decisions that are important. Jo Ann Garcia, TxDOT Laredo, noted that the Category 3 weightings are similar to Category 4. Blair Haynie, TxDOT Abilene, suggested that if we could narrow criteria, it might make it easier for people to understand. Seventeen criteria are harder to understand.

*Subcommittee Reports*

*Connectivity*

The floor was given to representatives from the subcommittees to provide the full committee with a progress report.

Bob Appleton, TxDOT Bryan, presented the current status on Connectivity discussions. The subcommittee tried to avoid a formula that "black boxes" the criteria.

As for multi-intermodal connections, one would hope these connections would relieve traffic congestion by placing freight onto rail or a major passenger terminal would take passenger travel off roadways. The idea is to take people off roadways and they would be given more credit than a distribution center that contributes a lot to the traffic, but does not do anything to reduce it. It would not get a lot of weight because it doesn't reduce traffic.

Appleton stated that to make this work you have to have clear definitions that everyone understands and agrees on.

John Barton, TxDOT Wichita Falls, discussed criteria for Closing System Gaps. He stated that basically what we have come up with is the 4 criteria in closing system gaps. The subcommittee also chose to approach the problem from an affirmative, giving value opposed to taking it away, multiples rather than additives mathematically.

The next factor was maximizing use. Barton noted that projects not at capacity where corridors exist and you would go in to improve is what I thought we were taking about. Segments are given a value of 1.2 if not 1 if improvements are to existing lanes rather than adding new lanes, etc. Intermodal connectivity is scored 1.25 – 1.0, Connecting with Principal Roadways 1.30, then multiply by value of 7.5, it comes out to 28.

Hugh McNeely, Waco MPO, asked why it was decided to prioritize small vs. large system gaps? Barton proposed weighting large ones heavier due to the macro economic standpoint. We want to create a more valuable total system.

Reggie Richardson, TxDOT Waco, presented an alternative scoring system for Connectivity. He handed out a sheet containing his scoring system proposal. He stated his goal was to simplify the formulas and criteria. Richardson attempted to fold Special Significance criteria into the category.

John Barton noted that, in light of defensibility, the system that Richardson is proposing would be easier for someone outside the group to understand and easier to defend. Gabriel Del Bosque, Laredo MPO, liked the formula and its simplicity. Members of the group cautioned that they should hear from the Special Significance subcommittee before agreeing to combine the categories.

Steven Stafford, TxDOT Beaumont, is not sure if he agrees with the lowest score/base level of 7.5 if the area is not doing anything. They are receiving credit for nothing.

John Barton noted that two 1/10<sup>th</sup> mile gaps are the same as one 10-mile gap in independent utility. How much is required to get the system to work as it was designed?

The discussion over system gaps led to discussion over the definition of the segments that the workgroup is considering. What is the purview of urban area corridor segments? Barton stated that is something that needs to be clearly defined. Max Proctor told all 25 MPOs that the issue is of statewide significance no matter where it falls. Hugh McNeely noted that he did not think that is what Category 4 is doing, though. Carlson noted that things were fuzzy going in and they are not concrete now.

Steven Stafford observed we are talking about small gaps. Are large gaps also deficient? We have to express deficiencies clearly and carefully.

Howard Lyons, TxDOT TPP, noted that if Category 4 pitches projects and we do too, they need to cutoff at urban boundaries. If they get it up to a free flow it would be okay. Otherwise we will have to wait and see if they take care of problems.

### *Special Significance*

The Special Significance subcommittee presented its ideas on scoring the criteria in the category. Hugh McNeely presented definitions of each criterion. Two scoring

systems were proposed. The first ranked the entire criterion in the same manner: 2.6 points to each one. McNeely proposed an alternative: 4,3,2,2,2.

McNeely made clear that in order to qualify for the points associated with either of these criteria the corridor segment should directly connect to or actually be on the type of facility defined in each criterion.

Barton did you discuss the definition of a freight route?

Del Bosque observed you should not have to be directly on the corridor itself. It's not a logical place to have a facility, i.e., a military base, plant, school, but the impact to the system is still there

Regarding ports of entry, naturalization was added to the definitions.

There was group discussion as to the types of national security installations that may qualify for credit.

Steven Stafford stated they should be special generators of traffic and cargo as the definition says.

Ajay Shakyaver, TxDOT Odessa, noted special significance looks at things that cause significant traffic. What about other things that do that like malls or recreational sights? Del Bosque responded that recreational sites don't count because they only happen once a week or so. Malls and such are critical and would probably be looked at under economic development. We're looking at things that are important to the well being of the state.

The workgroup also discussed freight route definitions and the proper truck volume to use as a threshold for urban areas. McNeely proposed 5,000 trucks per day. Barton suggested the group should look at the FHWA's definition of freight routes for Texas.

### *Traffic*

Joanne Wright from the TxDOT General Counsel Office gave a presentation on the liability issues if safety is used or not used as a criterion in prioritizing corridor segments. Based on the limitations on liability of the state, safety does not have to be considered as a criterion, but the state is also not opening itself up to legal action by using it.

Chris Didear and Mike Chamberlain of TxDOT TPP presented the data capabilities of the section. They have mapped Level of Service from the entire state. They showed a corridor analysis tracking tool used to track requests on projects. The database is connected to ArcView to create maps. The database and maps are envisioned for other uses than a corridor tracking tool. The project had generated a map for most if not all of the urban areas represented here. Richardson asked if this is available to every district? No, this is an in-house tool that is being developed as they go. Carlson asked whether the workgroup could get special permission to use this tool? The two responded affirmatively. The tool is a pilot program and is not precise as it could be with time and effort. The maps may not be the same as traffic maps TxDOT furnishes.

Mark Tomlinson, TxDOT Amarillo, asked how hard would it be to put the corridors we choose on these maps? Didear responded not hard at all, it would take minute.

Steven Stafford then presented scoring criteria for the Traffic criterion. The main focus is on LOS, but the subcommittee did not try to come up with factors for these. They believe that the main issue we're dealing with is deficiencies in dealing with capacity and flow. Stafford presented a formula of density equals volume divided by service/speed. If we could use a minimum LOS, throw out all that don't qualify, then look at the ones with the highest density. Don't initially look at cost, instead look at deficiency and the need. Put our money on the greatest need, regardless of the money available. This would take cost out of the issue. Our general goal would be to reduce the clutter. Safety could be moved somewhere else to be used as a tiebreaker. What do people think out there? What are they going to understand?

Shakyaver noted that density is not usually used as a measure; they use a service flow rate based on the maximum level. Perhaps instead of trying to come up with something new, you have to have the speed to figure LOS.

Mark Lund, Brownsville MPO, observed one would use a spreadsheet...whatever would add up to 100? What value would you place on a project that would be acceptable? Projects in level of service E. That's 36-45 passenger cars per lane per mile. Calculate percent trucks into equivalent number of cars.

Richardson asked how do you project for non-existing routes? He noted your estimate is based on improvements to brand new routes. But now we're comparing new locations to existing. That's going to be interesting. We'll have to address that there are no existing deficiencies.

Shakyaver responded when we're saying need it's taking the horizon compared to now. You project your volume and project future need. The difference in deficiency is what you have to develop. Barton observed that he did not know that would govern or control that. How do you prove it? Can't be truly forecasting.

Del Bosque noted in terms of new locations, it depends on how many points each criteria gets. You can forecast what the traffic will be. It is the most realistic means to reach a projection. A new location roadway can actually accumulate enough points to compete.

Hugh McNeely stated we have to have criteria to compare, either on existing or proposed projects. In Waco we need capacity of 12 lanes and it won't fit where the current facility is. I don't want to say it can't compete

Lund observed the model doesn't tell you about public support you can expect. They cannot predict other history and public involvement issues. The traffic tools are great, wonderful, but they can't do everything. Most people are going to be out of politics in 4 years and others will take credit.

Barton noted that McNeely was talking about addressing identifiable need. I'm talking about anticipated needs. I think you need to base decisions on existing needs. McNeely responded you have to have ways to let new facilities compete or they have no chance. Barton responded you could justify everything you do in the community based on the need on one corridor.

Lund noted different justifications could be used for any proposed project. As John said, there is that risk. But you have to trust some people. We have to look at the macro economic picture. Some areas like Waco are key areas. The valley we don't have to worry so much. If I have a whole new corridor opening up on 281 it will relieve the red showing on US 83. In McAllen and Pharr, they did that two years ago and it had much

more traffic than the model predicted. The model does not tell you how fast it will happen. But the models and new routes have to be part of the picture.

John Barton observed if you look at Amarillo, you could use a predicted model to say you need a loop going around the south side. Okay, we need a loop around the north too and there are numbers to support all of them. If you put them all in the mix, how do you keep them from all being chosen if the numbers are right?

Del Bosque noted if we model 25 years out, we want to see how everything is to function. It's so far out and only so many can be funded. It's not until one project is finished that you can start on another. The numbers are constantly being updated before the project will ever actually be funded.

Harold McDaniel, Amarillo MPO, asked is this equation going to say all east of I 85 is higher priority because of numbers? Garcia asked what if they are already planned in the ten-year program?

Tomlinson noted that he feels like cost has to be considered. We're really growing and to give carte blanche to people to be too extreme. Stafford responded you could rank them based on deficiency, then go down the list and assign costs. Then, if you know how many you could do in a year, decide. The current CEI encourages low-balling. We're getting projects that are underestimated and under funded. This approach would be more realistic.

Shakyaver stated in LOS concerning passenger cars, I suggest for trucks having a real impact on the pavement we should consider ESALs. That number is readily available from TPD. What you may find if the road has low ADT, the higher ESAL count is factored in.

Blair Haynie wondered if something could be put in place urging realistic estimates, realizing that whenever you exceed the cost by what would have to be provided by the districts or something.

Barton noted he was not sure I agree that density or flow rate to reveal LOS. Speed will factor in. I tend to drift back to LOS. Stafford responded that density reveals LOS. Speed is factored in. For urban streets there would be a whole new procedure.

Shakyaver then presented a formula on percent trucks.

Based on the ideal flow rate at the free flow at posted rate. That's where service speed comes from. I'm trying to measure the percentage of flow rate for each segment. How much had the traffic increased and how much the LOS has changed a degree of congestion is assigned according to a percent of LOS?

Capacity needs = change in service flow \* change in LOS \* some weight factor

You may have a high flow rate with poor LOS or a low Flow rate and high LOS. This is trying to figure how to figure what would be needed in 20 yrs. I see safety as statistical and I don't see how the department would be liable. I say compare the accident rate from your segment to the average statewide stats for those types of roadways.

Needs also should be looked at from a standpoint of existing infrastructure. For instance looking at four factors of infrastructure for one roadway segment and plot the length of the segment. Find out about that segment of pavement.

Total score = (Capacity needs + ARI + PT) \* weighting factor

McNeely asked how long would it take a district to come up with this information? Shakyaver responded LOS comes from the existing model or you can get it from TxDOT.

Lund observed that he liked the formula because it includes safety. Stafford's formula could be tweaked and added to yours and he would be satisfied.

Steve Seese, Wichita Falls MPO, approved of the effort, but is not sure he agrees with the safety factor and how it could be quantified.

### **General Discussion**

Before the Financial criteria could be discussed, the group entered into a general discussion of the overall UTP Restructuring process.

Tomlinson observed that it appears we getting more complex. The CEI hasn't been a terrible thing and has done a good job. He is not proposing we go back, but can't explain what we're doing here. When people think of how this should work, and they're the people we're serving, it reminds me of trunk system, it was the same sort of sense of doing the whole thing instead of in pieces. Path is increasingly complex: how do you apply it to the corridors? It's too complex. Keep in mind if a corridor can be finished. Look at I-35; we thought it could be finished 25 yrs ago. As needs increase we'll look at those corridors needing improvements. The projects, language was confusing until ISTEA came up with allocating funds to every district and all districts got something. You could save and build. Little pieces came together and common people could understand the process. Urban mobility funds are allocated and I don't know if it's best. Maybe we back up and make this really simple. We got locked into the corridor box but maybe it's not valid. Maybe we should split it up by population and everyone gets something.

Blair Haynie added that he wanted to build on that—we're saying simplify so people will understand. These equations are getting complicated; we're building another CEI. There was some stuff presented yesterday—simple-minded—I thought that was a good way of looking at this. We need a simple way to look at this so they can understand even if they don't agree. We'll be here forever if we don't keep getting bogged down.

Walter McCullough, TxDOT San Angelo, observed on the issue of traffic and LOS, we do have people who vote and legislators have an interest. We do have the ability to get these built. It's a safety issue and a transportation issue if we look at the 4 criteria. Some roadways are always going to be congested no matter how much we expand them. Other parts of the state will not have access to the funds we need other factors that will allow a budget balance.

Lund observed that there are artificial barriers in the metro groups...large and smaller metro groups...while I'm working on an urban area formula. In five years Brownsville will be a TMA and I won't be in this group. Texas needs something we don't have on table—regional planning. Regional plans could connect highways and buy up access from agricultural areas. But they're not looking at highway connection but its one of best we could draw. Maybe in ten years citizens and TxDOT will allow it to happen. Maybe we should devise what Mark suggested: more flexibility. If money was

on the table and other's money was too, we could have a regional plan between MPOs and do the logical thing. But that's not on the table and so the results are artificial.

Lund added it could be a combination of funds? Organize a mechanism where there could be discussion between the groups. It seems logical to trade between groups if it effects more than one group so they are not trapped by a formula and it's a planning mechanism all things being equal do the best thing for all affected.

Tomlinson said the backbone of bank balance funding is allocation. You know what the budget is going to be and you can shift funds to another area, but it doesn't happen much—financially constrained—problem with CEI is you cannot manipulate your estimate, you're going to get it close and no games. Local people know what is best for their region. We know that we'll have for the future and plan accordingly. I know safety is important but you're limited in what you can do. I thought all along that the Commission thinks we should spread funds out. It's going to happen anyway, why not just do it?

Richardson noted that if there a way to give districts a simple formula that they can put into their bank balance formula they could accumulate their funds. In advocating that we add a twist-not just a percentage—but some formula and maybe a certain amount of this category money be set aside for areas that don't get any project funds.

Brad McCaleb, Texarkana MPO noted the ones who handed down our charge, and they had already discussed this and why couldn't we come up with an idea that the funds be distributed by population areas, come up with their own list of projects and prioritize themselves, and if they choose to bank balance funds that's their choice. We're coming up with a new formula that is going to completely restructure what they have been planning. The process should start at local level and percolate up. What we're doing is not accomplishing that. Population distribution is getting us back toward that. In cooperation with district and region they select projects, it removes state level politics from planning. Areas cannot come forward and say don't forget about us.

Haynie added that he thinks what McCaleb is saying is correct. We're going through all this and then sit down and try to figure out where are the priorities. And some projects are not going to fit our priorities but will fit the equation. If we could look at a regional distribution of funds, we could look at regions and see what projects would be funded we would know what factors to look for. We have done this in our areas and worked it out in 2-3 hrs. I'm afraid we're gonna spend a lot of time, some will win and some will lose, if its done at local level, we'll do better.

McNeely noted that Category 4 would have to pick up projects in urban areas with statewide significance. Then we could do this. It should be designated by MPO not districts.

McCullough stated we may be looking at something like is done with federal funds, looking at areas that cannot afford large projects if done by population. We do need a ranking system, but a percentage does need to go the MPO or the region. I don't think simply a ranking system will survive.

Carlson called Montie Wade, TTI, for clarification of bank balance allocation. He reported back to the group that it is supposed to prioritize segments from a statewide view so the Commission can make decisions. If you do population percentages and bank balance allocations, you would be "passing the buck" to MPOs.



Lund noted that it's not radical we're going back to something TxDOT did earlier. The idea of development is TxDOT would be working with the MPO. All the checks and balances built into it. It's saying the add-ons at the end, geography and regional distribution, should be looked at earlier. It doesn't kill the statewide focus, it says the MPOs can cooperate with TxDOT to allocate funds. We'll see if the Commission ratifies it. They can still say no, but they might say we're right.

Lund added that as a minority report, a regional distribution is a valid approach. There's merit in doing this and it does not contradict what we're trying to do. I don't want to take up the group's time. It's something I don't mind working into a minority report. The public would go for the CEI before they'd go for this.

McCaleb asked a question about how the project works through this system. MPO identifies their projects and prioritizes them, and then those prioritized projects are presented to the commission. Give us the top five from each MPO, and then they will run them through this process and reprioritize them. What if one area's projects wind up the last five, then the commission takes one and moves it up to satisfy that area. You've circumvented the whole process. I don't think that should be done. But if you distribute the funds based on some neutral criteria, then the area can prioritize their projects based on the funding they have available. They can decide and live with their decision. This process circumvents the whole TEA 21 local control issue.

Appleton observed the way he envisioned this process is not that each area would submit projects and they would go from there. I thought we would establish a list of prioritized corridors. The MPO would still prioritize their needs, but they would find out if they would be covered by funds or if they needed to go elsewhere for funding. In trying to distribute these funds, each district is trying to get their fair share. Nobody ever gets that and we wind up with small parcels and no statewide plan.

Richardson noted we were instructed from the beginning not to consider money, only to set criteria. The MPOs prioritize their projects and we're overriding what they've done.

McCaleb added the MPO might rank safety number one and give it 70%. My MPO may see capacity as a heavier rank. But if you take my top 3 and theirs and put them into this formula, mine will come out on top and safety will wash out. I'm going to have to look really hard about going back to the public and recommend that they use this formula in selecting projects.

Gary Law, TxDOT Odessa, noted at a district or MPO we're all trying to get maximum projects for maximum funding available. There are other funding mechanisms that compete the best for these funds and for other funds. We need to decide on what our focus is for the urban corridor project. I'm going to structure and package it so it competes the best I can. I won't package every project I have for these funds. What are the parameters of the corridor we're looking at and what fits around the state?

Del Bosque stated we really have a dilemma between federal regulations and MPOs prioritizing projects. Also, the Feds allow TxDOT to prioritize projects. When we go out to compete, maybe our second best gets funded. That's always been the case and probably will always be. There may be other piles of money you have to go to if your number 1 doesn't get funded. I agree with MPOs that the micro decisions be made at micro level. Our MPO would best be able to prioritize our projects if we know what our funding is. But this is our charge and I'm going to be here to participate.

McNeely stated that he talks regularly with MPO directors all across the state that feel this is circumventing the federal process. The UTP process has always done that. We do work well together, but the processes don't. The UTP is a ten-year program and work is already being done on them. It makes it difficult for MPOs to have a say. We were told all the projects were locked in and MPOs have no say. You can participate but you won't have any real say. Many people still think it's wrong. Del Bosque reiterated that concerns about federal regulations should be answered.

The workgroup agreed that these issues would be addressed at the next workshop and continued the discussion of criteria.

### *Subcommittee Reports*

#### Financial

McCaleb reported that the subcommittee had been unable to confer on the criteria in the interim. Howard Lyons reported that he had found one report, but nothing more. Every state is pretty much on its own. Each one is subjective and needs an economist to monitor.

Discussion followed on using economically disadvantaged counties and enterprise zones and their use in financial criteria. The discussion considered definition and quantification.

The workgroup took a vote on the use of an economic development criterion in prioritizing corridor segments. The tally was 11-8 against. It will not be used as a criterion.

The group discussion turned to Benefit/Cost Ratio.

McCullough stated that he thinks cost should be considered in some fashion when you get down to it, how do you consider it getting biggest bang for buck? Lyons responded that at that level of development, it's hard to be accurate and it may not be in our best interest to be accurate. Why don't we come up with some cost per lane mile? Keeps cost down if you're only allowed a certain amount of funds.

Lund stated that he liked the idea of cost. Maybe instead of looking at benefits vs. cost, we look at it on a bigger scale statewide, compare longer, bigger corridors. We examine closing a gap on a corridor, the benefits that would result.

Seese agreed MPO and TxDOT cost comes in no matter what because they're all constrained.

Garcia suggested that you turn in your best estimate now, and you can't ask for more. If you do, you have to pay for it. The most it could be off is a certain percentage. You have to come up with the difference.

McCaleb noted as far as the leveraging, areas are told they can expect a project to be built, but they have to have their part in the bank even when TxDOT doesn't have their part. It's not their fault if cost goes up. I agree with Garcia, some projects would never get built. I think there's a way to have a realistic cost estimate that can be applied to a long-range project. I'd prefer we don't include benefit cost.

Haynie added that there is merit to what Garcia is saying, but problems too. A lot of projects are built years after initial estimates. If we hold district to the estimate, the DE

could be under pressure to have the project elevated in status. He low balls to raise status and then 20 years later there are consequences.

McCaleb asked what would be a standard unit of measure?  $X$  dollars per lane mile. McCaleb added how can you compare lane mile costs across regions? You cannot look at one thing per region and the all rest statewide. Plus, aren't we supposed to choose projects based on need? To do that, you cannot consider cost.

Maria Burke, TxDOT Design, noted the issue has always been important in Austin, the actual construction cost, sometimes you cannot penalize anyone for costs being underestimated due to time, etc. If I were out there competing looking at all the costs, and they are used to a standard, the other guy gets his project through and you can't even compete due to costs. Whether we use it in this or not it gives everyone a level playing field. All projects submitted are needed in someone's mind. It's going to work itself out. But having no cost or putting undue weight on cost cause problems. If there were a standard cost, it would help.

McNeely added whatever happens, if all projects do their estimates the same way, everyone would be on a level playing field. If you want to add bells and whistles, add it into projects and explain extra cost. Law noted trying to define an estimate and scope, comparing general costs, are hard to compare on a statewide basis. I don't see it as controlling gold plating except through cost benefit ratio. It may weigh it down.

Law added we still need a control of cost benefit ratio so things can be compared. If I get the choice I'll do concrete pavement everywhere, but if I get that money in our corridor, I've taken significant dollars that could be used elsewhere.

The workgroup took a vote as to whether to keep some form of benefit-cost ratio as a criterion for prioritizing corridor segments. The tally was 14-5 for using benefit-cost ratio as a criterion.

### **Units of Measure for Criteria**

Special Significance subcommittee stated they were ready with their units of measure. Lyons noted that the group would probably need to come back to it once the other committees are through and look at the points. Richardson reiterated that we should put Special Significance under Connectivity and rescore the whole thing.

Connectivity stated that they still need definitions.

Stafford stated that Traffic subcommittee could come up with something more in line with what the others are using, and said the subcommittee would leave safety under the category for the time being. Carlson noted that Traffic is 46% of the formula and we have to get consensus to be able to move forward.

Two more questions face the workgroup. One, the issue of double counting and triple counting within the criteria needs to be clarified. Second, what criteria could be dropped out if we need to, or what criteria need to be added?

### *Next meeting*

The next meeting of the workgroup is scheduled for September 23-24, 2002 at 9:00 a.m. at the Thompson Conference Center in Austin.

Workshop 5 is scheduled for October 15-16, 2002 at 9:00 a.m. at the Thompson Conference Center in Austin.

**UTP Restructuring Workshop  
Category 3  
Workshop 4  
Thompson Conference Center  
Austin, TX  
September 23-24, 2002**

**Notes**

*Statements reported in these notes are not direct quotes, but reflect the general idea of the questions or comments made by each individual. Statements are not in exact chronological order as they occurred during the meeting. They have been arranged in order according to the topics that were discussed.*

The fourth meeting of the urban area corridor workgroup was held September 23-24, 2002 in the Thompson Conference Center located in Austin, Texas.

Todd Carlson, TTI, reviewed the criteria developed at the previous workshops and handed out hard copies of the agenda, meeting notes and maps.

Carlson stated that the goal of this workshop would be to determine formulas, weightings and scorings for the criteria. The group should also have a sense of how to approach and determine data needs to weigh corridor segments to help TP&P know what data to gather for the corridor segments.

Montie Wade, TTI, addressed the group about certain issues that have developed in the process. Wade mentioned that he reviewed all the message traffic that ensued since the last meeting. Wade said he felt there was a lot of good points raised, addressed, and deliberated at considerable detail. He added that he felt he needed to address the “public involvement” requirements. He has discussed some of these items at the recent TEMPO meeting. Wade believes that he thinks you all have come to the right and same conclusion that this process does not circumvent the required open/public meetings involvement. The UTP, along with this particular workshop process, is unique to Texas. Beyond that, the commission will be very sensitive to this element. Wade added if this particular process became more formal and regular, then it may be up for possible consideration for the Texas Transportation Plan and the related public involvement.

Wade also addressed the relationship between Categories 4 and 3. He said we’re optimistic that as the natural interface arises, then your group will need to be aware of what the Category 4 group is doing.

Wade also noted he was asked to review whether there is some real or perceived conflict with the priorities established at your respective MPOs. When you pick your local priorities, they may not actually program and go to contract with other projects. This workshop is just another planning process. You have been asked by the commission to look at particular types of corridors and put them into some hierarchy of priorities. This will not supersede the local priorities. However, Wade added that the order that projects actually go to contract might not directly adhere to the priority order. You have

been asked to do something that is basically simple to consider, but not easy to actually accomplish.

Mark Lund, Brownsville MPO has no problem with this process and does not see any conflict with the local process. Lund is concerned that we don't disregard or throw out the local priorities. He may still submit some minority report if he feels it will be constructive and instructive to the commission. Lund added he is concerned about building in some discretion into the process. Danny Aylor reiterated that he sees no conflict since we still will have a discretionary category (Category 11).

Hugh McNeely, Waco MPO, does not hold the view he had earlier. He feels this is a constructive, necessary effort, which does not overcome or rule out the local requirements and public involvement.

Gary Law, TxDOT Odessa, stated there will continue to be a need for annual or periodic reconciliation of all the listings of projects. He believes that it will serve as a guide or recommendation of priorities to the commission.

Montie Wade addressed another item he felt needed added discussion: the regional distribution of funds, or how to handle the "bank balance" categories? It was never our effort to do a bank balance program.

Wade added that basically your charge was to look to assure some equity among the regions.

Max Proctor, TxDOT P&S, stated that regional distribution must be considered. If you came up with a perfect ranking system, and some areas didn't realize any projects, then we would want you to look at the results to assure some reasonable equity. The differences among the MPOs in this group are much less than that in the Category 2 group, where you go from DFW to Lubbock. As a result, DFW winds up getting about 30 percent of the statewide total. Population or VMT as a criterion will still make distributions similar to those in the past. We had about \$1 billion available. They divided this into 3 five-year groups. Then we are asking them to prioritize the corridors/projects in each of the five-year groupings. It is not a bank balance process; it is a target. You have to ensure that there is some level of equity.

Ajay Shakyaver, Odessa MPO, noted it then seems that using population would be the first and strongest criteria.

Max Proctor added the criteria should work out fairly equitably. You're not distributing dollars. If everybody is reasonably happy, then you have done a good job.

Montie Wade noted the commission asks that you look at the whole process. Once you get your criteria and ranking in place, then you want to assure equity.

Wade added that one other issue raised was the short time line allowed for this fairly complicated process, but also highly important effort. Proctor added the commission is interested in getting your best effort on the table and documented.

Max Proctor addressed the group: One thing I heard this morning was the need to try to tie this effort to statewide connectivity (Category 4). Not sure that's really necessary or important. You need to look at function, not boundaries, per se. Part of what you deal with may go outside your boundaries. You still need to deal with the prioritizing of the project that are, in fact, the highest local priorities. There was some confusion earlier.

Howard Lyons, TxDOT P&S, added the Category 2 group doesn't have enough money to deal with what is in their areas, let alone going into your areas.

Max Proctor responded, that I briefed this from the beginning. Your real concern should be functional, not the geographic confine or boundary.

Montie Wade added that Lyons is right. Category 4 is not going into your area. They are stopping at your boundaries.

Proctor noted the Category 4 group has to deal with continuous corridors. If they stop short of your areas, or inside your areas, and don't continue on through, they will be sent back to the drawing board. A perfect example, we have on the books to expand IH 35 from Georgetown to Hillsboro, then that is full connectivity.

Gary Law asked won't the segments that go through the urban area be able to get funding from either source? Proctor responded no, only if it was getting expanded for local traffic would it be eligible for urban related funding. Otherwise, it would be funded out of the statewide connectivity category funding.

Bob Appleton, TxDOT Bryan, observed when you said something about projects going through urban areas, we have projects that handle local traffic and don't feel it should get funding from statewide category sources. Law added we have to have some screening factors. What we need to concentrate on are those projects that go through the urban area. Proctor responded that statewide consideration is what's most important to the state, not local requirements.

Ross Jones, Abilene MPO, noted if I heard right, we will try to assure equity among all the areas and regions. We know what our top ranked projects are in Abilene.

Hugh McNeely stated he doesn't like what Category 2 is doing at this time. As Gary Law said earlier, some of these local routes should be under consideration from the Category 11 Discretionary category. Reggie Richardson, TxDOT Waco, responded I kind of disagree with Hugh. This group is supposed to deal with routes that have statewide significance. We have the bank balance programs to deal with local need projects. We shouldn't include routes in urban areas just because it has high local traffic volumes. Proctor responded that you cannot count on the Category 11 Discretionary funding. You'll never have enough money in that category.

John Barton, TxDOT Wichita Falls, observed that a local route would have to get some additional local leveraging, from the city, developers, etc. Proctor added if a route is on the state highway system, it is part of the statewide connectivity effort. Barton added so it looks like a lot of the local routes with lots of local traffic will get included in our process, but it will need some local leveraging.

Aylor wants to make sure none of us shortchange our areas. We need to include all our corridors. Then we can know what competes well. Just because it seems like a local project, we should exclude it right off the bat.

Law added we won't know the extent of local commitment or other leveraging that may be required to elevate a project to actual construction.

Shakyaver noted a point was raised: How many corridors can be brought to this process? Should we place any limits to number each district brings into our process? Richardson responded that from earlier discussion, each area represented in this group, would bring their projects to this group. Lund added you shouldn't limit your projects. We have to submit the projects even though it may, in fact, be a truly local or even border projects. Lund added he has heard that some areas are submitting everything. Steve Seese, Wichita Falls MPO, stated this whole process should focus on the criteria. Barton

added that within our definitions, we should bring everything we think applies to the table. However, are we doing justice by bringing all our projects?

Gary Law stated that only the true top local priority projects should be brought forward for our consideration. Mark Lund responded that because of the long-term nature of this process, we should include everything.

Montie Wade responded what does it matter how many projects are brought forward, except true local mobility? You still want to rank by local need, but this group needs to deal with statewide priority needs. It shouldn't matter if it's 50 or 200 projects. Let the criteria do what it's supposed to. Carlson added that with all the criteria you've developed so far, there should be enough cross checks to balance out the distribution.

John Barton observed that what brings me some comfort is that we may not get all our desired projects, that we will be pretty competitive with projects across the state, including Beaumont. I think this will all shake out.

Hugh McNeely observed he keeps hearing that the only projects to be included here are those that are already in the MTP. I don't think that should bind us. We have other projects that are priorities.

Danny Aylor added about the MTP: yes, there's a lot of planning that gone into this area, but that's not the only source of need. Often, we see that the number ones are for political reasons. I think this kind of process will make a significant change to what projects get on the MTP in the future. Again, let's not limit ourselves.

Max Proctor stated let's review why you were asked to be here: to help the commission determine what are the most important projects in your areas. Seese responded if that's all we're doing, then just take our lists and turn it in to you. Proctor responded you've got to merge the priorities against the criteria, ranked statewide. Montie Wade added you've been charged to prioritize the projects statewide.

Mark Tomlinson, TxDOT Amarillo, observed in hearing what's been raised, I think Category 2 has come up with a pretty elegant solution, which is that everybody gets something. The system doesn't have a big bureaucracy that says that's not good. We probably need to be careful about our extreme examples. If our criteria are good, then there will be equity and fairness. Keep the process simple.

Blair Haynie, TxDOT Abilene, stated he is comfortable with what we're doing.

Greg Davies, Longview MPO, noted we haven't sifted all of our local projects to see if they fit the connectivity criteria. Reggie Richardson added that each of our two MPOs use a different criteria for establishing the respective priorities.

Montie Wade noted that since we're all friends, I think what the big concern is a fear to see what the current criteria and related equations would come up with. Please realize that your initial iterations are only among you all. Once you run the numbers a few times, then you can tweak it further to try to balance the extremes and to assure optimum equity.

The group discussed different approaches to the task after absorbing comments from earlier in the workshop. Concerns over regional distribution were prevalent. The group took a vote for consensus and decided to remain with the approach developed thus far: staying with the criteria and running the formulas.

## **Criteria Discussion**



Todd Carlson distributed John Barton's proposal for the criteria and projected it on the screen.

John Barton explained his approach. He made an attempt to combine all the major categories into this formula.

Traffic	50 points
Connectivity	25 points
Financial	12.5 points
Special Interests	12.5 points

Group discussion regarding the formulae presented followed. Discussion revolved around accident rates and length off corridor segments. Shakyaver suggested using a five-year average rather than just one year for accidents.

Reggie Richardson observed you'd lose a lot of points for a gap, if it were the whole segment. Barton responded that you have to assess if the segment has independent utility?

Mark Lund noted that under your system, in connecting to all of the system, even though the project is only a small part of the corridor. It's the corridor that completes the gap. Steven Stafford, TxDOT Beaumont, noted there's little difference between a segment that is the whole project and the corridor is smaller in relation.

Mark Tomlinson asked Barton if he has thought about how to deal with interchanges? He thinks that would be a part of the gap.

The group then discussed financial criteria.

Regional distribution: Steve Seese asked is the state broken up into any formal regions? Bob Appleton feels that John's approach is the type of methodology that we ought to run the process on. He added it's fairly straightforward. Then, we could tweak it as we see the need for it later.

Hugh McNeely noted at some point, he feels a need to factor in population at some point.

Reggie Richardson thinks this proposal is a good basis for getting started. It has some reasonable simplicity for describing to the public, which have always been our goal and our challenge. He asked how do you all see this having some problem for any regions?

Danny Aylor likes Barton's proposal. However, he suggests the group consider using ADT instead of LOS in the second element of the Traffic area. Barton responded he sees no real advantage, although useful to some districts or MPOs than others.

Blair Haynie asked John Barton were you considering current data for the LOS? Barton replied affirmatively, FHWA for us wants to see current LOS, and want to see LOS C.

Gary Law noted on the Financial part that we threw out the Economic Development element, but I'd like us to reconsider it in light of it's potential for leveraging. Howard Lyons remarked he sees his point about including it or leaving it. Barton added you could pursue an Executable Agreement, to commit the funds now or in the future. It works much better than just Agreements, which they can slide out of in future years with new elected officials. Reggie Richardson added our commission has

been leveraging for many years, to make local years feasible. Another vehicle is an Advance Funding Agreement that commits the funds today.

Members called for consensus on whether to use John Barton's proposal as a basis for continuing efforts with the criteria.

There was overwhelming approval for using it.

Todd Carlson about the proposed regional distribution of urban areas in Barton's proposal. The group did not approve of it.

### Special Significance

Group discussion followed regarding the Special Interests section of the proposal.

The definition of a Major Freight Route proved to be difficult. Proposals for a threshold of 5,000 trucks per day were considered. Steven Stafford noted that most areas have at least one route with 5,000 trucks. The numbers must be verified. This isn't a real big issue with only 4 total points riding on this. John Barton added the map he found most interesting is the one with truck bandwidths for Texas. Many corridors carry more than 5,000 trucks per day. Howard Lyons mentions that he doesn't see any value in whether the truck is loaded or empty, so it's not the freight volume but just the count of trucks (ADTT). Stafford states I don't see the few points we are giving for major freight routes as significant. We may need to look toward the major truck corridors.

John Barton suggested maybe we should consider Hugh's idea as to giving a corridor the full 4 points only if the truck count is 5,000 or more. Walter McCullough, TxDOT San Angelo, thinks 5,000 trucks, as a cutoff for factor credit, is too high. He thinks we should just give the 4 points if the route is a Major Truck Route. If not, then no points.

After further discussion, Gary Law noted that most all these Special Interest items were to be tiebreakers.

Danny Aylor observed it seems that we might be able to get some guidance for what would be a realistic threshold for a truck route. McCullough suggests why not put this truck item under Traffic with a variable point weight based on percent trucks.

John Barton observed it sounds like we should rename this to Major Truck Route and drop the freight element.

Steven Stafford notes that what's really important, is the significance that truck volume has to statewide corridors.

Todd Carlson suggests maybe we need to try to get someone from Traffic Engineering Division to help us with this. We'll contact them to see who might be available to address this for us.

### Financial Criteria

After a break, Carlson thinks we need to spend some time dealing with the financial area, to which we devoted 12.5 or 13 points.

Gary Law attempted to reintroduce an Economic Development factor into the criteria. Law stated if a community today takes a recognizable step toward this initiative.

Law's proposal gives credit (rewards) those communities for corridors they are willing to participate in at higher than ordinary levels.

Steve Seese agrees with Law, but also recognizes the view that John Barton had about those, in that there are various other mechanisms at play, such as Enterprise Zones and Economically Disadvantaged Counties. He added we are dealing with a project where the city is trying to get landowners to donate the land as a way to accelerate a project. Shakyaver affirmed we try to capture everything that's applicable.

The group votes whether to reintroduce an Economic Development factor in the list. 5 votes for it, the remaining members reject it. It is kept out of the criteria list.

Discussion continues on financial criteria.

John Barton thinks we all agree that we need to give credit or provide incentives for leveraging. We need to be sure we include the best true costs. It's hard to quantify realistically from the front end, when lots of things such as ROW, PE, etc. costs tend to escalate over the original estimate.

Mark Lund stated, as a general rule, you ought to be doing planning agreements with local entities as early as possible to do the best we can to lock the costs in, as much as possible. The problem right now is: How do you factor in the true costs?

Reggie Richardson observed we should get the local entities to lock in points according to their level of participation. Steven Stafford responded our experience has been that their level of participation relative to the overall cost of the project has been pretty insignificant. Steve Seese added that if a city is going to secure the ROW, they need to lock in the costs early. But, he agrees the typical amounts involved have been insignificant.

Hugh McNeely agrees with the current line of discussion. We should not include construction costs, but relative to the immediate ROW or percent of development costs. Another area that's getting more attention from the commission is toll facilities. This is a way to leverage a project.

Steve Juneau, TxDOT Atlanta observed we are talking about a fairly significant amount of points here. It's much more than a tiebreaker.

Walter McCullough states that most cities are not going to be highly motivated to participate until they know what the estimated total construction cost are or estimated to be.

John Barton notes a couple of points: I've never seen a city willing to give TxDOT a blank check. I agree completely with corridor preservation. We learned last week that doing this for the purpose of accelerating a project before the NEPA is a violation of the law. Finally, even if the city buys the ROW in advance, there's no guarantee or mandate that TxDOT will move any faster or really use that ROW.

Group discussion followed on points given to leveraging.

Mark Lund states we need some form of incentives to encourage participation above the minimum levels. He likes the idea that they get points based on all the areas of PE, ROW, etc.

Steven Stafford added that if we want to be equitable among the cities, we need to set the amounts they need to achieve.

(End of Day 1)

Todd Carlson begins the discussions by declaring our goal today is consensus on most, if not all, the criteria. This will provide a starting place for initial iterations to see where the corridors/projects shake out.

Walter McCullough asks has the deadline been slipped? Carlson responds, as Max and Montie mentioned yesterday, that the commission wants some good products rather than just some rough process by November, the original deadline.

Group discussion ensues about financial criteria.

Walter McCullough asks how about Cost per Lane Mile? Stafford responds that's not a real Cost/Benefit Ratio. McCullough adds that this is a good formula to allow those wishing to build a longer lasting system with a thicker base. He adds if we use Cost per Lane Mile divided by ADT, it gives us a good number, something similar to the old CEI.

Danny Aylor believes we ought to encourage longer corridors. Brad McCaleb asks then, by using the Cost per Lane Mile will we tend to encourage longer segments in projects? Aylor believes this would be so.

Danny Aylor: Back to Cost per Lane Mile, I think the number of lanes we build should be guided by our design criteria. I think we are better to use Cost per Vehicle Lane Mile. Steven Stafford responds that I feel the Cost per Lane Mile divided by VMT is more realistic.

Hugh McNeely asks why don't we just make it where we give some bonus points for those projects that fall in the top 25 percent to encourage cost effective projects.

Ajay Shakyaver asks aren't we really trying to give more credit/ point to efficient projects?

Todd Carlson reminds the group that we're only talking about 12 or 13 points total.

Reggie Richardson states we need to be careful that we don't exclude interchanges, which cost more and don't have the length in lane miles or maybe even the traffic.

Bob Appleton agrees with Reggie Richardson. It's very difficult to factor in an equitable measure for interchanges. Also, some of our projects have a lot of ramp changes, which may not get any credit for lanes. Steve Seese thinks this will work against good projects that are interchanges, and they may not even be part of the corridor.

John Barton states we just need to ensure that we give the most credit to projects that benefit the most people/VMT at the lowest relative costs. He added that, in the past, for DCIS, for interchanges, the VMT of both intersecting corridors/routes were combined, which should raise their priority in this scheme.

Steve Juneau observes that he has a feeling that once we start running the iterations, that districts will see how this works and then figure out ways to frame their projects to come out higher on the ranking. Gary Law responds that I think that will happen to some extent regardless of the criteria and formulas we choose. He thinks over the long haul this will balance out, because in the end we want a project that lasts, not wins the ranking for earlier construction.

Danny Aylor addressed interchanges: I think that when we run this thing, I think we should run interchanges as they are currently defined. I think it makes a difference

how we measure the VMT for the intersecting corridors. I think it should be from the natural starting point of the corridor, the external termini.

Steve Ekstrom, TxDOT Paris, said I'm not so concerned about the cheating, but that we may be doing it 25 different ways. We'll need our people to be trained and dedicated screens or places in DCIS to reflect this.

John Barton said my concern is that it won't encourage longer gap closures. Usually, the shorter the project the higher the relative cost. Steve Seese responded just because the cost is relatively higher may not be a bad thing.

Howard Lyons noted we will need to ensure that the best complete segment is included in the project and not intentionally carved into small pieces for consecutive work. We plan to have some accountability mechanisms in place to ensure that districts aren't playing this game.

Mark Lund observed in Barton's formula, what if you run it and group like projects to compare like projects against each other. You then give more points for the best project in each comparative group. The math could handle this. So you'd be comparing projects with similar projects.

Danny Aylor observed I think we need to keep in mind the trees instead of the forest. We need to still ensure we're advancing the projects with the most bang for the buck, especially those gaps, that have been neglected. We need to deal with those and then shift the focus to more integral segments.

Brad McCaleb suggests why don't we just run the formula, and stop debating on what we think it will do. Let's see what it does and then we can tweak it, accordingly. Todd Carlson added I would suggest that we put our effort to get one formula as good as you feel you can, run it, and then see what you get.

Todd Carlson refines the formula, while noting to clearly define what the group wants for "Adjusted VMT."

Adjusted VMT = Current Adjusted ADT x Corridor Segment Length  
Corridor Segment Cost = Construction Cost

Reggie Richardson asked would the construction cost be for the actual segment?

Steven Stafford stated I think that our task was to identify the longer corridor needs, and let the commission's strategic priority funding take care of those critical interchanges.

I see the interchanges to be special needs. Reggie Richardson responded I don't think the commission wants us to come back to them with a lot of these rinky-dink (special interchange) projects.

Mark Lund asked why don't we run the formula and keep track of how the projects/ segments fare? Then we can look at them in groups to see how they turn out.

Ajay Shakyaver proposed another way to try to clarify this conundrum on benefit/cost.

His diagram showed a typical section with two interchanges in which the work would be done.

He suggests using the respective VMT and project cost.

JoAnn Garcia, TxDOT Laredo, noted we've been talking about segments. You may have a corridor with independent utility, but you may not have the traffic to warrant. You will be forced to do all your needed work on day one, but you can't do what's needed until the traffic is there in future years. I think we need to consider that. Howard Lyons responded it's one of those things, then your LOS is good, but it won't justify the project. We can't build in anticipation, while there are needs going begging elsewhere. The commission doesn't want to piecemeal our work in the future. Garcia added that seems good, but there will still be situations where you won't have the full traffic to warrant a project until later. You still need to phase some of the work, so you don't do most of what you need on day one.

A group vote occurred. The question was two options for the Benefit/Cost factor:

Barton formula, where it emphasizes corridor segment - 21  
Alternative, where the emphasis is on project segment - 3

Todd Carlson directed the discussion towards External Leveraging.

Steve Seese noted this External Leveraging is where most of the politics is. The share that local entities have borne on most projects is usually far above the 20 percent.

Gary Law noted we've always focused leveraging on the actual construction cost. I suggest we put the emphasis on what the cost will be in the planning development phase, to accelerate the project. Then, give points based on what it takes to get the project to get it to construction.

Mark Lund asked isn't there really policies already in place for that? Gary Law responded there are participation ratios, but not hard and fast. I'm suggesting there are really two opportunities for local participation: During the planning/development phase and then the construction phase. A city may not have anything but in-kind contribution, but that could be factored in to move a project along in the timing.

Hugh McNeely observed usually we don't even know what the true construction cost is early in the process.

JoAnn Garcia added this would bring in another level of competition to the table. Won't we just really get a lot of competition going? You have to keep going to the cities or counties to replay their role.

Mark Lund respectfully disagrees. You usually don't know what all the levels of participation. We need to keep it real simple, for participation at each element of the PE, such as share contributed for PE, ROW, Environmental, etc.

Walter McCullough suggests why don't we put all the components of the PE and show what the participation will be?

Steven Stafford stated he is in favor of giving credit for some percent level of participation. Then, the locals will know how what they do will effect the criteria and ranking. They usually tend to share in the costs on the smaller projects.

Mark Lund noted lots of the things leading to construction might be out of TxDOT's hands, such as NEPA, etc.

Brad McCaleb thinks we will have some problems trying to educate the locals.

Howard Lyons noted the commission still makes the final selection, and they may not go sequentially.

Danny Aylor stated we can get plan authority from TPP, but we need Construct Authority from the commission. There's no real opportunity for this local participation until the Construct authority has been given.

Howard Lyons notes McCullough's point is still valid. There are all sorts of costs before the actual construction. There's still the opportunity for the local entities to participate in the various parts of the PS and E phase.

John Barton notes he needs to be clear about how we define External Leveraging. Steven Stafford noted our subcommittee considered the definition to be for external contribution.

The group takes a straw poll over whether to define external leveraging by a percentage of defined levels, actual dollar amounts, or a range of participation.

Percent of some defined criteria	13
Actual Dollars (to in-kind contributions)	4
Where you would set the range for their participation, and they get so many points	

4

The group decides to go with some kind of percentage.

Walter McCullough proposes a percentage scheme. Discussion ensues.

Brad McCaleb suggests maybe we need some way to give extra credit (points) for a local entity that could participate beyond the 25%. Mark Lund suggests maybe we should open the point credit at some given percent, such as 10%.

Steve Juneau notes we still don't know what the final credit is because that participation won't be known until later into the project planning cycle.

Mark Lund suggests we need to design this scheme for the majority of ways projects are planned, not the few exceptions, which will just add unnecessary complexity.

Reggie Richardson feels the points ought to be based on the total construction costs. Many of the PE costs are very nebulous, such as ROW, utility adjustments, or even environmental reviews. Hugh McNeely affirms.

Brad McCaleb asks a question on the construction cost: What is that really? Gary Law responds it is total cost of the project to TxDOT. Now, they can come forward with various types of contributions, such as in-kind, ROW, etc.

Steven Stafford observes even for counties, they can often come up with some kind of contributions. But, often they do try to play games in their favor on this, such as inflated appraisals on ROW.

Reggie Richardson notes we already factor the impact of participation on costs in the Benefit/Cost criteria. So, we are sort of allowing double credit.

John Barton observed often on PE, we just allow a flat percent, like 10 percent. He is not sure how you even put a value on utilities (adjustment); that's so nebulous.

Walter McCullough states we are mincing this too much for something that is so nebulous for a cost estimate that is going to be 10 to 15 years into the future.

John Barton states total project cost for us would be the best estimate on construction and put a multiplier on it to get the overall costs, for the ROW, PE, etc. I think it's the construction costs plus a multiplier for the other contingencies.

Mark Lund suggests we have to put in the best possible projected construction cost.

We might ought to have a group run a scenario with some hypothetical project that brings in some of these special conditions we have worried about.

Gary Law notes we can come up with a way to arrive at the true construction costs across all districts. Construction costs themselves are very fluid.

Brad McCaleb asks how can we get the local government to commit any level of participation so early into a project? There needs to be some understanding as to when they can expect the project to need their money. We often see projects slip or stall for any number of reasons.

Gary Law added we have some established gates at which the local entities can bring their share to the table. John Barton added we have various safeguards and ways to enforce the contribution to be collected, such as halting not only construction on that project and even jeopardize maintenance in that county.

Blair Haynie noted we have several established ways to arrive at the best construction cost, so they can try to assess their level of participation. We have several projects that have worked with local participation.

Steven Stafford observed usually there is a lot of work that goes into estimating the construction cost so the local government can begin developing their part. We use a total construction cost.

Hugh McNeely stated that the more I hear, the more I feel the locals will not commit their shares of a project that early into a project, 10, 15 years ahead, especially if they have to seek bonds for that share.

Mark Lund added we have gone through this and take the local government at their word. The other piece of the puzzle is to get them involved as early as possible. Let's just set the rules and adhere to them.

Steve Ekstrom stated he basically agrees with Mark. We need to give the locals some points for some level of participation.

Reggie Richardson states we need to try to lock in the construction cost. I think we do have a good handle on making good estimates, for something that is 10 years plus into the future. All the ancillary costs can be estimated with some reliability. Gary Law agrees, we have the means to arrive at a quality estimate even earlier.

John Barton thinks the commission will use the leveraging into consideration for the final selection.

Todd Carlson calls for a consensus on the use of External Leveraging. The group votes 13-10 to keep it as a criterion.

JoAnn Garcia reiterated if we don't have some mechanism for recognizing the local participation it will never get a consistent way of handling it.

John Barton thinks we ought to move on, but since it was so close, we should refer it to a subcommittee for reporting and handling at a subsequent meeting.



The group calls for a consensus vote on the definition of External Leveraging. Should the percentage of participation be based on total project cost or just the actual construction?

The group votes 15-7 to use construction cost as the basis.

Howard Lyons asks how can we be assured that the local commitments are firm and enforceable. He proposes that we table this criteria with a recommendation to the commission that they support the need for some credit for this Ext Lev/ Local Participation, to hold formal public hearings and pass it through a minute order.

Discussion ensued regarding external leveraging, time constraints, and potential projects for inclusion.

Brad McCaleb moved that the 10-35 percent range for arriving at the credit points for external leveraging be adopted, with 1 to 6 points being the range of points.

The workgroup gave unanimous approval

### Special Significance

Howard Lyons addressed freight routes. Each district treats the truck routes differently. TPP has some maps that FHWA develops showing the truck volume by band size.

Hugh McNeely stated we should be recognizing the truly statewide freight routes.

Gary Law added there are distinct US DOT-designated trade corridors, NAFTA, etc.

McNeely proposes the definition changed to: US DOT-designated NAFTA or trade corridor, with the 4 points credit. He went on to read the formal definition for what constitutes a formal Port of Entry (credit for corridor within 5 miles of a POE with a US Customs or INS facility).

Group discussion followed regarding the other Special Significance factors. No problems were evidence with Hazardous materials Routes, Military/National Security Installations, or Hurricane Evacuation Routes.

Todd Carlson called for a consensus vote.

The group unanimously adopted the Special Significance point structure and definitions.

### Connectivity

Discussion regarding Closing System Gaps ensued.

Mark Lund suggests you get 10 points for Yes or No, then vary the remaining 5 points depending on the size of the gap. Reggie Richardson responds, based on the discussion, he thinks we should give the whole 15 points if it is a gap of whatever size, in order to keep it simple.

Walter McCullough asked how do we really define gap? Stafford responds most of our projects out of our area are gaps in lanes. Law responds we're addressing that through LOS and capacity.

Steven Stafford agrees that we should encourage gaps, but this may do it only for corridors, not in other areas that are not on a continuous corridor. How long is the corridor through your area is what's really important? Danny Aylor adds that's why we need to address gaps between logical termini.

Reggie Richardson proposes that it be an all or none, gap gets the full 15 points. Gary Law sees a problem with this all or nothing approach. Don't think a segment that has had little prior investment, should get as much credit as a gap on a corridor that has had considerable work.

Brad McCaleb doesn't see it necessarily that smaller segments getting equal or more points as a large gap. I would think we could show that the smaller gap impact a large segment

Walter McCullough notes closing the smaller gaps should be a priority, and I think this formula will do that.

Steven Stafford thinks the real issue should be the corridor length through the urban area, is what we need to address, and this entire corridor length should get the credit.

Mark Lund likes John's formula, but we shouldn't penalize a big project.

Brad McCaleb suggests what about giving the first 5 points for any gap, then vary use John's formula for how much of the remaining 10 points the corridor gets. Hugh McNeely responds he still supports all the points for a gap, rather than some mixed method. This is probably the most important criterion for this whole category.

The group reaches a consensus to use the hybrid approach of 5 points + a function of gap length to total corridor length.

Discussion begins regarding the Maximize Existing Use of the Transportation System criteria.

JoAnn Garcia needs more clarification of this criterion. She suggests "Maximize Use of Existing System."

Considerable group discussion ensues.

Walter McCullough thinks this will open the door for almost any kind of project. Maybe we should just drop it altogether.

The workgroup refined the definition:

*N* points – if the project is not an added capacity project (i.e., ITS, access management, TMS)

Steven Stafford notes this would have to show a documented improvement to warrant an investment in this. If we use ITS, Access Management, it needs to improve the LOS of the roadway.

Todd Carlson asked what about "Connect with Principal Roadways?" No major concerns were raised.

Todd Carlson asked "Intermodal Connectivity?"

$N$  points, if the project serves an airport, rail yard, or seaport

(Adjourned)

**UTP Restructuring Workshop  
Category 3  
Workshop 5  
Thompson Conference Center  
Austin, TX  
October 15–16, 2002**

## **Notes**

*Statements reported in these notes are not direct quotes, but reflect the general idea of the questions or comments made by each individual. Statements are not in exact chronological order as they occurred during the meeting. They have been arranged in order according to the topics that were discussed.*

The fifth meeting of the urban area corridor workgroup was held October 15-16, 2002 in the Thompson Conference Center located in Austin, Texas.

Todd Carlson, TTI, opened the meeting with various announcements and passed out the agenda and copies of the formulas developed thus far. Carlson recognized Michael Chamberlain from TxDOT-Traffic Analysis Section who is available for questions regarding data collection from the formulas.

Carlson noted the last workshop was dedicated to refining the formulas. The workgroup reached a basic consensus on Connectivity. There was some consensus on Traffic. But the group still needs some work on the Regional Distribution.

## **Criteria Discussion**

The workgroup continued its discussion of the various criteria to be used in the formulas.

### *Traffic*

Steven Stafford, TxDOT Beaumont, stated that last time we discussed about leaving some of the factors out, but came up with some options on using all the factors. JoAnn Garcia, TxDOT Laredo, added we've done a lot of work on this and probably need some outside review and input on these.

Steven Stafford comments that we need to realize that anything similar to the CEI requires use of LOS.

Steven Stafford noted that he and Garcia have proposals for the category. Reggie Richardson, TxDOT Waco, also noted that he had one.

Todd Carlson asked that members with distinct proposals to bring them up and we'll try to get copies made for hand out to the rest of group.

JoAnn Garcia discussed LOS: Presented the truck component, in particular, which is based on the peak 18 hours count. Gary Law, TxDOT Odessa, observes the way the formula handles the truck traffic won't work for the Odessa district, because most of the

truck traffic on the Interstates is between 9pm and 6am. Howard Lyons, TxDOT TPP, responds we do have the capability to adjust for special conditions, rather than the standard distribution used in the old CEI.

Gary Law adds if we're looking at corridors now, we need to look at this differently. We should also pick up some other corridor characteristics under other formula components. We need to look at only the main lane features. My IH 20 will not compete on this factor. It will have to compete

Brad McCaleb, Texarkana MPO, notes if you set some minimum LOS, then all or most of the money would flow to IH 35.

Discussion regarding how LOS is used followed.

JoAnn Garcia wants a clear, consistent application. Gary Law believes we need to focus our LOS on the main lane traffic, not frontage roads. That's what they use at the statewide level, not at interchanges or cross flow. Reggie Richardson said that would be straightforward and would remove the confusion.

Steven Stafford noted the table does a lot of combining, but does not include LOS F, which is what we wanted to use in this factor. A table will not take into consideration special conditions in various areas of the state. It's not all peak hour oriented. People will want to use a table as long as it works in their favor.

JoAnn Garcia noted that there is a table that includes LOS F.

Gary Law noted these are accepted approaches in the Highway Capacity Manual. The standards in the manual use the first 15 minutes of the peak period. You'd need a way to get opening day traffic projection for the design.

Hugh McNeely, Waco MPO, asked wouldn't we want to use the lower LOS for a corridor in the projections? He added you have to show a valid way to arrive at the opening day traffic. We have, all of us probably, have pared down the traffic levels in the design process.

Howard Lyons noted we have proposed if congestion is anticipated, then the designer will identify alternate facilities, and that has to go through public hearings.

Ajay Shakyaver, TxDOT Odessa observed the Highway Capacity Manual is very rigorous, where you just plug in the numbers. The corridors need to be based on existing need.

Howard Lyons noted we justify the construction traffic on the problem. We get the designers to use existing routes/corridors to compute the traffic for new location determinations.

Hugh McNeely asked how are going to take it on blind faith that the LOS will be a function of the traffic on the existing corridors/lanes? John Barton, TxDOT Wichita Falls, responded the model would handle it, based on existing locations. Gary Law reaffirmed that point.

Gary Law asked who is going to re-prioritize based on changing conditions, where growth may occur and other situations change over time? Mark Lund, Brownsville MPO, responded we are always monitoring the data, and then have to make adjustments in our growth projection. Howard Lyons added running the data would have to come from the district.

Reggie Richardson thinks there are ways to build it into the formula a way to properly factor in LOS and Safety.

Howard Lyons comments that he thinks our task is to pick out the corridors in the greatest need. Some of these concerns are not borne out in actual practice.

Steve Juneau, TxDOT Texarkana, asks have we considered how much the new facility will affect the LOS on the existing route? If we put the projected change in level of service would be, then we would have a stronger formula. Ajay Shakyaver comments that the justification is based on what the deficiencies are on the existing routes.

John Barton stated you can't build a new facility and get it approved by FHWA unless you clearly justify an true improvement in LOS on the existing to a LOS of C, or better, in order to get approval.

JoAnn Garcia stated we should put the various options on the board, to let us see clearly what the concerns are. We could make the adjustments for the trucks. We should put it to a vote.

Todd Carlson put the three basic concerns/options arising from the prior discussion up o the board.

1. LOS of Main Lane of the segment
2. Hwy Cap Manual – derived
3. How to account for new location projects?

The group voted unanimously for the first two items. Discussion followed regarding the third question.

JoAnn Garcia stated that in the old way, there was a different approach for new location versus expansion.

Howard Lyons noted that new location relied on the CEI, with alternate routes with operating speeds of 20 MPH. My issue is: Why would you build a new facility if you weren't trying to relieve traffic somewhere else?

Hugh McNeely noted that in Richardson's proposal, the formula would give you points for an improvement in LOS by one level (from D to C, etc.).

Howard Lyons observed we just evaluate need and assume that improvements will result, whether it will be new location or expansion.

Gary Law asked that in trying to keep this simple for the large number of corridors we'll be dealing with (50 to 100), can't we somehow show how some change in LOS would give you some type of credit in the formula? Where the reliever route would show an improvement in LOS, by at least one letter (level). So we'd have two tables, one for improvements in LOS for each new location and/or expansion.

John Barton noted the degree of sophistication to run the models for an entire area does not currently exist for all urban areas. What we have to do is corridor segment to corridor segment evaluations. Gary law affirmed Barton's point.

Hugh McNeely observed that most criteria have some limitations. Evaluation criteria still has to have some starting point. We have to use the best available data for our evaluations and comparisons.

Bob Appleton, TxDOT Bryan, stated I'm having trouble relating to some of the on-going discussion, where you have to justify a relief route in a new location based on traffic on existing corridors. Maybe we should see how the existing corridors shake out in this formula. I don't see how a new location corridor will compete equitably with needs on existing locations.

Howard Lyons responded that it makes no difference whether you talk about new location versus expansion.

Mark Lund observed that to follow Hugh's logic, we need to look at ways to put money into corridor preservation. I really think we need a vehicle for dealing with access management and corridor preservation. This may have to be addressed in a minority report.

Todd Carlson noted that the group needs to remember this will be an iterative process, whereby the entire process – criteria and formula – will be reviewed and refined at a regular frequency.

Gabriel Del Bosque, Laredo MPO, stated I have to be ready for a situation where our real number one need is; we can't even bring it into this process. We would need to expand a corridor that's not even built. We only have enough money to build 2 lanes, but it may not have significantly reduced or favorably impacted existing corridor segments. Steven Stafford responded it should just go into the competition and compare on its merits. You may need 6 lanes, when you only have enough money for 2 lanes.

Mark Lund observed that we are going to have just as much uncertainty about other areas of the formulas.

Gabriel Del Bosque stated we should let the formula run and then use some hypothetical project data to see how a new location project fares with an expansion. Mark Lund responded that we need to see where the current formula stacks up our projects before we tweak something we have not seen work.

Mark Lund stated I'm not sure we are absolutely clear what is a true new location project. Gary Law responded FHWA has established fairly rigorous parameters for what justifies a new location. A way to do this is network analysis, using TPP Systems Planning assistance. Law added we might have to go through several iterations on this effort. Lund added I think what Law just said is that there are ways to do this, with various analytical tools. These are not new challenges. For all projects, especially new location or extension projects, we have to deal with existing hard data and legitimate assumptions.

Gary Law stated what I've been trying to say is, that when we do the analysis of alternate routes, whether new location, reliever, or expansion, we have to run the numbers in some evaluation or modeling, that the solution project will measurably improve the LOS. We have to compare the relative deficiencies statewide. I would advocate a hybrid concept for handling this, that we model and demonstrate that the existing corridor will be the beneficiary of the improvements from the candidate project.

John Barton commented that I think some of these refinements can be looked to in the next iteration of this process. I think we will add too much complexity to try to handle too many special conditions. Reggie Richardson agrees with Barton, TPP does not have the capability to do these models and network analysis without relying on existing traffic data. They can't use hypothetical data. Lyons noted TPP has to have very finite data and a specific location available.

The group called for consensus on approach to LOS and new and existing projects. Does the group wish to maintain the current path or split the methodology to account for new versus existing projects? The group voted 17-3 to stay on the current path.

Gary Law suggested that we ought to come up with a way to handle the LOS issue, where we recognize LOS C or better as the desired threshold:

$<B = 0$

$C = 0.5$

$D = 0.75$

$E-F = 1.0$

Reggie Richardson responded that it's a good concept, but sometimes C and even D is not that bad, when we have some much at E and F, so think C should start at 0. Steven Stafford agreed with Richardson.

Hugh McNeely suggested a possible compromise, where LOS:

$B = 0$

$C = .25$

$D = .50$

$E = .75$

$F = 1.0$

The group called for a consensus. McNeely's compromise was adopted by a 12-4-6 vote

Todd Carlson asked what about the time period for the VMT for LOS? After general discussion, it was agreed to use most current year.

Mark Lund stated that my assumption was that we all put our cards on the table, playing by the same rules, to use consistent ways to reflect data for a reliever route, and we need to cite whether we are using the model, network analysis, or other assumptions relevant. Brad McCaleb added that he doesn't think that the Austin HQ staff will have enough time and staff to do the level of analysis necessary for this effort.

Randy Bena, TxDOT Yoakum, noted that now I hear us talking about how to analyze new corridors. Where's the burden of proof for justifying and making a reliever route competitive? Where do we have a checkpoint for equitable consideration of such routes?

Reggie Richardson added all districts have to go to the TPP traffic group to assure a single, independent source for the route/corridor segment.

Todd Carlson asks that as we go down the Traffic Engineering criteria list, how do we distribute the points?

Steven Stafford asks couldn't we just throw our some other round numbers for the overall category?

Carlson notes that the general consensus was that Trucks were folded into the overall AADT. Now we only have 3 criteria under Traffic Engineering.

John Barton comments that in the Highway Capacity Manual, there's an equivalency for how many cars each trucks are equal to, which is something like 1 to 3. Mark Tomlinson, TxDOT Amarillo, argues that those routes with heavy truck use will have greater wear and thus need more recognition than what the manual might give us.



He adds that I feel there needs to be some way to reflect the wear impact trucks incur, such as the 8,000 to 1. Howard Lyons suggests that may need to be reflected in the cost area.

Todd Carlson asks the group if they want to look at the overall points/weights given to each major category. John Barton would like to see these weight rounded to cleaner, even numbers if we can.

Traffic 46

- Traffic
- LOS
- Safety

Connectivity 28

- Closing System Gap
- Maximize Use
- Connect w/ Principal Roadways
- Intermodal Connectivity

*Financial 13*

- Cost
- External Leveraging

*Special Significance 13*

- NAFTA or Trade Corridor
- Port of Entry
- Military/ Nat Security Installation
- Hazardous Material Route
- Hurricane Evacuation Route

Hugh McNeely asks if we want traffic to have the high weight as currently shown? John Barton responds that at least with traffic it's compared equally across the state. Steven Stafford adds that traffic is where you derive the greatest need for improved transportation. He thinks this will play out better. Ajay Shakyaver notes that I think we talked about including population in our early discussion, but we felt this was reflected in the traffic volume data.

Brad McCaleb thinks we should try to round off the numbers, and then run the formula. Gabriel Del Bosque asks why is rounding to a clean number important? John Barton believes McCaleb had a good point, to just use the numbers we have and run it that way.

Brad McCaleb notes the project lists will change over time, so we need the best possible way to seek equity. Barton adds that any empirical experiment has to be tested and adjusted, like tweaking the recipe. Blair Haynie adds we need to be sure that we have fairness in the end, as much as we can do it.

The workgroup decided 11-8 to re-vote on criteria category points and weights. Carlson asked them to write their preference on a sheet of paper and he would tabulate them in an Excel spreadsheet during the break. Members turned in their vote.

The results of the re-vote:

Traffic 45

Connectivity 27

Financial 13

Special Sig. 14 (adjusted to 15 by consensus to add up to 100)

Todd Carlson asked the group if they desired any other changes, such as priorities under each category? None were given.

Traffic 45

LOS

Traffic

Safety

Connectivity 27

Closing System Gaps

Maximize Uses

Connect w/ Prin Rdwys

Intermodal Connectivity

Financial 13

Cost

External

Special Significance 15

NAFTA or Trade Corridor

POE

Military/ Nat Sec

Haz Mat

Hurr Evac

Mark Lund suggests that maybe we could add a half-point to POE and Mil/Nat Sec in the rounding up?

The workgroup votes 23-1 in favor of adding the half-point to each of the two criteria.

Steven Stafford recommends a spread of 30, 10, 5 for the Traffic category. Hugh McNeely likes Stafford's spread, but would like to make it: 20, 15, 10. Harold McDaniel, Amarillo MPO suggest the group vote on the two options. Mark Tomlinson still feels truck impacts are underrepresented.

Mark Lund calls for a group vote on the two spreads for the Traffic Engineering criteria.

Option 1 (30/10/5)      7  
 Option 2 (20/15/10)   16

The 20/15/10 weightings are chosen by group consensus.

John Barton points out to that this revised weight total (45) will require Carlson to make appropriate changes to his projected file criteria descriptions. Barton adds that the range parameter for the Safety component where if the Accident Rate is at least 2 time the state rate, you get the whole 10 points.

### Connectivity

Hugh McNeely suggested spread for Connectivity: 15, 5, 4, and 3.  
 Mark Lund suggests 10, 7, 6, and 4.

The group called for a consensus vote. The tally was:

Mark's option              8  
 Hugh's proposal          14

The workgroup adopted a 15/5/4/3 weighting for the four criteria in Connectivity.

John Barton observes that we now need to spread out the 15 points in Closing System Gaps. He suggests:

**10 pts + {5 pts \* [1 - (Corridor Segment Gap Length/ Corridor Length)]}**

$n + n_l = 15$

No gap = no points

Every segment should have a gap

Another suggestion reversed the 5 and the 10. The group called for a vote.

Option 1, 10/5              12  
 Option 2, 5/10            10

The equation as outlined above was adopted by a close consensus.

Todd Carlson asked the group how to handle Intermodal Connectivity?

John Barton observed that just because the airport is within 2 miles, but has no connection on the corridor in question.

Mark Tomlinson thinks the issue is connectivity, whether there's access to the facility in question. We still haven't seen how these points will actually be used in the project prioritization iteration.

Brad McCaleb asks don't we have some guidelines on how to look at this access to an Intermodal facility?

Reggie Richardson suggests 1 mile.

Brad McCaleb suggests a half-mile.

John Barton asks if it is air distance or driving distance?

Mark Tomlinson still thinks the connectivity is the issue. Just because the property line is near the roadway, but there is no immediate connectivity to the facility gate. Mark Lund adds that I think we get into this issue since many of these intermodal facilities are large and have their own property.

Todd Carlson asks the group if there is another way to define this criterion in a way that makes sense?

Hugh McNeely states it sounds like we're down to two options: physical connection within 1 or half mile, or within a certain distance between the corridor segment and the intermodal facility's property line.

Gary Law notes that in the MUTCD, there is a provision for a Trail Blaze connection to an Intermodal Connection. We just adopt this as a radius distance.

Mark Lund suggests we should just run the project at a quarter mile from the perimeter of a valid intermodal facility.

Howard Lyons notes our intent is to reflect the proximity factor.

Brad McCaleb observes that since this is under the Connectivity criteria, we need to include the physical connectivity between the hwy system and the intermodal facility.

Blair Haynie suggests a quarter mile to property perimeter. Ajay Shakyaver likes Blair's suggestion. He thinks the connectivity issue is key. Where do they access the roadway in question?

The group decides after discussion to allow the district to decide as to whether the intermodal facility is adjacent to and impacted by proximity to the roadway. 14 votes for this definition are given. The point is adopted by consensus.

## **Final Criteria and Weightings**

### **Traffic - 45**

Level of Service (20)

Traffic (15)

Safety (10)

### **Connectivity - 27**

Closing System Gaps (15)

Maximize Use of Existing System (5)

Connect w/ Principal Roadways (4)

Intermodal Connectivity (3)

### **Financial - 13**

Cost (7)

External Leveraging (6)

### **Special Significance - 15**

NAFTA or Trade Corridor (5)

Port of Entry (3.5)

Military/National Security Installation (2.5)

Hazardous Material Route (2)

Hurricane Evacuation Route (2)

## Data Needs

Todd Carlson informed the group that we need to talk about data needs and requirements.

Under Traffic, is the AADT available?

The group responded affirmatively. Austin TxDOT staff can provide it. Gary Law adds that we'll have to give Michael Chamberlain the traffic for each control section and mile point in defining the corridors and corridor segment.

Brad McCaleb asks how do you account for a roadway segment, which may not have counters? John Barton explained how this works based on permanent and seasonal counts, and adjusting it for adjacent roadways.

Level of Service? Can we get all the data needed?

Michael Chamberlain responds that he can't say that all this is currently available. Ajay Shakyaver asks can you get us some kind of template for providing this data? Gary Law adds that not all this data is in one place. Howard Lyons adds we are still working the LOS data. We may even have to resort to the lookup chart.

Safety? Can we derive the Corridor Segment Accident Rate?

Howard Lyons believes Meg Moore, TxDOT TPP, said they could get this. We may need to get TRF to make this a priority.

Todd Carlson asks about the other part of this factor: Statewide Average Accident Rate for Similar Facilities? Howard Lyons responds we'll have to get with TRF on this. It may take some extra work for them to get this for us.

Closing System Gaps?

Michael Chamberlain asks what will that be based on if the districts identify it? Gary Law responds I think there will be a Corridor Assessments required for almost every corridor and segment submitted. Howard Lyons states we'll try to adapt the DCIS to handle this, but we'll give you some guidance on that.

Maximize Use of Existing System?

Howard Lyons responds that it is a Yes or No from the districts. Mark Lund adds we have at least three international bridges on separate corridors that will need to be addressed.

Connect with Principal Roadways?

Michael Chamberlain responds that we can do that from the formal designations and lists in our system.

Cost?

Howard Lyons responds that we can get most of this from DCIS, and Michael Chamberlain will have to set up some special programs to arrive at the formula.

External Leveraging?

Steven Stafford states we need to use some formal source of documenting this, such as resolutions, etc. Hugh McNeely adds we'll have to have pretty good cost data.

Special Significance?

Michael Chamberlain responded affirmatively.

Port of Entry?

Michael Chamberlain responds that we can do that. In fact, we can do all of these here.

Chamberlain reiterates that the other three Special Significance criteria can be done.

(Adjourn for the day)

Todd Carlson began the second day of the workshop with comments made at our close yesterday that should be addressed and attempted to resolve: Construction Costs and the denominator for the formula for Closing System Gaps.

### Costs and External Leveraging

Gary Law states that the issue is what does the numerator include: Does it include various cost components, such as external leveraged money brought from locals or private sources? Todd Carlson responded that we did talk about that the external leveraging required formal documentation, such as local resolutions. These need to be validated and supported by the district.

John Barton adds that he feels that we need Contract Services to give us help to ascertain formal, authorized confirmation for this external leveraging. Gabriel Del Bosque added a need some formal agreement that can be used.

Reggie Richardson noted we don't ask the locals to establish an agreement for future commitments. We ask for a resolution for early planning and programming. When the authority for actual PE and construction is obtained, then we seek a formal agreement.

Maria Burke, TxDOT Design, is concerned that resolutions are not binding to future officials. Reggie Richardson feels that for planning purposes, resolutions are acceptable, particularly for on-system.

Maria Burke notes I agree with John Barton that we can hold a Funding Agreement more binding, but it is still not a solid commitment. My point is that the project gets the points without very strong commitments.

Mark Tomlinson adds that it's important to remember that TxDOT will be extending funds based on varying levels of commitment.

Howard Lyons responds that the local's money is not going to be a factor until final selection by the commission comes into place.

John Barton notes that every district has large number of projects with PS&E that were scrapped due to broken promises. Hugh McNeely adds that I've heard many city councils maintain that their resolutions are not binding on future councils. Gary Law notes we can get them to set up a sinking fund account for a "shared project." Mark Lund adds I think the tradition is to get the district has to make the determination as to whether the local action, by resolution or agreement, etc., is valid and considered binding.

Todd Carlson asks what about the concern regarding documentation and verification?

Gabriel Del Bosque states I don't think we will have many project out that far with formal local commitments, of whatever kind. In the future, we should allow this to bump up a project when the leveraged funds become available.

Mark Tomlinson states it's important we all play by the same rules. We need to make the local bodies aware that to get the points to move up the ranking of a desired project will require real formal binding commitments.

Reggie Richardson notes that each year additional projects will be included in this prioritization process. Then, TPP re-ranks all the projects and comes up with the UTP for a given fiscal year. If a local entity comes up with the shared money, then it will bump up the project in future years. If they fail to come through, then the projects fall in the ranking.

Steven Stafford notes it is still a matter as to the extent, the percentage, of the local participation based on best estimate.

Steve Juneau supports using the initial project cost to establish the local percentage for this point computation.

Howard Lyons thinks it was purely the participation on actual construction estimates that determined points gained.

John Barton observes there's no way to get a good handle on final PS&E. It needs to be based on a fairly consistent level percentage.

Gary Law suggests we keep in mind we're concerned with establishing the cost at the initial planning point. I don't think we need to get into the legally binding aspect.

Brad McCaleb states this is why I was against these whole financial criteria in the first place. There's entirely too much opportunity for a lot of fluidity. Let's try to deal with this prioritize projects without this shaky financial data. That financial matter can come into play when the projects come up for final commission selection. He added that if these projects had a shorter time horizon, such as 5 years, for these projects, that might be more appropriate.

Gary Law states this is contract management that we're really talking about. What we are trying to do is to assign points. We could make this fairly clean, such as 3 point for resolutions, and the whole 6 points for a formal agreement.

Mark Lund observes we see too many smart people trying to be very clever. Lots of things happen between initial identification of the projects and final construction. I already have a project that came up through the complex process, but just achieved final authority for construction with known local participation and known federal share.

Harold McDaniel states he is tending to agree with McCaleb. If the locals renege on a project, or their percentage changes, that doesn't make it a bad project. Let the commission be the final determinant as to whether it goes or not.

Ross Jones, Abilene MPO, states he feels we are trying to overcomplicate this criteria, even though he feels it should be left in.

Steven Stafford asks in the current UTP how is the current leverage aspect established? Howard Lyons answers that it's based on what and how the districts establish it. Hugh McNeely asks is it based on best estimate of overall construction cost? John Barton responds yes, best estimate of overall construction cost.

Steven Stafford notes that the way we do it now, it isn't a matter of binding or not, just district determination. John Barton adds that we are breaking from the traditional approach to handling this. Hugh McNeely responds that's what this is all about: breaking with tradition and history.

The workgroup takes a vote on the issue of binding or non-binding agreements to receive points for external leveraging. The tally was:

- 9 Binding Agreements
- 15 Binding and/or Non-binding Agreements

Todd Carlson asks what about the denominator? Construction Cost? Mark Lund responds that we're really looking at the numerator.

JoAnn Garcia states that once we say we're going to peg the other costs, such as for environmental and design, we stick with that.

Steven Stafford believes there is a real good reason for using the construction cost. They tend to be more solid, since that relates to the actual allocation of money in the UTP. The other PE costs come from a multitude of sources.

The workgroup votes for consensus on the definition of the denominator in Cost. The two options were:

- Percentage of construction cost
- Numerator includes all the PS&E costs

The group voted 16-7 in favor of including PS&E costs.

JoAnn Garcia observes we need to be judicious in establishing estimates on all the related costs, at the early stage, realizing that many of these can change over time.

Gary Law added that yes, there is some fear that numbers can be fudged, both the numerator and the denominator. We could make consistent choices about costs to use, such as a given cost per mile for each type of project.

JoAnn Garcia noted you document the costs along the way, and over time we have a pretty good feel for what the respective costs are.

John Barton added we all have initial guidelines for various costs. For example, the consultants have curves for their costs used in proposals. We still get caught with large variations that bind us up.

Gabriel Del Bosque added that we have over time established various ways to arrive at the best cost elements, even early on in a project. Certainly there is always a lot of variation. Even for ROW, there can be wide variances.

John Barton added that costs for ROW and Utilities are very variable, but the other costs have maintained a fairly consistent percentage within common types of projects.

Mark Tomlinson asks couldn't we use the PEER report to help make these estimates? JoAnn Garcia responds even the PEER is not a solid source.

Howard Lyons asks will we rely on the PEER or just however the district chooses to arrive at the cost?

Steven Stafford adds that costs can vary from corridor to corridor.

John Barton clarified by saying I was talking more about the parts of ROW, such as appraisal, documents preparation, etc.

Gary Law said I don't think that matter so much as having the district document what their share includes. Then we add any other costs with good support data.



Ajay Shakyaver is concerned about how we handle these various costs. I think we could come up with a hybrid system for arriving at the total preconstruction costs from which to arrive at the local share.

Gary Law stated it all comes down to individual professional integrity.

Gabriel Del Bosque observed we can consistently arrive at best estimates working with the district, and then this will serve at the basis

The workgroup took a vote regarding the documentation of costs in financial criteria. The results were as follows:

Documentation at the district level – 18

Not in favor, based on percentage – 3

Todd Carlson concluded that district's documentation would be used to arrive at the numerator in order to arrive at the percent of local share.

Hugh McNeely stated I don't think the locals will have time to do this for this "go-round" on the formulas.

Mark Lund responded that I don't have any problem excluding this for this iteration. I agree that we shouldn't have the districts rush around with the locals to arrive at good numbers or percentages.

Gary Law stated this reminds me that we had some discussion about the handling of disadvantaged counties. I forget how we came down on that. John Barton noted that's a matter of law. Gary Law concluded we should make the first run without the financial criteria.

Gabriel Del Bosque agrees that we do not have the proper time to coordinate with and validate these cost matters with the local governments.

Steve Juneau thinks we ought to put it up to a vote, to exclude the financial criteria, and just use the total of 87 points.

Todd Carlson reminded the group that they had decided from the earlier meetings to include the financial criteria. This should remain a built-in incentive for use in future year's iterations.

Hugh McNeely stated including the financial criteria could result in locals coming to the position that at least one of the criteria was misused without their full involvement. It could sabotage the credibility of our entire effort.

Reggie Richardson stated I don't think we should penalize those districts that already have their leverage data established for some of the priority project.

JoAnn agrees with Richardson. I don't think it would change to go to the locals even in the short term to seek local participation. Our experience has shown very little local interest in bumping up their participation, from some initial level.

Todd Carlson stated the formulas could be run without the financial criteria by just asking for Michael to exclude it.

Gary Law suggested he would move that we formally exclude the financial criteria, largely due to this Disadvantaged Counties rule. I'll probably get beat out in these early runs as a result.

Hugh McNeely stated we really have three options: 87, 94, or 100 points.

John Barton noted he could give you a cost for every project on the lists today.

Mark Lund stated he doesn't share the fragility about this I'm hearing here. We need to do the work we were charged to do. I feel I need to have the costs factored regardless of how it plays out.

Hugh McNeely noted he started this whole line of discussion by suggesting we throw out the whole leveraging factor, for now and in the future. I feel we should not even run it with the leveraging data in there. Steven Stafford thinks we should have the results of how this would affect the priority results.

Todd Carlson asked are you all comfortable with running any level of point structure, at the full 100 points, or with these financial factors excluded: at the 94 and 87 points? The group expressed satisfaction.

Howard Lyons laid out the basic data ingredients for the group he will need for Michael and Brad to run a statewide list.

## **Maps**

Workgroup members that had their corridor segment maps posted on the walls of the room, 15 in all. The group spent the afternoon of the second day looking at and commenting on the various maps.

The group discussion regarded formatting and color coding of the maps. The group also reiterated the definition of corridor segment established at the first meeting that should be reflected on the maps.

After the observation and discussion of the urban area corridor maps, Todd Carlson reminded the group that the next workshop is scheduled for December 3-4. We will try to ensure that the new maps will be ready by then. If not, we may have to cancel that meeting time and re-schedule it, maybe into January 2003. Carlson will let you know how things look by e-mail.

(Adjourned)

**UTP Restructuring Workshop  
Category 3  
Workshop 6  
Thompson Conference Center  
Austin, TX  
January 14-15, 2003**

**Notes**

*Statements reported in these notes are not direct quotes, but reflect the general idea of the questions or comments made by each individual. Statements are not in exact chronological order as they occurred during the meeting. They have been arranged in order according to the topics that were discussed.*

The sixth meeting of the urban area corridor workgroup was held January 14-15, 2003 in the Thompson Conference Center located in Austin, Texas.

Todd Carlson, TTI provided opening remarks, reviewed the agenda, and provided an overview of the last workshops and the work that was done by workgroup members in the interim. Fifteen out of 17 areas have submitted their project data, according to Howard Lyons, TxDOT TPP. In the course of running the data several issues came up regarding Level of Service (LOS) and equity among urban areas. Furthermore, the time being taken by the Category 3 and 4 workgroups has become a concern to the Commission.

Jim Randall, TxDOT TPP, made introductory comments to the video of a Commission hearing regarding the work done so far by the UTP Restructuring Workgroups.

The video of the hearing was shown.

Jim Randall stated that primarily what the commissioner's comments were intended to convey is the new goal theme, established in the department's strategic plan, issued last Spring: Plan it, Design it, Build it, Maintain it, and Manage it.

Hugh McNeely, Waco MPO, observed that Commissioner Williamson seemed to contradict what Commissioner Nichols had said: that statewide distribution of available funds was paramount to true prioritized corridor connectivity.

Max Proctor, TxDOT TPP, attempted to clarify what he felt Commissioner Nichols was really saying: that the Category 2 work group took the process and returned it back to the MPOs. Proctor added that your role is not to program funds allocated to this Category, but rather you should be doing the planning.

Gary Law, TxDOT Odessa, noted that it does make a difference on our connectivity, what the Category 2 group did. Law noted we have arbitrary boundaries.

Proctor responded to Law's comments: Yes, there is some relationship between what you do and what the Category 2 group did, but should not impact on it. There does need to be some strong coordination with the local planning officials. Our long-range plan in the past has not done real planning.

McNeely said he still has concern that the IH 35 funding will be in Category 4. He asked how can the commission ignore the needs of the IH system? Proctor responded that the Commission is taking the position that the new future priority will be to put the large investment into alternate routes, such as SH 130 for IH 35. Proctor added this major shift should have been preceded with some major analysis to see the cost benefit of investing in alternative routes, rather than continued investments in existing over capacity/ highly congested corridors.

Reggie Richardson, TxDOT Waco, stated he couldn't see how they can kick out formerly authorized projects. The districts are caught in a "Catch 22," where adjusting the projects raises their cost and causes them to be kicked out.

Hugh McNeely asked; has the Category 4 group looked at the Trans Texas Corridor? John Barton, TxDOT Wichita Falls, responded that yes they have, but not with any real commitments, since no firm alignments exist. Max Proctor added that the Trans Texas Corridor is far from firmed up, and it will be 25 to 50 years before it gets firmed up in terms of alignments and funding. Jim Randall added that you will start seeing more public input sought on Trans Texas Corridor in the coming years. Proctor stated there is no IH 35 Corridor; there is really an Austin to DFW corridor.

John Barton said: I understand Commissioner Nichols to be telling us to get our work done, through a planning methodology. However, I am pretty confused as to how our efforts are construed as programming. Max Proctor responded that what's missing from the previous planning process was the absence of a fiscal target for the local entity. Category 2 is allowing each urban area to prioritize their projects based on the fiscal target. Barton responded that all along we were told to prioritize corridor segments. Hugh McNeely added: That's not planning, that's really politics.

Gary Law asked are we really trying to plan within a hypothetical funding stream? Law added we developed a WPA with which to carry out our design and construction effort.

Scott Rollins, TxDOT Beaumont, felt compelled to comment: The path we're on is a well-traveled path. There was a task force established in about 1998 to identify the major corridors and try to prioritize them. There were lots of iterations and scenarios run by TPP. We did conclude that it was an almost impossible task. This group is headed in the right direction.

Walter McCullough, TxDOT San Angelo, stated that just to keep us on track, he would recommend that Jim Randall or Max Proctor stay around or come back tomorrow. Max Proctor stated that this group represents about 11 percent of the state's population. You're looking at approximately \$100 million per year. In effect, we only have about \$10 million. So, we literally have a nickel waiting on a dime.

McCullough directed comments to Jim Randall about the concept of how Category 2 handled their job, and wondered how Commissioner Nichols seemed to applaud the regional distribution approach.

(Break)

Harold McDaniel, Amarillo MPO, asked if everybody had a chance to look at the LOS iterations? Danny Aylor stated that we had the maps that Deborah Graham, TxDOT TPP, gave us back in August. Most everything on them was in LOS A and B. Howard

Lyons clarified that the maps were really Quality of Service, which is an approximation of LOS, in other words a shortcut approach to LOS. He added that most all corridors weighted out at QOS B. There are chances for error in both processes. It is important to note that the errors tend to level out. Aylor recalled all corridors in the Tyler area were mostly LOS B. Lyons added the LOS has the K factor, which is the 30<sup>th</sup> highest hour, for a true design value.

John Barton wanted to ensure the group was speaking from the same perspective. He stated that the LOS calculation is really a freeway-oriented calculation.

Howard Lyons stated we have at least 3 people that have a problem with LOS. So, what can be done? John Barton suggests the QOS, perhaps better than the Tim Lomax, TTI, RCI factor, which is really oriented to freeway conditions. Barton added that we should realize that the worst LOS drives the overall LOS. For example, if a particular interchange is at LOS F and the rest is at C or B, the LOS is a function of the constriction.

Brad McCaleb, Texarkana MPO, asked Howard Lyons if the LOS is a fairly sterile calculation and doesn't factor in driveways, traffic signals, etc. Lyons responded: yes, to get more detailed LOS calculations would require a lot more data. Your principal arterials will tend to look worse and the freeways tend to look a little better. Michael Chamberlain, TxDOT TPP, offered that the LOS was designed to be a shortcut tool, not useful for more thorough analysis. McCaleb added it seems that the example John Barton mentioned could be a problem in that the overall LOS may not reflect the real problem condition. Lyons mentions that these small problem areas should be solved/addressed with other sources of funding.

Mark Lund, Brownsville MPO, suggests that we may need to tweak several things and not just one. We need more than one horse in the race. We may find we have more than one tool to get at the solution.

Walter McCullough reminded the group that the Commission stressed "ease of understandability" by the public. McCullough added if we cannot get a handle on this factor, then how can we "sell it" to the public.

Danny Aylor recommends for consistency that if we continue with this formula in close to its current form, then we go for using Quality of Service.

Brad McCaleb followed up on the commission's comments that the average citizen can understand TxDOT reports. McCaleb feels they are asking an impossible task, since the average citizen does not deal with highway engineering issues. Max Proctor notes that is what they are saying: Keep the whole thing simple. Danny Aylor adds that he thinks that's why the Commission likes what Category 2 did, the overall simplicity. Howard Lyons adds that there's no restriction on the local planners using some more complex approach on how they proceed.

Steve Seese, Wichita Falls MPO, states that he tends to go with Aylor's and other's comments. If we keep insisting on using LOS, then we'll take away a lot of local prerogative.

Ajay Shakyaver, TxDOT Odessa, thinks we should try our approach without the LOS factor.

Scott Rollins noted that again from our prior Trunk System work, each time we tweaked the process, including for LOS, we didn't see much impact.

Gary Law observes this may demonstrate to the State of Texas that we really do have some top 5 or top 10 corridors of greatest need. There will still be a lot of politics required to see it.

Todd Carlson noted that one of the reasons the Category 2 group took their approach was because of the vast disparity in size between the largest and smallest metropolitan area.

Max Proctor presented the Category 2 methodology. He noted that the Category 2 group decided early on that they did not want to compete against each other. They also realized that it would be political suicide for the commission to approve an approach that didn't give some money to all areas. They then decided to allow the local areas to determine their priorities. They decided to go for a planning split.

Proctor provided an overview of the criteria they considered and which ones they decided to use. He presented the various percentage iterations they progressed through on the board. Scott Rollins observed it appears that Category 2 aborted a true consensus approach and opted for a voted approach.

Max Proctor stated that, for the most part, the commission wants to put the money where the people are. He gave a rough distribution among the Metro, Urban, and Rural areas by population: Metro: 60%, Urban: 10%, Rural: 30%. Brad McCaleb asked what is the population of the smallest metro area? Proctor responded Lubbock with 202,000.

Gary Law asked do you envision a trade fair kind of process for how they actually allocate the money? Proctor responded that's really a programming question, but I'll answer it. Yes, we will have a "Consensus Meeting" each year. That's what you're doing with the Dec 12 memo from Mr. Saenz, because we have a true fiscally constrained program.

Max Proctor suggests that the group "cut to the chase." The group should go to the end and work backwards. He notes that if a metro area decides to use tolling as a solution, then they have just leveraged their "allocation." They will not be penalized for creative solutions with alternative financing approaches.

Gabriel Del Bosque observed it looks like we can go back to simplifying our approach or work off the Category 2 approach. Proctor responded that you don't have to throw anything out.

Walter McCullough noted that if this can work, using an approach like Category 2, then I think we should do that. Hugh McNeely observed that he sees a lot of energy going to the Category 2 approach. Blair Haynie, TxDOT Abilene, stated that he agrees with what McNeely just said. If we are close to what they've done, we'd have less explaining to do.

Brad McCaleb asked if we couldn't still adapt what we have done? He thought we were charged to come up with a way to identify priority corridors. John Barton responded that we thought we were pursuing a particular charge, but the paradigm has changed. McCaleb noted anyway you look at it, you're still distributing dollars. Proctor responded that the group is not prioritizing dollars.

Maria Burke, TxDOT Design Div., asked if the group could vote on what approach it would now like to take?

Todd Carlson called for a straw vote.

The vote was taken: An overwhelming consensus to adopt a method similar to what Category 2 did.

(Lunch)

Todd Carlson began the afternoon session with some observations:

- The straw poll was pretty indicative
- At the same time, we don't have to think that we've just tossed out 6 months of work
- Two months ago, I passed on to you that the Commission was interested in you getting a quality product, even if it takes a longer time.
- Maybe we can wrap this up and move on...
- It looks like your general sense is to adapt the Category 2 approach.
- We may need to come to consensus on percentages
- You may want to go back to your policy boards for their input.
- The whole process should now be completed by February 1st.

Howard Lyons concurred; the final process should be completed by February 1. Max Proctor added that what we need by February 1 is enough of the consensus process to allow for proceeding to the March Commission meeting.

Brad McCaleb asked what if your MPO is in the middle of completing its MCP? Proctor responded that the projects you put in your MCP are up to you. He added that in the meantime, you provide us the best info you have. In the latter part of this year, we'll start building the FY 2004 UTP. Proctor added we do want the completed report by April 1, so it can get to the Commission at their May meeting. Category 2 did their thing in about 2 hours, and scheduled the projects as well.

Gabriel Del Bosque noted that the MPOs have gone through a much stricter effort to get projects. Maybe we should leave the first 5 years alone and do the years after that. Max Proctor responded that for the Category 2 group, they realized that the projects might change in the second five years.

Hugh McNeely would be interested in hearing from some of the group that didn't vote for the Category 2 approach. Joanne Garcia, TxDOT Laredo, wanted to see the actual outcome of the initial data run. She added that we need to look at traffic and see where the demands are. John Barton is still opposed to just doing the Category 2 thing. He doesn't feel that's really planning, that's really avoidance. Gary Law stated he would like to operate in the real world, as well, accept the realities of the data.

Randy Bena, TxDOT Yoakum, stated that Gary Law covered both sides of the issue. Law said we'd all like to do what is right and best for the state. To do that, we would stick to our original formula. Bena is still going to argue that that is the best approach. Right now, his district doesn't have the critical need that other parts of the state have.

John Barton asked how many of you have found yourself in some situation with a local county official where you've been plagued with incomplete FMs, because we've tried to spread the money around. In effect, no single corridor was completed.

Brad McCaleb noted it seems the Commission should just allocate the money to the district and let them decide with the local officials. Max Proctor responded that the Commission already has made the decision of how much money goes to each category;

your job is to determine what the locals want. They don't want to do what they've been doing. Proctor added that the only way we can get the legislature to realize we need much more money is to show how little today's funds will accomplish.

Harold McDaniel suggested taking the global view and do what's best for the state, similar to what the Feds do with tax dollars.

Mark Lund added that Brownsville has a \$150 million project. We could run the formula and see how it would shake out. It's kind of a way to honor the hard work and commitments we've made over recent months. Todd Carlson clarified: So you're suggesting a basic minimum amount, and then some formulaic process. Hugh McNeely responded that it sounds good in theory, but I don't think it will really make a difference.

Harold McDaniel stated it's going to be easier to sell if we don't deviate from Category 2.

Walter McCullough would still like to see the formula results. Gary Law recommends that the group see what the formula would do, then come back tomorrow morning to see the results and make any tweaks if necessary.

Group discussion began regarding the criteria used in the Category 2 methodology and whether to add any for Category 3. Todd Carlson listed the criteria on the board.

Hugh McNeely recommended deleting Fatalities/ Incapacitating Accidents and % Population under Poverty Level. Walter McCullough responds that we should include all the factors listed to see how it works out. Mark Lund noted that the factors are important to his area.

Max Proctor suggests the group list the criteria you want and then decide on the relative percentage of each through a consensus process.

Danny Aylor thinks we need to consider two critical issues: Consistency and Time. We need consistent approaches and also quickly available data. Hugh McNeely agrees with Aylor to leave all the criteria as is.

Gabriel Del Bosque recommends the group avoid using data by county. He would prefer they use data for the urbanized boundary. Gary Law asked if this data was available by UAB and MPO boundary and he would recommend using the Planning Boundary (PB).

The workgroup agreed.

Steve Seese suggests adding "Vehicles per Household," which is available from the Census Bureau.

Mark Tomlinson, TxDOT Amarillo, suggests that we take each criteria to see if we want to keep or delete.

The workgroup considers each of the criteria.

Total VMT

- Mark Tomlinson asked why should this criterion include Off System VMT?
- Danny Aylor noted one of things that jumped out at me was that these are not highway specific criteria, but rather area specific.
- The consensus of the group was to use total VMT.

Truck VMT (On System)



- Gabriel Del Bosque agrees it should be included.

#### Population

- Hugh McNeely asked about which base level would be used.
- Gabriel Del Bosque would rather use the population from the 2000 Census for the MPO boundary (UAB)
- Gary Law noted we're trying to project what the needs are for 5, 10, and 15 years out, the planning boundary does this best.
- Brad McCaleb added that the planning boundary is supposed to be the long-range projected boundary. But that is a disconnect for today's urbanized area population, which reflects today's needs. All the other criteria are based on current, existing data.

#### Centerline Miles

- Brad McCaleb feels that it is not reflective.

#### Lane Miles

The group decided to vote whether to make a data run exactly like Category 2 ran it. The vote was unanimous to duplicate the percentages in an iteration.

#### Fatal/Incapacitating Accidents

- No member objected.

#### % Population under Poverty Level

- Walter McCullough suggests keeping it in for now.

Howard Lyons told the group that if we get you to pick the criteria, we can then build a huge spreadsheet for you all to play with it and then when you find an iteration you like, you save it, and that's your vote. We take that same input from each of the 17 areas, we come up with an overall averaged weighting for each criteria.

Group discussion ensued regarding additional criteria focusing on the Special Significance factors from the previous methodology: Port of Entry, Military Installations, and Hurricane Evacuation Routes. Problems regarding quantification within percentage distributions became evident for several.

Brad McCaleb noted that it seems to me the POE/Mil Install criteria is not a real data item, but just a matter of Yes or No.

Ajay Shakyaver asked how are we trying to give special consideration for the Military Installation? Hugh McNeely responded: Alternate routes, ease of mobility, etc. Gary Law noted that this is handled through the STRANET program, by FHWA.

(Break)

Walter McCullough stated he thinks that all of these alternative criteria are already incorporated in the basic criteria.

Mark Lund noted for the border regions, the % Pop under Poverty Level is relevant. We got hit heavily with NAFTA, as well. Lund suggests leaving it in there.

Danny Aylor asks can we get the numbers on the level of traffic that crosses the border? It seems that this would be more traffic-related than the poverty pop %. Gabriel Del Bosque responds it seems that's already in the truck data.

Brad McCaleb feels nothing needs to be added to the seven criteria.

The alternative criteria were reviewed and voted on. Port of Entry, Military Installation, and Vehicles per Household each received one vote to be included. The criteria were rejected for use.

By this time, the possibility of not meeting on the second day became a possibility. Data for the seven criteria in each urban area would have to be compiled, requiring more than an evening.

The group agreed to want to see the spread of funds over 15 years, as Category 2 proceeded.

Comments regarding consistency between Category 3 and 4 were made. The issue was noted, but no solution is possible until both groups complete their work.

Todd Carlson suggested that each group member give a percentage weighting to the seven criteria. These would be averaged and then become one scenario in the spreadsheet to be e-mailed to each member. The group would then have the Category 2 weightings and an initial weighting of their own. The final weightings would be determined at the next meeting. The group agreed and provided initial weightings to the criteria to be compiled by Carlson after the workshop.

It was agreed that the next meeting data would be scheduled via e-mail.

(Adjournment)

**UTP Restructuring Workshop  
Category 3  
Workshop 7  
Thompson Conference Center  
Austin, TX  
January 29, 2003**

**Notes**

*Statements reported in these notes are not direct quotes, but reflect the general idea of the questions or comments made by each individual. Statements are not in exact chronological order as they occurred during the meeting. They have been arranged in order according to the topics that were discussed.*

The seventh meeting of the urban area corridor workgroup was held January 29, 2003 in the Thompson Conference Center located in Austin, Texas.

Todd Carlson, TTI, made several introductory comments. He also handed out copies of the meeting agenda and meeting notes from the previous workshop. Carlson also reviewed the last meeting, discussions in the interim, and some goals for the current meeting.

**Criteria**

Brad McCaleb, Texarkana MPO, stated he has a problem with some of the ways several of the criteria are being treated in current proposals, particularly the overlapping and duplicate recognition of population and poverty level. He is specifically concerned about the multiple and full treatment of the population, such as several MPOs in the valley: Brownsville, Harlingen.

Howard Lyons, TxDOT TPP, noted that only two items, Fatalities and VMT are handled for the whole county. The rest of the criteria reflect the planning area boundaries only.

Gabriel Del Bosque, Laredo MPO, feels overweighting lane miles skews the results. It just begets more infrastructure. John Barton, TxDOT Wichita Falls, agrees with Del Bosque's comments.

Danny Aylor, TxDOT Tyler, asked if anyone had a chance to really analyze the results of the most recent iterations?

Todd Carlson handed out the latest iteration of the Criteria Percentages, based on the votes made at the end of the last meeting.

John Barton showed strong concern that any one MPO turned in a vote of 100% for a single criterion. It reflects very localized self-interest that doesn't contribute to a goal of statewide connectivity.

Danny Aylor made a strong appeal to the group in response to what he saw going on in the e-mail traffic exchanged in recent days before this meeting. He says his role is certainly to represent his area. He also makes a strong case for the group working for

something that truly represents a true statewide model. Aylor says he's willing to compromise. He did not mean to foster division in some of his e-mails.

Gary Law feels there are only two criteria that really apply to this category: Population and VMT divided by Lane Miles. If there are other projects and problems we feel will be addressed in this category and reflected in other criteria, then he would suggest criteria percentages of:

Population: 33%

VMT divided by LM: 33%

The other 33% spread reasonably through consensus among other criteria.

JoAnn Garcia, TxDOT Laredo, agrees with Law on the VMT/LM and Population, but she would want to separate the Truck VMT out.

Steve Seese, Wichita Falls MPO, always supports the right of group members to vote their conscience and still try to do what's best for the state. He is willing to put on a Beaumont hat, but if everyone does that we will not accomplish that. If someone feels that 100% is best for the state, that's fine, but not if it reflects the local self interest. Seese feels we have all acted with professionalism and maturity.

Howard Lyons feels that with all the experts presented and engaged in a true statewide process, we'll do the best job for the state. We only waste our time if we're only going to play our games.

Blair Haynie, TxDOT Abilene, owned up to voting for 100% on Population. He feels that some of the other mixes would only impact Abilene by as much as \$100,000. Haynie feels that some of the arguments about VMT have merit. Also, if we go with criteria used by Category 2, it would be easier to sell and understand.

Ajay Shakyaver, TxDOT Odessa, senses that the most sincere numbers are those represented in the straw vote, even if some member skewed their votes with 100%.

John Barton suggests we just use the criteria that Category 2 used, but it does bother him that we would just fall back on using the criteria and formulas chosen by another group. I know that are some special programs and needs that have merit, such as poverty, colonias, etc. And, if these special needs are used, that they not get more than 5%. Also, Barton feels that a vote on any criteria should not exceed 50%.

Danny Aylor points out that we should fully represent our areas needs and interests, and not just buy the Category 2 formula without question. Their goals and motivations are different than ours.

John Barton stated that he is willing to vote differently if others are willing to as well. Gabriel Del Bosque stated his willingness to go with limits on percentages in another vote.

Todd Carlson asked that the group really look at the current aggregate percentages and decide if the rate for a given criteria is really best for the state, rather than a specific area.

JoAnn Garcia suggests maybe we should consider a different group of criteria, rather than the current seven.

Gary Law is still not real happy with the current process, but understands the reason for what's going on. Steven Stafford, TxDOT Beaumont also feels there is less than full comfort with the current seven factors.

Brad McCaleb feels our whole charge was changed as the last meeting. We are no long prioritizing statewide corridors and other things we thought were important. In one meeting, we were told to abandon what we had been doing. Given strong direction to follow the concept/formula coming out of Category 2. McCaleb suggests going back to what we had done from the outset.

Gabriel Del Bosque feels that we don't need to go all the way back to where we were. He does hold to keeping VMT/LM.

JoAnn Garcia feels that we may have to include some special factors to reflect special needs.

Brad McCaleb stated this is why they didn't want us to look at how much money is available. We're not doing this based on need.

Gary Law is not sure we've been told to go another totally different direction.

Brad McCaleb believes the commission's new charge should have gone through the CGWG. Gary Law feels that the commission just made a shift in direction and priority, especially with a deadline. He doesn't feel what happened early on was a waste. There's still been a lot of benefit: our learning curve and ability to educate local folks and officials better.

Danny Aylor noted a process we originally were told we couldn't use is now being advocated.

Randy Bena, TxDOT Yoakum, stated I didn't do a lot of talking in the early meetings. I did learn a lot, however. We did make a lot of good progress to accomplish. It may have taken longer than any of us desired or expected. Now, we have been hit with new direction and deadlines. The tone of the discussion this morning reflects a lot of frustration. We felt that our early work could still be used. But, here we are. He is just in favor of getting on with this. We are in a political game, like it or not.

Blair Haynie reiterates what Bena just said. We may not always agree with or like what the bosses tell us. The way the formula was going before, it seemed that only Beaumont and Waco were getting the best deal. He also doesn't feel our early work was wasted. Thinks we've all learned a lot.

Steven Juneau, TxDOT Atlanta, voted back in November that we should go with a regional approach. Under our original formula, even Texarkana would have gotten some critically needed projects, such as an IH 30 project.

Max Proctor, TxDOT TPP, spoke to the group. Over the break, I became totally aware that many of you are not satisfied with the impact of what the commission is expecting and wants by a given time. I want to remind you that you are still an independent group, whose results are desired soon by the commission. Any of you can individually or as a minority group can file a separate report. Your input and results are still desired. The commission is faced with reality and in the end is looking for a proposed "Regional distribution of dollars."

Danny Aylor noted that initially we were on what we felt was the right and best path.

Max Proctor noted that two or three days after the last meeting, Jim Randall, TxDOT TPP, asked to see the tape again. It was clear from some feedback trickling back to Austin. Basically, they were concerned that the Category 3 and 4 workgroups were not done and maybe far from done anytime soon. In the meantime, the administration is

thinking about convincing the commission to approve a UTP without another public hearing and without the complete results from these groups.

Brad McCaleb asked would some of the results from other groups be used in the next UTP? Proctor responded as we see it, none of the workgroup's results would be used. In the end, your best results with optimum consensus is desired. If you have some problems with any of this, let it be known. We don't want or need some surprising objections later.

Danny Aylor noted that under our initial efforts, we were on track to get a good spread of the funding, so there were almost all winners and no clear losers as under the new effort.

Max Proctor asked are there any MPOs that would get nothing under the new scenario? Brad McCaleb responded we essentially were zero in the early years.

Mark Lund, Brownsville MPO, stated in our early efforts, we felt we were on the right track to do the best for the state overall, and not have a distinct regional focus.

Max Proctor responded many months ago, I offered you a place to go, with the results of the Category 2, and you rejected it. Right? You decided not to go with a suggestion I offered. You can still not go along with the entire group. You can make your particular position known. We are never going to get all the money any area or region desired or needed.

Brad McCaleb stated I feel our original path would have served to point out that all needs couldn't be met just as well. Proctor responded I think you will all agree that you need to come up with something and that something appears to be regional distribution. Even San Antonio has to use incremental money to address partial needs. We cannot reach an optimal solution. You haven't wasted anything.

Steven Stafford stated our area is willing to accept some compromise. But he doesn't feel we can force the criteria used by another group (Category 2).

Gary Law stated that when we left last time, a day early, thinking these seven would cover our needs.

Max Proctor commented that we would like everyone to agree that they support the work of the group before you leave today. If not, let us know what your objections or positions are and that will go on the record. He added what consensus means to us, is that all represented and present today can live with the final results. If not, let your concerns be known. I'll try to be back after lunch to discuss whatever you like or go into further.

Steve Ekstrom, TxDOT Paris, asked for a roll call vote to see where we're at right now on the criteria percentages.

John Barton noted we have several levels of votes:

First, can we live with the seven criteria currently listed? The workgroup voted 12-5 in favor of the seven criteria.

Next, John Barton believes we should agree to no percentages of 50% or more on any one criterion.

Danny Aylor responded you are asking us to do this vote on a cap without knowing how it will result, then I'm not sure I can agree to that.

Steven Stafford stated we could also try to come up with a percentage cap on what funds one MPO would get from the formula. Put the extra money back into the formula.

John Barton stated that putting this cap on a criterion is a way to put some protection into the process.

Todd Carlson stated we have a recommendation to require a cap on the percentage vote on any single criterion.

The workgroup gave consensus to cap percentages at 50%.

The workgroup then conducted a roll call vote on the criteria percentages. Todd Carlson went down the line of MPOs and districts on the spreadsheet and entered their percentage votes. Carlson then ran the program with the updated percentages.

The resulting percentages were:

Total VMT (on and off system)	21%
Truck VMT	15%
Population	27%
Centerline Miles	5%
Lane Miles	11%
Accident Rate (MVMT)	11%
% Pop under Fed Poverty Level	10%

The updated final results were projected onto a screen for every member to review.

Gabriel Del Bosque is OK with the current result. He is still not real satisfied with the use of VMT. The MPO may still not be totally happy.

Gary Law asked Max Proctor if he foresaw this being the planning authorization. Proctor responded what this really means is that these are the planning factors and distribution that they can work with/plan on for the near and long term, subject to periodic reviews and formal updates. With this scenario, all MPOs will get far more money than they have had in the past for these type projects.

John Barton wants to share an observation: Some discussion during lunch showed some concern about the overall distribution of funding region by region. For example, the Beaumont MPO is around 15% of the total while San Angelo is about 3%.

Steve Juneau raised a question about what would happen if there were some established minimum level of funding, similar to Category 11? Max Proctor pointed out that the Category 11 minimum was legislatively mandated, the \$2.5 million floor from which to begin the funding distribution.

A straw poll of members showed less than a majority wishing to pursue a minimum level of funding.

John Barton pointed out that, even though Walter McCullough is not here from San Angelo, the \$39.9 million over 15 years is not enough to address his mobility requirements.

Gary Law stated that most all the west Texas districts/MPOs would have another source from which to draw.

Max Proctor asked for more finality on these percentages and then we'll look at other ways to handle other options.

The workgroup members voted on whether to adopt the process. There was decisive consensus. The group accepts the methodology, criteria, and percentages.

### **Corridor Project Prioritization**

The next step in the process will be for local areas to prioritize their corridor projects within the funding targets created by the methodology. Max Proctor explained the requirements to the group.

Max Proctor stated that this is similar to the way the Category 2 group handled this. We will probably deal with the distribution in three equal parts, for 15 years, or no less than 12, probably in 5-year increments. With the Category 2, we are asking the commission to use the first 5-year increment. Then, we will come back in 5 years to review where the distribution takes everybody, and re-assess for any adjustments that may be needed and work out an updated distribution achieved through consensus.

Proctor demonstrated how he planned to flow out the distribution.

Blair Haynie asked if that would be in today's dollars? Proctor responded affirmatively.

Proctor went on to explain how the whole process would play out. He asked to bear in mind once you get the distribution/allocation by the 3 five-year increments, then you should align it to the corridor that you would apply it to. You'll recall the emphasis by the commission and the Governor on completion of continuous corridors. Keep in mind this is still planning, not programming.

Reggie Richardson expressed concern about showing these future year increments in today's dollars. Proctor responded it's an equitable value for the dollar. Richardson added we're still going to have to adjust for the inflated values in future years. How will we answer the question? Proctor responded everyone is on the same playing field.

Gary Law agrees with Richardson. I can come up with today's dollars, but I have to at some time use the future anticipated cost to build the project.

John Barton noted what I hear is when we use today's dollars is that it shouldn't matter, if costs run closely with inflation and the estimated growth in revenue. Proctor added that revenue growth is estimated at 2%.

Danny Aylor observed that every year that the UTP comes before the commission, it would be in that year's dollars. Max Proctor responded that all costs would be carried forward in the given year's dollars. Bear in mind this is the best equitable way to keep all things relative.

Brad McCaleb asked what happens if we have the first project scheduled for year one, and then the money comes short? You can't honestly afford to program them until probably a few years after the money was authorized.

Mark Lund noted that we may still have to make future adjustments as things may change, such as environmental challenges, ROW problems, change in local priority, etc. Max Proctor responded that if a given MPO runs into an unforeseen delay, then the



money would be shifted to where a project can be brought to letting. He added you would have some flexibility for such unforeseen changes.

Gabriel Del Bosque suggests that the final report reflect these things we're talking about, such as the necessity to meet at least every 5 years.

Max Proctor adds we actually want the MPOs to reflect their changing planning climate on a real time basis, as it occurs: weekly, monthly, yearly. We want this to be your process by full participation every day. This is just a broad guideline.

Proctor notes we have to have the MPOs fully involved, but need prioritized project lists by the end of April. I think we have enough of a final position from this group for the commission to proceed with the public hearing for the FY 2004 UTP. We can then bring this into the 2005 UTP by May.

Proctor added we will try to get the 4 or 5 MPOs not currently present completed by the end of the week. Then we can get you the overall "near final" distribution early next week. Then, we need your final vote/approval ASAP, so we have it by mid-Feb.

Max Proctor added to please make sure you lay out your projects in the respective first 5 years phase. He further added that if it will take more than a month for your policy board to meet and bless a new priority list of projects, then provide me with what you have right now. Be sure that you give the breakdown by a given year in each 5-year increment, since not all districts can have projects in the same year.

Todd Carlson announced that the next meeting would be in early March to review our final distribution and resulting numbers, as well as the draft final report.

(Adjourned)

**UTP Restructuring Workshop  
Category 3  
Workshop 8  
Thompson Conference Center  
Austin, TX  
March 6, 2003**

**Notes**

*Statements reported in these notes are not direct quotes, but reflect the general idea of the questions or comments made by each individual. Statements are not in exact chronological order as they occurred during the meeting. They have been arranged in order according to the topics that were discussed.*

The eighth meeting of the urban area corridor workgroup was held March 6, 2003 in the Thompson Conference Center located in Austin, Texas.

Todd Carlson, TTI, made several introductory comments. He also handed out copies of the meeting agenda and meeting notes from the previous workshop. Carlson also reviewed the last meeting, discussions in the interim, and some goals for the current meeting. Members are to ameliorate any discrepancies or conflicts among projects submitted thus far within the three five-year segments.

**Corridor Project Submittals within the 15 Increments**

Discussion began regarding the process of submitting projects within an urban area's funding target. All urban areas had been asked to submit their corridor projects within their targets established at the previous meeting by today's meeting.

Howard Lyons, TxDOT, made some opening statements based on the e-mails received in recent days. Lyons displayed key elements of the allocations distribution in a spreadsheet projected on the screen.

General comments were made by members regarding their comfort level with their submittals.

Blair Haynie, TxDOT Abilene, stated that he made some minor adjustments to his area's numbers and now is comfortable with the results for Abilene and other areas.

Mark Lund, Brownsville MPO, suggested everyone get realistic and make cuts to their numbers if they need to.

Bob Appleton, Bryan-College Station MPO said he made cuts and felt he lost out because other areas didn't work toward the same goals.

Reggie Richardson, TxDOT Waco, commented that you're still allocated a certain target level of money and think we should be as fair and equitable as possible.

Randy Bena, TxDOT Yoakum, suggested that those that feel they got hurt more than they should have need to make a case for their situation.

Joanne Garcia, TxDOT Laredo, reminded the group that any shortfalls here will have to be made up from other sources.

The group then began to address the project distribution on the spreadsheet projected on the screen. Howard Lyons made changes to the sheet as discussion warranted.

Mark Lund stated he was not concerned about taking these numbers to the last dollar (i.e., the funding target). He is comfortable with numbers rounded to the nearest million, particularly in the out years when things will be in a greater state of flux. Projects move around the further out you go.

Howard Lyons noted that overall the areas are \$12 million under the overall funding target.

Brad McCaleb, Texarkana MPO noted that his area has one project in each of the five year increments. He still sees that there may be funding problems to accomplish them. He still sees a total need of about \$25 million, with only \$15 million available. Howard Lyons responded that several districts have cut down the scope of their plans, to be more realistic.

Brad McCaleb noted that the funding distribution coming out of the weighted criteria might change as a result of population changes after the first 5-year increment.

Steve Eckstrom, TxDOT Paris, feels that each district needs to be realistic for this to be a legitimate, viable planning process.

Paul Tiley, SETRPC, reminds the group that there will be at least two major censuses over the next 20 years.

John Barton, TxDOT Wichita Falls, believes all areas needs to be as close to the allocation number as possible.

Reggie Richardson observes that we've been concentrating on those districts that are way over their target. I'd like to hear from those more under. Randy Bena responded that we've been fortunate to get further ahead on lots of projects in past and recent years, and our overall needs just aren't as great as a lot of other areas.

Reggie Richardson observes that Waco district has almost \$200 million in projects than the allocations will fund. Some urban areas clearly have much greater needs than others, then we may not be satisfying the needs to the same proportionate level for equity.

Steve Seese, Wichita Falls MPO, notes there clearly are some discrepancies in the process. The allocation distribution did seem to be skewed for some districts more than others, particularly if the district has an interstate highway running through it.

Randy Bena thinks we could find more projects to balance out this equity. From day one of this process, I supported statewide equity and needs. We have a process that still forces equity in dollars rather than based on relative aggregate needs. I'm in support of finding where the real needs are, knowing we have served the statewide needs well.

Walter McCullough, TxDOT San Angelo, states he thought this had already been decided. There are other funding sources and mechanisms, such as Category 11 Discretionary for meeting extraordinary needs. Reggie Richardson agrees.

Danny Aylor, TxDOT Tyler, observes where we ended up is not where we started out, being to meet the greatest needs statewide. At the same time, as Commissioner Nichols pointed out in his December remarks, the best overall process may in the end may not be politically correct, knowing that if we don't do some broad statewide distribution, the legislature will do it for us.

John Barton states the group needs to seek to achieve optimum equity and then get consensus. We may have to face up to the fact that we will have to take the greatest differences and reallocate it. Howard Lyons thinks we have to face up to a process and result that most everybody agrees to in spirit, a broad consensus. Steve Seese states we just have to do the best we can. We have to realize that MPOs represented here are much closer to the political fire than the TxDOT staff, generally speaking. Seese is still worried how the commission will react and deal with our results.

Brad McCaleb states that Texarkana MPO is already preparing our minority report (dissenting comments), as directed by our policy body. If we all lowball our projections, we're not being realistic either. He feels that we were set on a path without regard to politics and when we were close to some acceptable process, we were told to go a different way.

[Break]

Mark Lund suggested that there should be an attempt to get to zero, but if anyone is uncomfortable, then maybe we should look at what such a minority report might look like. Who knows, the minority report might, in fact, turn into the majority report.

Bob Appleton directed his comments to Howard Lyons: Philosophically, He is a little disappointed the way this process turned out, but at the same time it looks like the results for my area (Bryan/CS) actually turned out better than we may have otherwise.

Danny Aylor notes he is still concerned what McCaleb alluded to earlier, in that on the spreadsheet there is a place to showing what the ultimate construction cost is, even though you had to use some lesser phase level costs. But, this shows what the overall needs are. Aylor is not ready to propose a *pro rata* distribution, based on the total project needs. Aylor proposed that some of the adjacent MPOs might want to get together on projects that have mutual benefit to both or more MPOs.

Workgroup members began to make refinements to their numbers on the spreadsheet.

Danny Aylor is concerned that the shake out for smooth letting may affect the district allocation. Howard Lyons responded you might have to restructure your numbers.

Steven Stafford, TxDOT Beaumont, asked haven't all the districts been informed of what fell out in the recent re-shuffle? He knows Beaumont has added some projects into this process that were programmed earlier. Lyons responded that should have all been done.

Brad McCaleb asked if this smoothing is not going to be re-prioritizing? Basically, what we are doing is shifting the money for the allocations, not changing the project mixes.

Jo Anne Garcia asked the districts that did this the old way, did they use LOS to help determine the priority? Steven Stafford replied affirmatively, they did use LOS.

Howard Lyons explained what the group needed to do with the spreadsheet being projected. The group needs to try to spread the project dollars to achieve some uniformity and smoothness in letting. We see that Tyler frontloaded their allocation since it all

related to single projects. Danny Aylor responded some of our front-end dollars could be shifted to help the smoothing.

John Barton offered to shift some of their projects, even though for several of their front-end projects they already have it ready to let (the ROW clear, the environmental clear, etc.).

Howard Lyons stated that projects that are ready to let should go early, those not ready can slip down in the five-year increment.

The workgroup spent the next period of time smoothing the projects across the first five-increment segment. The goal of the effort was to stay as close as possible to the funding target for the five-year phase. It required discussion between MPO members and their districts and discussion within the entire group. Various attempts were made to move projects around within the five-increment phase. Some attempts were accepted, some rejected. All urban areas were involved in the process.

After much discussion, the group achieved the goal of smoothing the projects among the areas in each of the three five phases.

## **Final Report**

Todd Carlson initiated discussion about various aspects of the final report. Carlson stated that if a member has some minority position like Texarkana MPO, then make sure I get this.

Howard Lyons informed members that he would need to work with each district to make sure there is some consistency among the project descriptions for each district. Some of these projects don't have any status listed in their DCIS file.

Todd Carlson asked that whatever you have to offer for the final report, get it to me early as possible.

Carlson asked for rationales for the seven criteria. Why did the group think that each of the seven was adequate to address Category 3 needs? Gary Law, TxDOT Odessa, Stated that we looked at each corridor in a competitive environment. Then after the commission direction, we adjusted accordingly.

Gabriel Del Bosque noted that we need to ensure that the reality of our process be reflected. I would have probably submitted a minority report if we had gone the original direction.

Brad McCaleb still feels we were asked to make a major shift after spending a lot of time on another approach. He doesn't feel we had adequate time to address the problems with it.

Ajay Shakyaver, TxDOT Odessa, reminded the group that it did seek consensus in all our deliberations, we did allow for full introduction and discussion of all positions.

## **Submittals of Dissenting Comments**

John Barton is concerned that there may be different ways to present and handle minority views or positions.

Todd Carlson responded that if I get formal minority reports, I am faced with having to address it in the formal report, then include any of them as an appendix.

Carlson asked that any dissenting comments be constructive and provided in a professional manner. Any "rants" will be rejected or the author asked to modify his comments.

Steven Stafford noted that in seeking consensus, we used the principle of "you may not like the full details of the process, or it's results, but can you live with it?" I think that some of us may just submit a minority position.

Mark Lund thinks that any of the group should be able to express some technical and professional concerns that need to be addressed and/or directed to the commission, such as Access Management, or Scenic Routes.

Michelle Leftwich, Harlingen MPO, asked should each of our MPO policy boards act on and present their formal position prior to the completion of the report?

Reggie Richardson thinks that opposition or dissenting positions should be presented during the public hearing process.

Group discussion followed regarding individual submittals of dissenting views or formal statements from MPO policy boards.

Mark Lund feels the MPO boards may not get the full benefit of what we really accomplished in this process. He believes, though, that if we feel the MPO policy board or technical committee is in support of the process and results, then it should be submitted.

John Barton feels that any dissenting or opposition input come from the work group member, not the larger policy group.

Steve Eckstrom thinks that whatever minority input is submitted needs to be provided to each member for them to respond to before the final report is completed.

General consensus within the group was that only members should submit dissenting views.

Steven Stafford feels it is important that all members that have some strong views submit them in a constructive manner to Todd Carlson.

Randy Bena makes a motion to allow members to submit their comments and include their input in an appendix to the report.

Unanimous support.

The workgroup then exchanged positive closing comments.

(Adjournment)

## Appendix C - Initial Category 3 Criteria, Weightings, and Formulas

### UTP Category 3 - Urban Areas (Non-TMA)

#### Prioritization Criteria Formulas

(16 October 2002)

#### Traffic (45 points)

##### Traffic

**15 pts** \* (Corridor Segment Adjusted AADT / Highest Adjusted AADT of all Urban Corridor Segments)

#### Level of Service

**20 pts** \* LOS Factor

##### LOS Factor

$LOS < C = 0$

$LOS C = 0.25$

$LOS D = 0.5$

$LOS E = 0.75$

$LOS F = 1.00$

*LOS of main lane of corridor segment as derived from Highway Capacity Manual methodology  
Most current year data is to be used*

#### Safety

**10 pts** \* (Corridor Segment Accident Rate / Statewide Average Accident Rate for Similar Facility in Urban Areas) – 1.0

*Minimum 0 points / Maximum 10 points  
Segment has to be at least twice the state rate to receive max points*

*Average is a 3 year moving average*

#### Connectivity (27 points)

##### Closing System Gaps

**10 pts** + {**5 pts** \* [1 - (Corridor Segment Gap Length/ Corridor Length)]}

$n + n_l = 15$

No gap = no points

Every segment should have a gap

**Maximize Use of Existing System**

**5 pts**, if the project is not an added capacity project

*Examples: ITS, access management, TMS*

**Connect with Principal Roadways**

**4 pts**, if the project connects to or is part of the NHS or Texas Trunk System

**Intermodal Connectivity**

**3 pts**, if the project serves an airport, rail yard, public transportation facility, or seaport

*District/MPO will certify intermodal facility is served by corridor segment and has a direct physical connection with facility.*

**Financial (13 points)**

**Cost**

**7 pts** \*  $\frac{\text{Lowest Corridor Segment Cost} / \text{Adjusted VMT of Lowest Corridor Segment}}{\text{Subject Corridor Segment Cost} / \text{Adjusted VMT of Subject Corridor Segment}}$

*Adjusted VMT = Current Adjusted ADT \* Corridor Segment Length*

*Corridor Segment Cost = Construction Cost*

**External Leveraging**

**6 pts**, based on percentage of Construction Cost

<i>1 pt</i>	<i>10.00 – 14.99 %</i>
<i>2 pts</i>	<i>15.00 – 19.99 %</i>
<i>3 pts</i>	<i>20.00 - 24.99 %</i>
<i>4 pts</i>	<i>25.00 - 29.99 %</i>
<i>5 pts</i>	<i>30.00 – 34.99 %</i>
<i>6 pts</i>	<i>&gt; 35.00 %</i>

*Numerator: PS&E, ROW, Cash, Mitigation, environmental, construction*

*Denominator: Estimated Segment Construction Cost*

*External leverage applies to that dollar amount which is above that which is required by TAC Section 15.5.5(b)*



**Special Significance (15 points)**

**5 pts**, if it is an USDOT-designated NAFTA or trade corridor

**3.5 pts**, if it connects to a port of entry with US Customs or INS facilities (*within 5 miles*)

**2.5 pts**, if it serves a military or national security installation (*within 5 miles*)

**2 pts**, if it is an USDOT, USDOE, or TxDOT-designated hazardous materials route

**2 pts**, if it is a TxDOT-designated hurricane evacuation route

**100 points maximum**

# Appendix D - UTP Category 3 Planning Increments and Funding Targets

## 15-INCREMENT SCHEDULE

		1st 5-Period Phase				
		1A	1B	1C	1D	1E
MPO	DISTRICT	1	2	3	4	5
ABILENE	ABILENE	\$0	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$12,000,000	\$5,000,000
AMARILLO	AMARILLO	\$6,000,000	\$6,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$26,900,000
TEXARKANA	ATLANTA	\$16,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SOUTH EAST TEXAS RPC	BEAUMONT	\$0	\$40,000,000	\$0	\$38,000,000	\$10,000,000
BRYAN-COLLEGE STATION	BRYAN	\$0	\$6,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$0	\$0
LAREDO UTS	LAREDO	\$0	\$16,550,000	\$0	\$0	\$9,000,000
PERMIAN BASIN RPC	ODESSA	\$15,000,000	\$0	\$15,300,000	\$0	\$10,000,000
TEXOMA/SHERMAN-DENISON	PARIS	\$7,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$12,500,000	\$2,200,000
BROWNSVILLE	PHARR	\$4,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$2,750,000	\$10,000,000	\$7,000,000
HARLINGEN-SAN BENITO	PHARR	\$4,500,000	\$4,800,000	\$4,600,000	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000
SAN ANGELO	SAN ANGELO	\$0	\$0	\$13,000,000	\$0	\$0
LONGVIEW	TYLER	\$9,700,000	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$15,000,000	\$0
TYLER	TYLER	\$20,000,000	\$0	\$10,000,000	\$0	\$5,500,000
CENTRAL TEXAS COG	WACO	\$11,500,000	\$20,500,000	\$0	\$10,000,000	\$15,000,000
WACO	WACO	\$11,000,000	\$0	\$27,000,000	\$0	\$0
WICHITA FALLS	WICHITA FALLS	\$17,200,000	\$0	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$0
VICTORIA	YOAKUM	\$0	\$15,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$16,000,000
	TOTALS	\$122,900,000	\$124,350,000	\$99,650,000	\$105,500,000	\$114,600,000

Phase 1 Total \$567,000,000

SUGGESTED MAXIMUM  
ANNUAL TARGET  
SUGGESTED MINIMUM

\$125,000,000
\$113,330,000
\$100,000,000

**Appendix D - UTP Category 3 Planning Increments and Funding Targets**

**15-INCREMENT SCHEDULE**

		2nd 5-Period Phase				
		2A	2B	2C	2D	2E
MPO	DISTRICT	6	7	8	9	10
ABILENE	ABILENE	\$0	\$18,000,000	\$0	\$12,000,000	\$0
AMARILLO	AMARILLO	\$0	\$0	\$19,000,000	\$0	\$16,300,000
TEXARKANA	ATLANTA	\$0	\$0	\$12,500,000	\$0	\$0
SOUTH EAST TEXAS RPC	BEAUMONT	\$0	\$25,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$60,000,000
BRYAN-COLLEGE STATION	BRYAN	\$9,900,000	\$0	\$3,000,000	\$11,000,000	\$3,000,000
LAREDO UTS	LAREDO	\$5,000,000	\$0	\$20,000,000	\$0	\$0
PERMIAN BASIN RPC	ODESSA	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$26,000,000	\$0	\$11,000,000
TEXOMA/SHERMAN-DENISON	PARIS	\$3,900,000	\$8,400,000	\$0	\$12,900,000	\$0
BROWNSVILLE	PHARR	\$3,750,000	\$4,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$18,000,000	\$3,500,000
HARLINGEN-SAN BENITO	PHARR	\$9,500,000	\$7,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$5,000,000
SAN ANGELO	SAN ANGELO	\$0	\$0	\$14,000,000	\$0	\$0
LONGVIEW	TYLER	\$0	\$16,700,000	\$0	\$12,000,000	\$0
TYLER	TYLER	\$7,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$0	\$5,500,000
CENTRAL TEXAS COG	WACO	\$11,500,000	\$24,000,000	\$0	\$8,000,000	\$9,200,000
WACO	WACO	\$22,000,000	\$0	\$14,000,000	\$14,350,000	\$0
WICHITA FALLS	WICHITA FALLS	\$20,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
VICTORIA	YOAKUM	\$19,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	TOTALS	\$115,550,000	\$116,100,000	\$125,500,000	\$95,250,000	\$113,500,000

Phase 2 Total            \$565,900,000

**Appendix D - UTP Category 3 Planning Increments and Funding Targets**

**15-INCREMENT SCHEDULE**

		3rd 5-Period Phase				
		3A	3B	3C	3D	3E
MPO	DISTRICT	11	12	13	14	15
ABILENE	ABILENE	\$13,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,000,000
AMARILLO	AMARILLO	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$19,700,000	\$18,000,000
TEXARKANA	ATLANTA	\$0	\$0	\$16,900,000	\$0	\$0
SOUTH EAST TEXAS RPC	BEAUMONT	\$0	\$40,000,000	\$0	\$31,000,000	\$22,000,000
BRYAN-COLLEGE STATION	BRYAN	\$14,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$19,000,000	\$0
LAREDO UTS	LAREDO	\$13,000,000	\$0	\$11,000,000	\$0	\$8,700,000
PERMIAN BASIN RPC	ODESSA	\$18,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$0	\$0
TEXOMA/SHERMAN-DENISON	PARIS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,100,000	\$9,800,000
BROWNSVILLE	PHARR	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$12,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$8,200,000
HARLINGEN-SAN BENITO	PHARR	\$0	\$9,000,000	\$4,500,000	\$3,500,000	\$14,000,000
SAN ANGELO	SAN ANGELO	\$0	\$0	\$12,750,000	\$0	\$0
LONGVIEW	TYLER	\$12,700,000	\$16,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
TYLER	TYLER	\$19,400,000	\$13,000,000	\$2,200,000	\$1,050,000	\$0
CENTRAL TEXAS COG	WACO	\$0	\$25,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$19,000,000	\$0
WACO	WACO	\$12,000,000	\$0	\$14,000,000	\$16,000,000	\$0
WICHITA FALLS	WICHITA FALLS	\$0	\$0	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$15,000,000
VICTORIA	YOAKUM	\$5,000,000	\$0	\$4,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$0
	TOTALS	\$111,100,000	\$123,000,000	\$92,150,000	\$133,850,000	\$103,700,000

Phase 3 Total      \$563,800,000

**Appendix D - UTP Category 3 Planning Increments and Funding Targets**

TOTALS					
	MPO	DISTRICT	TARGET	TOTAL	DIFFERENCE
\$70,000,000	ABILENE	ABILENE	\$69,900,000	\$70,000,000	-\$100,000
\$112,400,000	AMARILLO	AMARILLO	\$114,000,000	\$112,400,000	\$1,600,000
\$45,900,000	TEXARKANA	ATLANTA	\$45,900,000	\$45,900,000	\$0
\$266,000,000	SOUTH EAST TEXAS RPC	BEAUMONT	\$265,650,000	\$266,000,000	-\$350,000
\$90,900,000	BRYAN-COLLEGE STATION	BRYAN	\$90,900,000	\$90,900,000	\$0
\$83,250,000	LAREDO UTS	LAREDO	\$83,250,000	\$83,250,000	\$0
\$121,600,000	PERMIAN BASIN RPC	ODESSA	\$121,950,000	\$121,600,000	\$350,000
\$69,300,000	TEXOMA/SHERMAN-DENISON	PARIS	\$69,300,000	\$69,300,000	\$0
\$97,200,000	BROWNSVILLE	PHARR	\$97,200,000	\$97,200,000	\$0
\$93,400,000	HARLINGEN-SAN BENITO	PHARR	\$93,450,000	\$93,400,000	\$50,000
\$39,750,000	SAN ANGELO	SAN ANGELO	\$39,750,000	\$39,750,000	\$0
\$86,100,000	LONGVIEW	TYLER	\$86,100,000	\$86,100,000	\$0
\$106,650,000	TYLER	TYLER	\$106,650,000	\$106,650,000	\$0
\$161,700,000	CENTRAL TEXAS COG	WACO	\$161,550,000	\$161,700,000	-\$150,000
\$130,350,000	WACO	WACO	\$130,350,000	\$130,350,000	\$0
\$58,200,000	WICHITA FALLS	WICHITA FALLS	\$58,200,000	\$58,200,000	\$0
\$64,000,000	VICTORIA	YOAKUM	\$65,850,000	\$64,000,000	\$1,850,000
\$1,696,700,000		TOTALS	\$1,699,950,000	\$1,696,700,000	\$3,250,000

TARGET is based on Criteria Percentages used for the urban areas and the \$1.7 billion planning assumption  
TOTAL for each urban area is the sum of the three 5-period phases

## **Appendix E - Corridor Project Descriptions by Urban Area**

**ABILENE DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES**

CSJ	Project	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (mi)	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments				
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15					
0006-05-098	IH 20 Corr. #1	On IH 20 at FM 3438	Construct ramps & upgrade intg roads	0.1	2	2		2													Project has been submitted as Congressional High Priority					
				Total	2	2																				
0006-18-044	US 84 Corr. #2	At FM 3438	Construct Interchange	0.1	12	12				12											Project has been submitted as Congressional High Priority					
				Total	12	12																				
0006-05-090 0006-06-081	IH 20 Corr. #3	From: Abilene West City Limits To: Near Catclaw Cr From: Near Catclaw Cr To: Abilene East City Limits	Add two lanes for a six lane divided highwa Add two lanes for a six lane divided highwa	9.5	38	8														8	Project has been PLAN level for several years, truck traffic increasing Safety Issues					
				11.3	45	0																				
				Total	83	8																				
0699-01-038	FM 89 Corr. #4	From: US 83/84 To: Antilley Rd	Widen to six lane with left turn lane	3.5	5	5				5											Traffic increasing due to development in area Safety Issues					
				Total	45	5																				
2398-01-	LP 322 Corr. # 5	From: IH 20 To: SH 351	Construct New Four Lane Freeway	5.2	18	18						18														
				Total	18	18																				
0006-05-099	IH 20 Corr. #6	At US 83/277	Reconstruct Interchange	0.1	12	12								12							Safety Issues because of low bridge clearances, and left exits					
				Total	12	12																				
0033-06-090	US 83/277 Corr. #7	From: N 10th to S 14th in Abilene	Add two lanes for a six lane divided highway	4.3	13	13											13				Continuation of project to add 2 lanes because of congestion from increase in traffic					
				Total	13	13																				
								Grand Total	185	70	0	2	0	12	5	0	18	0	12	0	13	0	0	0	8	
								5-yr Subtotal=					19	5-yr Subtotal=					30	5-yr Subtotal=					21	

**AMARILLO DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES**

CSJ	HIGHWAY Seg. ID	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (mi)	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments		
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15			
0275-01	IH 40 108	Loop 335 to 1 mile West	Upgrade to 6 lanes	1.000	6.0	6.0	6.0																	
		1 mile West of LP 335 to Hope Rd.	Upgrade to 6 lanes	1.089	6.5	6.5		6.5																
				2.089	12.5	12.5																		
0275-01	IH 27 105	Western St to Loop 335	Upgrade to 6 lanes	2.722	16.3	16.3										16.3								
		Loop 335 to Jct US 60	Upgrade to 6 lanes	6.095	16.7	-																		
				8.817	33.0	16.3																		
2635-02	SL 335 101	9th Street to IH 40	Mainlanes and interchange	1.000	26.9	26.9						26.9												
		IH 40 to 45th Street	Mainlanes	2.883	19.0	19.0									19.0									
		Georgia St to IH 27	Mainlanes and interchange at IH 27	1.500	19.7	19.7														19.7				
		IH 27 to Coulter	Mainlanes	1.383	18.0	18.0															18.0			
		Georgia St to 9th Steet	Relocation	4.300	24.4	-																		
				10.066	108.0	83.6																		
				Grand Total	153.5	112.4	6	7	0	0	27	0	0	19	0	16	0	0	0	20	18			
							5-yr Subtotal=					39	5-yr Subtotal=					35	5-yr Subtotal=					38



**ATLANTA DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES**

CSJ	Project	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (mi)	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments		
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15			
0610-07	IH 30																							
		IH 30 from FM 2878 to FM 559	IH 30 WB - US 59 SB direct connect, complete south frntg. road, construct turnaround(s) & relocate ramps	2.2	18.5	16.5	16.5															JOB NO. 077		
		IH 30 from FM 1397 to US 71	Reconstruct IH 30/US 71 Interchange, complete frontage roads, construct turnarounds @ FM 1397, 6 lane IH 30	1.5	14.5	12.5								12.5								JOB NO. 054		
		IH 30 from FM 989 to US 71	Construct turnaround @ FM 559, 6 lane IH 30 from FM 989 to FM 1397, 3 lane C & G frontage roads, modify ramps, contract bypass from FM 2878 to Pecan St.	5.5	24.2	16.9												16.9				JOB NO. 053		
				Grand Total	57.2	45.9	16.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.9	0.0	0.0	
				5-yr Subtotal = 16.5						5-yr Subtotal = 12.5					5-yr Subtotal = 16.9									
				Annual Target = 3.06						15 yr Target = 45.9					15 yr Project Total = 45.9									

**BEAUMONT DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES**

CSJ	Project	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (mi)	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments			
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15				
	IH 10 Corridor #202	From US 69 West Junction to	Widen from 6 lanes to 8 lanes	3.6	40	40		40																	
		US 69 East Junction				0																			
				Total	40	40																			
	US 69 Corridor #206	From IH 10 to SH 347	Reconstruct from 4 lanes to 6 lanes	6.2	38	38				38															
						0																			
				Total	38	38																			
	IH 10 Corridor #203	From KCS RR to SH 62	Widen from 4 lanes to 6 lanes	11.0	10	10					10														
		From SH 62 to SH 87	Reconstruct from 4 lanes to 6 lanes	4.3	25	25						25													
				Total	35	35																			
	US 69 Corridor #205	From US 96 to IH 10	Widen from 4 lanes to 6 lanes	9.8	60	60										60									
						0																			
				Total	60	60																			
	IH 10 Corridor #201	From FM 364 to US 69 West Junction	Widen from 4 lanes to 6 lanes	4.5	40	40												40							
						0																			
				Total	40	40																			
	US 69 Corridor #204	From SH 327 to FM 421	Reconstruct from 2 lanes to 4 lanes	8.0	31	31														31					
						0																			
				Total	31	31																			
	SH 105 Corridor #212	From SH 326 to Jefferson Co. Line	Reconstruct from 2 lanes to 4 lanes	8.0	22	22															22				
				Total	22	22																			
							<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>22</b>	
							<b>5-yr Subtotal= 88</b>					<b>5-yr Subtotal= 85</b>					<b>5-yr Subtotal= 93</b>								

**BRYAN DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES**

CSJ	Project	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (mi)	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
0049-12	SH 6 Corridor #1	From SH 21 to BS 6-R (South)	Widen to 6-Lane Freeway Facility and Upgrade Interchanges	8.5	25	25			25													
					0																	
					0																	
			Total	25	25																	
3138-01	FM 2347 Corridor #2	From BS 6-R to FM 2154	Widen to 6-Lane Urban Arterial with Raised Median	1.3	6	6		6														
					0																	
					0																	
			Total	6	6																	
0050-01	BS 6-R Corridor #3	From FM 60 to FM 1179	Widen to 6-Lane Urban Arterial with Raised Median	5.4	9	3						3										
0050-01		From FM 1179 to Coulter	Widen to 6-Lane Urban Arterial with Raised Median			3								3								
0050-01		From Coulter to SH 21	Widen to 6-Lane Urban Arterial with Raised Mediar			3								3								
		Total	9	9																		
2399-1	FM 2818 Corridor #4	At FM 1179	Construct Urban Interchange	7.0	75	11								11								
		From FM 1179 to FM 60	Widen to 6-Lane Super Arterial with Access Mgmt and Interchanges			0														\$14 Million in a later year		
		At FM 2347	Construct Urban Interchange			10						10										
		From FM 60 to FM 2154	Widen to 6-Lane Super Arterial with Access Mgmt and Interchanges			0														\$10 Million in a later year		
2399-1	FM 2818 Corridor #4	At BS 6-R	Construct Urban Interchange			11										11						
2399-1		From FM 2154 to BS 6-R	Widen to 6-Lane Super Arterial with Access Mgmt and Interchanges			19												19				
		Total	75	51																		
		Grand Total	115	91																		
							0	6	25	0	0	10	0	3	11	3	14	0	0	19	0	
							5-yr Subtotal= 31					5-yr Subtotal= 27					5-yr Subtotal= 33					

**LAREDO DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES**

CSJ	Project	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (mi)	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
	HIGHWAY # Loop 20	From SH 359 to US 59	Upgrade to five-lane section	2.2	5	5						5										
		From SH 359 to Mangana Hein	Upgrade to five-lane section	7.3	15	15		17														
		From US 59 to McPherson	Upgrade to five-lane section	8.1	9	9					9											
		From McPherson to IH 35	Upgrade to five-lane section	1.1	20	20							20									
	HIGHWAY # IH 35	Loop 20, North Uniroyal and Uniroyal Improvements	Two Interchanges and Uniroyal Improvements	2.0	13	13											13					
				2.0	13	13																
	HIGHWAY # Laredo Outer Loop	US 59 North to Int. Inner Loop	Upgrade to four lane section	7.0	11	11													11			
		US 59 South to Cuatro Vientos Int.	Upgrade to four lane section	6.8	9	9															9	
				13.8	20	20																
Totals				16.9	53	53	0	17	0	0	9	5	0	20	0	0	13	0	11	0	9	
							5-yr Subtotal= 26					5-yr Subtotal= 25					5-yr Subtotal= 33					

**ODESSA DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES**

CSJ	Project	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (mi)	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments		
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15			
	HWY # IH 20 Corridor #1  Midland County	West Lp. 250 intg.		3.5	18,223,000	18												18						
		Midkiff intg.			7,057,000	15	15.0																	
				1.0	557,000																			
		Cottonflat intg			6,093,000																			
				1.4	1,139,000																			
		SH349 intg.			7,057,000	14						10.0	4											
				0.6	38,000																			
		Lamesa Rd intg.			7,057,000	15				15.3														
				1.2	870,000																			
		SH158/FM715 intg.			7,057,000																			
				1.6	1,474,000																			
		FM307			5,259,000																			
				2.7	2,945,000																			
			HWY # IH-20 Corridor #2  Ector County	East Loop 250 intg.			15,439,000	18									18							
				1.3	1,782,000	8									8									
BI20/UPRR					6,381,000																			
				3.6	4,344,000																			
FM1208					5,259,000	11											11							
				1.0	986,000																			
To 1mi. East of FM1208						0																		
TOTAL				17.9	99,017,000	99																		
	HWY # IH-20 Corridor #2  Ector County			From 1mi. West of FM1936																				
						1.0	1,028,000																	
				FM1936 intg			5,205,000																	
						1.0	735,000																	
				W. BI20/UPRR			6,263,000																	
		UPRR O/P str.		1.0	5,128,000																			
		West Lp 338			8,988,000																			
				1.3	1,603,000																			
		FM1882			3,817,000																			
				1.2	1,242,000																			
		Crane Rd			3,755,000	2														2				
				0.6	424,000																			
		US385 intg			5,317,000	20													20					
		Dixie Rd grade separation		1.1	4,169,000																			
		Grandview/FM3503 intg			4,494,000																			
Industrial Rd grade separation		2.0	5,744,000																					
JBS Parkway interchange			6,010,000																					
		1.0	758,000																					
East Loop338			8,532,000																					
		1.0																						
To Ector/ Midland county line																								
		TOTAL		11.2	73,212,000	22																		
	HWY # IH-20 Corridor #3  Midland County	From Ector/ Midland County line																						
				1.0	1,144,000																			
		Future Faudree Rd interchange			5,347,000																			
				1.6	1,456,000																			
		Future Park Rd interchange			5,347,000																			
				2.2	2,211,000																			
		FM1788 interchange			18,158,000																			
				2.0	2,007,000																			
		Future East airport interchange			5,347,000																			
				1.0	738,000																			
		Future Scharbauer Rd intg			5,347,000																			
				1.0	509,000																			
		To 1 mi. west of West Loop 250																						
				TOTAL		8.8	47,611,000	0																
		Grand Total		219,840,000	121	15	0	15	0	10	4	0	26	0	11	18	20	2	0	0				
							5-yr Subtotal=					40	5-yr Subtotal=					41	5-yr Subtotal=					40

**PARIS DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES**

CSJ	Project	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (mi)	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
0091-01-037	SH 289 Corridor #1	From SH 56, to US 82	New location 2-lane CR with shoulders	3.6	20.0	7.5	7.5															
0091-01-038		From US 82, to FM 120	New location 2-lane CR with shoulders	7.2		12.5					12.5											
				10.8	20.0	20.0																
0202-08-901	FM 120 Corridor #2	From FM 996, to FM 406	Rehabilitate Existing & Add 10-ft Shldrs (5-lane in Pottsboro)	3.2	6.1	2.2					2.2											
0202-08-902		From FM 406, to End State Mnt.	Rehabilitate Existing & Add 10-ft Shldrs	4.0		3.9							3.9									
				7.2	6.1	6.1																
2453-02-021	FM 1417 Corridor #3	From SH 11, to SH 56 (eastside of Sherman)	New location 2-lane CR with shoulders	4.5	8.4	8.4							8.4									
				Total	8.4	8.4																
0045-19-900	US 82 Corridor #4	From Frisco Rd. (Sherman), to FM 1417 (eastside of Shrmn)	Add 2-lanes to exist 2-lanes to make 4-lane divided	2.1	25.0	12.9									12.9							
0045-19-901		From FM 1417 (eastside), to US 69	Add 2-lanes to exist 2-lanes to make 4-lane divided	7.5		12.1												12.1				
				9.6	25.0	25.0																
0047-02-119	US 75 Corridor #5	From Center St. (Sherman), to Travis St. (Sherman)	Upgrade existing to current standards and add 2 lanes to create a 6-lane divided facility	1.8	11.0	11.0														9.8		
				Total	11.0	11.0																
				Grand Total	70.5	70.5	7.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	2.2	3.9	8.4	0.0	12.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.1	9.8	
							5-yr Subtotal= 22					5-yr Subtotal= 25					5-yr Subtotal= 22					

**PHARR DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES (BROWNSVILLE)**

CSJ	Corridor Segment	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5 - Year Phase					2nd 5 - Year Phase					3rd 5 - Year Phase					Comments
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
0331-01	SH 100 301	US 77/83 to South Padres Island		25.105																		Pharr District Final Proposal Feb 11, 2003
0331-02		US 77/83 to 6 Mi. E of FM 1847	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	10.502	1.5	1.5																
0331-03		6 Mi E of FM 1847 to W End of Causeway	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	11.920	1.5	1.5																
		W End of Causeway to PR 100 North	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	2.683	0.5	0.5																
0039-08-	US 77/83 302	SH 100 S. to Los Tomates Int'l Bridge		13.940																		
0039-09		SH 100 to 0.6 Mi. North of FM 3248	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	7.743	2.0	2.0																
0039-16		0.6 Mi. N of FM3248 to 0.5 Mi N of FM 802	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	2.200	1.0	1.0																
0039-16		0.5 Mi N of FM 802 to LosTomates Int'l Br @ Los Ebanos Road	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	3.997	2.0	2.0																
			Construct Overpass	1.000	7.5																	
										</												

**PHARR DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES (HARLINGEN/SAN BENITO)**

CSJ	Corridor Segment	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5 - Year Phase					2nd 5 - Year Phase					3rd 5 - Year Phase					Comments
							1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
	<b>US 77/83 501</b>	FM 1015 to SH 100		27.272																		Pharr District Final Proposal Feb 44, 2003
0039-18		US83: FM 1015 to CL	ITS /Operational/Improv's	6.241	\$ 1.5																	
0039-19		US83: CL to US 77/83	ITS /Operational/Improv's	9.776	\$ 2.0	\$ 2.0	2.0															
0039-07		US77/83: Interchange to Bus 77,S	ITS /Operational/Improv's	8.885	\$ 2.0	\$ 2.0	2.0															
<b>0039-07</b>		<b>US 77/83 @ FM 509</b>	<b>Construct Directional Interchange</b>	<b>2.000</b>	<b>\$ 60.0</b>																	
0039-08		US77/83: Bus 77,S to SH 100	ITS /Operational/Improv's	2.370	\$ 0.5	\$ 0.5	0.5															
0220-02		US281: 1 Mi E of FM 1015 to Cam CL	Widen to 4 Lane Contr'd Acc's	4.516	\$ 9.0	\$ 9.0											9.0					
0220-03		US281: HidalgoCL to 1 MiE of FM 506	Widen to 4 Lane Contr'd Acc's	3.651	\$ 7.0	\$ 7.0									7.0							
0220-03		US281: 1 Mi E of FM 506 to 1 Mi W of FM 1479	Widen to 4 Lane Contr'd Acc's	2.150	\$ 4.0	\$ 4.0								4.0								
0220-03		US281: 1 Mi W of FM 1479 to 1 Mi E of FM509	Widen to 4 Lane Contr'd Acc's	3.700	\$ 7.0	\$ 7.0							7.0									
0220-03		US281: 1 Mi E of FM509 to .5 M W of FM732	Widen to 4 Lane Contr'd Acc's	2.860	\$ 5.0	\$ 8.0					8.0											
0220-02		@ FM 491	Construct Overpass	1.000	\$ 5.0																	
0220-03		@ FM 2556	Construct Overpass	1.000	\$ 5.0																	
0220-03		@ FM 506	Construct Overpass	1.000	\$ 5.0																	
0220-03		@ FM 1479	Construct Overpass	1.000	\$ 5.0																	
0220-03		@ FM 509	Construct Overpass	1.000	\$ 5.0	\$ 5.0										5.0						
0220-03		@ FM 2520	Construct Overpass	1.000	\$ 5.0																	
0921-06		North Arterial: Hidalgo County Line to US 77	Constr 4 Ln Managed Access Arterial	8.000	\$ 14.0	\$ 14.0															14.0	
			Total		\$ 142.0	\$ 58.5																
	<b>LP 499 502</b>	FM 507 S. to FM 106																				
1137-02		FM 507 S. to FM 106	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	2.212	\$ 1.5	\$ 1.5																
1137-02		FM 507 S. to FM 106	Widen to 6 Lane Arterial	2.212	\$ 4.5	\$ 4.5						4.5										
			Total		\$ 6.0	\$ 6.0																
	<b>LP 499 503</b>	FM 106 S. to US 77/83		2.398																		
1137-02		FM 106 S. to Bus 77	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	1.385	\$ 1.5	\$ 1.0		1.0														
1137-01		Bus 77 S. to US 77/83	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	1.013	\$ 1.5	\$ 1.0		1.0														
			Total		\$ 3.0	\$ 2.0																
	<b>SP 206 (Tyler - Harrison)</b>	US 77/83 to LP 499		3.443																		
1425-03		US 77/83 to LP499	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	3.443	\$ 3.0	\$ 1.5		1.5														
			Total		\$ 3.0	\$ 1.5																
	<b>US 77 505</b>	FM 509 Extension to US 77/83 Interchange		9.276																		
0327-08		FM 509 Ext @ Orphanage Rd to 1.2 Mi S	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	1.238	\$ 1.0																	
0039-07		1.2 Mi S of FM509 Ext @ Orphanage Rd to US77/83	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	1.000	\$ 1.0																	
0327-08		FM509 Ext @ Orphanage Rd to 1.2 Mi S	Widen to 6 lanes	1.238	\$ 10.0																	
0039-07		1.2 Mi S of FM509 Ext @ Orphanage Rd to US77/83	Widen to 6 lanes	8.038	\$ 80.0																	
			Total		\$ 92.0	\$ -																
	<b>Bu 77S 506</b>	US 77 S. to LP 499		8.803																		
0327-08		US 77 S. to .65 Mi North of LP 499	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	8.150	\$ 2.0	\$ 1.0		1.0														
0039-12		.65 Mi North of LP 499 S. to LP 499	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	0.653	\$ 0.3	\$ 0.3		0.3														
			Total		\$ 2.3	\$ 1.3																
	<b>Bu 77S 507</b>	LP 499 to SH 345																				
0039-12		LP 499 to SH 345	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	3.807	\$ 1.5	\$ 1.0			1.0													
0039-12		LP 499 to SH 345	Widen to 6 Lanes	3.807	\$ 8.0	\$ 8.0				8.0												
	<b>Bu 77S 508</b>		Total		\$ 9.5	\$ 9.0																
0039-12		SH 345 to US 77/83	ITS/Operational/Access Mng																			
		SH 345 to Bus 77,S	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	2.264	\$ 1.0																	
			Total		\$ 1.0	\$ -																
	<b>Δ FM 509 Extension 509</b>	US77 @ Orphanage Rd E & S to FM508 @ exist FM509																				A Commission action needed to be FM 509.
New Locatio		US77 @ Orphanage Rd E & S to FM508	Construct New Loop Extension	10.000	\$ 5.0	\$ 5.0						5.0										
			Total		\$ 5.0	\$ 5.0																
	<b>FM 509 510</b>	FM 508 to Business 77																				
2369-01		FM 508 S. to Bus 77	Widen to 4 Lane Divided Rur	7.858	\$ 10.0																	
			Total		\$ 10.0	\$ -																
	<b>FM 509 511</b>	Business 77 to Free Trade Bridge @ Los Indios																				Pharr District Final Proposal Feb 04, 2003
2369-01		Bus 77 to US 77/83	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	0.956	\$ 0.5	\$ 0.5				0.5												
1065-01		US 77/83 to FM 675	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	5.512	\$ 1.0	\$ 0.8			0.8													
1065-03		FM 675 S. to Free Trade Int'l Bridge	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt	3.863	\$ 1.0	\$ 0.8			0.8													
2369-01		Bus 77 to US 77/83	Widen to 4 lane Divided	0.956	\$ 1.0																	
1065-01		US 77/83 to FM 675	Widen to 4 lane Divided	5.512	\$ 4.5	\$ 4.5													4.5			
<b>1065-01</b>		<b>@ FM 800</b>	<b>Construct Overpass</b>	<b>1.500</b>	<b>\$ 5.0</b>																	
<b>1065-01</b>		<b>@ FM 675</b>	<b>Construct Overpass</b>	<b>1.500</b>	<b>\$ 5.0</b>																	
1065-03		FM 675 S. to Free Trade Int'l Bridge	Widen to 4 lane Divided	3.863	\$ 3.5	\$ 3.5														3.5		
			Total		\$ 21.5	\$ 10.1																
				6.500																		
	<b>FM 508 512</b>	<b>FM 508 US 77 E. to FM 509</b>			6.500																	
0342-04		US 77 E to FM 509	ITS/Operational/Acc Mngmnt		6.500	\$ 12.0																
			Total		\$ 12.0	\$ -																
			Grand Total		\$ 295.9	\$ 93.4	4.5	4.8	4.6	8.0	8.0	9.5	7.0	4.0	7.0	5.0	-	9.0	4.5	3.5	14.0	
							5 yr Sub total = 29.9					5 yr Sub total = 32.5					5 yr Sub total = 31.0					
							Annual Target 6.4					15 Year Target 95.4					15 Year Project Total 93.4					
																	DIFFERENCE 2.0					

NOTE: ITALICS font represents additions resulting from comments made by City of Harlingen, City Engineer Julio Cerda and Director of Planning & Development Michelle R. Leftwich, AICP



**SAN ANGELO DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES**

CSJ	Project	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (miles)	Total Const	Phase Const	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
0158-02-	US 67	From LP 306 to US 277	Construct freeway and interchange	1.000	13.00	13.00			13.00													
					-	-																
					-	-																
				Total	13.00	13.00																
0264-07-	FM 388 & LP 306 FM 765 & LP 306	At FM 388 & LP 306	Construct interchange	1.000	7.00	7.00								7.00								
0264-07-		At FM 765 & LP 306	Construct interchange	1.000	7.00	7.00								7.00								
					-	-																
				Total	14.00	14.00																
0070-02-	US 87	From LP 306 to US 277	Construct interchange	1.000	12.75	12.75												12.75				
					-	-																
					-	-																
				Total	12.75	12.75																
				Grand Total	25.75	39.75	-	-	13.00	-	-	-	-	14.00	-	-	-	-	12.75	-	-	
							5-yr Subtotal= 13.00					5-yr Subtotal= 14.00					5-yr Subtotal= 12.75					

TYLER DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES (LONGVIEW)

CSJ	Project	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (mi)	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
1763-02	<b>LOOP 281</b> Corridor 1B	From FM 2206 to US 259	Reconstruct as 4 Lane Divided Freeway, Grade Separations and One-way Frontage Roads	6.1	116	39	9.7						16.7				12.7					Entire project cost for this segment is \$116 million. Only a some of Loop 281 may be improved.
0545-04	<b>SH 42</b> Corridor 8B	From I-20 to US 80	Reconstruct as 4 Lane Divided, TMS & Grade Separations	5.9	15	15				15.0												
2073-01	<b>FM 2206</b> Corridor 2A	From Loop 281 to SH 42	Reconstruct as 4 Lane Divided & TMS	3.7	12	12									12.0							
0096-04	<b>US 80</b> Corridor 7C	From Loop 281 W. to Loop 281 E.	Transportation Mgmt. System/Intelligent Transp.System	7.4	4	4		4.0														
	<b>Outer Loop</b> Corridor 8D	From SH 300 to US 259	Construct 2 Lane Freeway w/Grade Separations & Transportation Mgmt. System	4.0	16	16											16.0					May substitute Corridor 8C
				Total	0	0																
				<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>163.0</b>	<b>86.1</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>12.7</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	
							<b>5-yr Subtotal= 28.7</b>					<b>5-yr Subtotal= 28.7</b>					<b>5-yr Subtotal= 28.7</b>					

**TYLER DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES (TYLER)**

CSJ	Project	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (mi)	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
3847-01	Loop 49 West Corridor #1	From SH 155 to SH 64	Construct 2 Lane Controlled Access	16.7	51.7	20	20															Tyler MPO Leveraging commitment as
		From SH 64 W to IH 20	Construct 2 Lane Controlled Access		65.7	7						7										
		From SH 64 W to IH 20	Construct 2 Lane Controlled Access			18											18					
			Total		117.4	45																
2075-01	Loop 323 West Corridor #6	From US 69 S to US 69 N	Reconstruct as 6 Lane divided with raised medians, TMS, and Grade Separations	7.843	58.3	10			10													
2075-02				Total	58.3	10																
0165-01	SH 110 S Corridor #2	From SH 31 to Loop 49 E	Reconstruct as 6 Lane divided with raised medians, TMS, and Grade Separations	6.391	40.3																	
0345-01																						
		at Loop 323	Grade seperation			5.5																
			Total	40.3	5.5																	
	Loop 49 East Corridor #2	From FM 756 to SH 110	Construct 2 Lane Controlled Access	2	13.6	13							13									
				Total	13.6	13																
2075-02	Loop 323 E Corridor #14	From US 69 S to US 271	Reconstruct as 6 Lane divided with raised medians, TMS, and Grade Separations	7.88	78.6	10								10								
1790-02				Total	78.6	10																
0245-05	SH 64 W Corridor #26	From Loop 323 W to FM 279	Reconstruct as 6 Lane divided with raised medians, TMS, and Grade Separations	5.65	30.9	5.5										5.5						
				Total	30.9	5.5																
	Loop 49 Ext N Corridor #3	From IH 20 to SH 69 N	Construct 2 Lane Controlled Access	7	18.5	13												13				
				Total	18.5	13																
0492-04	FM 756 Corridor #22	from Loop 323 S to Jeff Davis Dr	ITS/TMS	6.274	23.2	2.2													2.2			
		From Jeff Davis to Loop 49	Reconstruct as 4 Lane Divided with Flush median & TMS	Total	23.2	2.2																
0345-01	SH 110 S Corridor #17	From Loop 49 to FM 344	ITS/TMS	6.594	0.35	0.35														0.35		
0345-02																						
			Total	0.35	0.35																	
0424-01	SH 31 E Corridor #11	From Loop 323 E to FM 757	ITS/TMS	9.299	0.35	0.35														0.35		
				Total	0.35	0.35																
0245-06	Sh 64 E Corridor #24	From Loop 323 E to FM 2607	ITS/TMS	10.834	0.35	0.35														0.35		
			Total	0.35	0.35																	
2833-01	Spur 364 Corridor #18	From Loop 323 W to SH 31 W	ITS/TMS	4.018	0.35	0.35												0.35				
				Total	0.35	0.35																
0492-01	FM 14 Corridor #25	From Loop 323 N to IH-20	ITS/TMS	4.509	0.35	0.35												0.35				
				Total	0.35	0.35																
2558-01	Spur 248 Corridor #23	From Loop 323 to SH 64 E	ITS/TMS	3.601	0.35	0.35												0.35				
			Total	0.35	0.35																	
0164-03	SH 31 W Corridor #9	From Loop 323 W to FM 315 in Chandler	ITS/TMS	8.64	0.35	0.35												0.35				
0164-04																						
			Total	0.35	0.35																	
				Grand Total	383.25	106.65	20	0	10	0	5.5	7	13	10	0	5.5	19.4	13	2.2	1.05	0	
							5-yr Subtotal= 35.5					5-yr Subtotal= 35.5					5-yr Subtotal= 35.65					

**WACO DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES (KTUTS)**

CSJ	Project	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (mi)	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
	Corridor #1																					
0184-04-031	SW Loop 363	S. 5th Street to UP Railroad	Construct frontage roads with grade separation for Spur 290 and future 5th Street.	1.120	10.0	10.0				10.0												
0184-04-030		I-35 Interchange to 5th Street	Construct main lanes including 57th Street improvements.	1.800	25.0	25.0												25.0				
		UP railroad to SH 95	access facility with one way continuous frontage roads.	1.100	8.0	8.0												8.0				
			Total		43.0	43.0																
	Corridor #2																					
0231-02-035	US 190	Phase 1a Copperas Cove By Pass (100% Local Funding)	Phase 1a: Construct a southbound frontage road from US 190 east to Old Copperas Cove Road		1.0	1.0	1.0															
0231-02-035		Phase 1b Copperas Cove By Pass	Phase 1b: Construct interchanges and connecting roadways at FM 3046 and FM 116 (include land fill remediation)		10.5	10.5	10.5															
0231-02-035		Phase 2 Copperas Cove By Pass	Phase 2: Construct 4-lane section from FM 116 to Old Copperas Cove Road		20.5	20.5		20.5														
0231-02-035		Phase 3 Copperas Cove By Pass	Construct east and west connections to the existing US 190		24.0	24.0						24.0										
0231-03-106		Willow Spring Rd to FM 2410	Realign ramps & widen frontage roads	6.750	11.0	11.0					11.0											
		FM 2410 to Nola Ruth Road	Realign ramps & widen frontage roads	2.000	4.0	4.0					4.0											
		US 190 Extension - I-35 east to SH 36/US 190	Construct new location a 4 lane rural divided highway Extension of US 190	12.700	40.0																	
0231-03-103		W.S. Young to FM 2410	Widen main lanes from 4 to 6 lanes.	3.250	9.2	9.2									9.2							
			Total		120.20	80.2																
	Corridor #3																					
0320-06-001	NW Loop 363	SH 36 north to I-35 Phase I	Construct northbound frontage and intersection at SH 53/SH 36.	3.950	11.5	11.5						11.5										
0184-04-038		SH 36 to Hopi Trail Phase II	Widen main lanes reconstruct intersection at FM 2305 & upgrade existing frontage roads	1.400	8.0	8.0								8.0								
		IH 35 North to SH 53/SH36 Phase III	Construct main lanes and interchanges at Lucius McClevey and Industrial Boulevard	3.950	19.0	19.0												19.0				
			Total		38.5	38.5																
	Corridor #4																					
	SH 36	SH 317 to Leon River Bridge	Widen to 4 lane divided rural with depressed median.	5.000	22.0																	
			Total		22.0	0.0																
			Grand Total		223.7	161.7	11.5	20.5	0.0	10.0	15.0	11.5	24.0	0.0	8.0	9.2	0.0	25.0	8.0	19.0	0.0	
							5-yr Subtotal= 57.0					5-yr Subtotal= 52.7					5-yr Subtotal= 52.0					

**WACO DISTRICT MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES (WACO)**

CSJ	Project	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (mi)	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
	<b>Corridor #1</b>																					
0258-09-112	SH6/ East Loop 340	Brazos River to SP 484/SH 6	Phase 1 - Widen to 4 lane freeway.		11.0	11.0	11.0															
2362-01-017		US 84 to Sp 484/SH 6	Phase 1 - Widen to 4 lanes divided with grade separation at Orchard Lane.		15.0	15.0			15.0													
		IH-35 to US 77	Widen to 4 lane freeway with frontage roads and reconstruct interchange at US 77.		14.0	14.0								14.0								
0258-09-112		Brazos River to SP 484/SH 6	Phase 2 - Construct overpass for LP 340 over SP 484.		14.0	14.0												14.0				
0258-09-112		Brazos River to SP 484/SH 6	Phase 3 - Construct direct connects for northbound SH 6 to southbound LP 340 and northbound LP 340 to southbound SH 6		14.0																	
2362-01-017		US 84 to Sp 484/SH 6	Phase 2 - Construct grade separation at FM 2491.		5.0																	
2311-01-020		LP 340/FM 3051 at US Business 77	Construct grade separated interchange		5.0																	
			<b>Total</b>		<b>78.0</b>	<b>54.0</b>																
	<b>Corridor #2</b>																					
0258-08-025	SH 6	Doshier Ln/SP 412 to Baylor Camp Rd	Phase 1 - Widen to four lanes divided with grade separation at FM 185.		12.0	12.0			12.0													
		IH 35 to US 84	Widen to six lanes.		22.0	22.0						22.0										
0258-09-900		Bridges over Lake Waco	Replace bridges and approaches and widen to accommodate six lanes.		24.0																	
		US 84 to Doshier Ln/SP 412	Widen to six lanes.		30.0																	
			<b>Total</b>		<b>88.0</b>	<b>34.0</b>																
	<b>Corridor #3</b>																					
	FM 185	FM 1637 to FM 933	Construct 2 lane FM facility.		16.0	16.0													16.0			
1969-02-013		SH 6 to FM 1637	Widen to 4 lanes divided.		22.0																	
0909-22-098		US 84 to SH 6	Construct 2 lane FM facility.		15.0																	
		FM 933 to IH 35	Construct 2 lane FM facility.		6.0																	
			<b>Total</b>		<b>59.0</b>	<b>16.0</b>																
	<b>Corridor #4</b>																					
	US 84	SH 6/West LP 340 to FM 1695	Phase 1 - Reconstruct and relocate exit/entrance ramps and reconstruct interchange at FM 1695.		15.0	14.0								14.4								
		South Bosque River to Bosque Lane	Phase 1 - Widen to 4 lanes with frontage roads with grade separation at FM 2837		12.0	12.0											12.0					
0055-07-054		SH 317 to Bosque Lane	Widen to 4 lanes with frontage roads.		48.0																	
		SH 6/West LP 340 to Wickson Rd	Phase 2 - Widen to six lanes.		12.0																	
0055-08-090		Wickson Road to South Bosque River	Construct grade separation at Bush Drive.		10.0																	
			<b>Total</b>		<b>97.0</b>	<b>26.0</b>																
			<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>322.0</b>	<b>130.0</b>	11.0	0.0	27.0	0.0	0.0	22.0	0.0	14.0	14.4	0.0	12.0	0.0	14.0	16.0	0.0	
							5-yr Subtotal= 38.0					5-yr Subtotal= 50.4					5-yr Subtotal= 42.0					

**WICHITA FALLS DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES**

CSJ	Project	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (mi)	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
0156-04-092	US 82/277 Corridor #1	0044-01-080)	Construct Direct Connect Interchange of 2 Freeways	0.4	18	17	17														Kell Freeway and Elevated Freeway Interchange	
0156-04-080		Fairway Blvd.	Construct Freeway Mainlanes	2.4	20	20						20									100% Complete on PS&E, ROW, UTI	
				Total	38	37															100% Complete on PS&E, ROW, UTI	
0249-01	US 281 Corridor #2	From FM 1954 to Wichita Falls City Limits	Widen to 5-Lane Arterial	2.0	2	2			2												US 281 Gateway to WFS Urban Area from South	
			Total	2	2																	
0283-06	SH 79 Corridor #3	From FM 1954 to FM 369	Widen to 5-Lane Arterial	9.3	15	15														15	SH 79 Gateway to WFS Urban Area from the South	
			Total	15	15																	
2582-01	FM 890 Corridor #4	From IH 44 to SH 240	Widen to 5-Lane Arterial	1.3	4	4												4			FM 890 Connection to Loop 11 and Eastside Dr.	
																					Serves as Principal Arterial for Shepperd AFB and	
																					Eastside Residential Community	
			Total	4	4																	
				Grand Total	42	41	17	0	2	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	15	
							5-yr Subtotal= 19					5-yr Subtotal= 20					5-yr Subtotal= 19					

**YOAKUM DISTRICT PROPOSED MAJOR PLAN PROJECT PHASES**

CSJ	Project	Priority Phasing Limits	Scope of Work	Length (mi)	Total Const (\$M)	Phase Const (\$M)	1st 5-Year Phase					2nd 5-Year Phase					3rd 5-Year Phase					Comments
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
0088-06	US HWY 59 Corridor #1	At Intersection with US Hwy 77	Construct overhead direct connection ramps	1.0	15	15		15														
2350-01	Loop 463 Corridor # 2	From FM 1315 to US 59BU	Construct Freeway Main lanes and overpasses	3.5	35	0																
		From FM 1315 to Mockingbird	Construct Freeway Main lanes and overpasses	1.6		16						16										
		From Mockingbird to US 59BU	Construct Freeway Main lanes and overpasses	1.9		19							19									
2350-01	US 77 Corridor #3	From 1.04 mi West of US 87 to US 59BU	Add 2 lanes for 4-lane divided highway	6.2	9	0																
		From 1.04 mi West of US 87 to .9 mi East of FM 1685	Add 2 lanes for 4-lane divided highway	1.8		5										5						
		From W. of FM 236 to US 59BU	Add 2 lanes for 4-lane divided highway	4.4		4													4			
0370-05	US 77 BU Corridor # 4	From Airline Rd to US59 BU	Add 2 lanes for 7- lane urban facility		5	5														5		
				Total	64	64																
				Grand Total	64	64	0	15	0	0	16	19	0	0	0	0	5	0	4	5	0	
							5-yr Subtotal= 31					5-yr Subtotal= 19					5-yr Subtotal= 14					

## Appendix F - Comments from Workgroup Members

### Unified Transportation Plan (UTP) Category 3 - Dissenting Opinion

By Brad McCaleb, P.E.  
Study Director, Texarkana MPO

#### The UTP Process: A Map To The Future

In August 2001 the Texas Transportation Commission's (the Commission) Transportation Working Group issued a report to Governor Rick Perry, members of the Texas Legislature (the Legislature) and all Texans entitled *Texas Transportation Partnerships . . . connecting you to the World*. On page 12 under a section titled "Streamlined Project Delivery" the report states that it is in the public's best interest that entire **corridors** be completed. On page 13 the report recommends that, to improve project delivery, partnership actions should include the consolidation of projects or the contracting of **corridor segments** (bold added).

In a letter to Commission Chairman John W. Johnson dated September 18, 2001, Governor Rick Perry stated:

"I encourage the commission to take a comprehensive approach to include finance, planning and delivery of projects. Of **particular interest** are **methods to deliver continuous and complete corridors**, which may well get **needed** projects completed more quickly, more efficiently and with a minimum of inconvenience to motorists and the surrounding community" (bold added).

In a letter to the Chairpersons of Texas MPOs dated March 5, 2002, Mr. Amadeo Saenz, Jr., P.E., Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Assistant Executive Director stated:

"...the Texas Legislature and the Governor requested that the Texas Transportation Commission consider a simplified procedure for planning, programming, and development of **complete and continuous corridors**" (bold added).

In the "Restructuring the UTP Questionnaire" questions specifically refer to corridors, competition between corridors and the design and construction of projects in corridors as follows:

- Do you concur with the emphasis on **corridors** in the mobility categories?
- Do you feel the department will realize a savings in construction costs by designing and constructing projects in **corridors**?



- Do you agree with the **corridor competition** based on Metropolitan, Urban and Statewide Connectivity categories?
- Would you be willing to participate on a committee established to determine **corridor evaluation criteria**? (bold added)

In a document titled *Proposal to Implement TTI Recommendations* the first paragraph on page 4 states that **corridor** selection would be limited to **competition** between similar areas.

The Texas Transportation Institute (TTI), under contract with TxDOT, developed the UTP Restructuring process using a hierarchy of workgroups to carry out the direction provided by Governor Perry, the Legislature and the Commission. Under this process the Corridor Guidelines Workgroup (CGWG) was responsible for establishing and submitting charges to the Category 2, 3 & 4 Workgroups. This was a logical and reasonable structure and it should have been adhered to throughout the process.

### **The Road We Traveled**

At the first meeting held July 23 – 24, 2002 the Category 3 Workgroup (Cat 3 WG) determined that the charge from the CGWG was to identify corridors within the urban areas and prioritize corridor segments statewide on a competitive basis using a set of weighted criteria. The workgroup was given until November 2002 to complete its task.

On August 12 – 13, 2002 the workgroup met for the second time and continued to evaluate, in detail, individual criteria for inclusion in this process.

At the third meeting, August 26 – 27, 2002, the workgroup held a detailed discussion about the UTP Restructuring Process. Bank balance allocation and regional distribution were discussed. The workgroup requested information related to bank balance allocations, regional distribution and the estimated funding level for Category 3. Mr. Todd Carlson, the workgroup facilitator, discussed these issues with Mr. Montie Wade, TTI's project manager. The response to the workgroup was that using population percentages and/or bank balance allocations would be "passing the buck" to the MPOs. The workgroup was told that the funding information for Cat 3 was not needed because our task was to identify corridors and prioritize them on a statewide basis **not to develop a method of distributing funds** (emphasis added).

The next meeting took place September 23 – 24, 2002. The workgroup was told the November deadline was flexible because the Commission preferred we take the time to do a good job rather than rush to meet a deadline. Mr. Wade addressed the workgroup and stated that our workgroup was asked by the Commission to look at corridors and put them into some hierarchy of priorities. Mr. Wade and Mr. Max Proctor, TxDOT staff, provided additional comments

regarding the issues of regional funds distribution and bank balance allocation. Mr. Wade stated that our workgroup was never meant to develop a bank balance program and that our group should address statewide priority needs. Mr. Proctor said that we were asked to help the commission determine what the most important projects are in our areas and to merge the priorities against the criteria, ranked statewide. Based on these comments the workgroup decided to continue developing a criteria based formula that would meet the charge issued by the CGWG.

On October 15 – 16, 2002, the workgroup met for the fifth time to finalize the DRAFT formula for selecting corridors and corridor segments based on merit using the selected criteria and weightings. Workgroup members agreed to submit the required corridor related data by October 31, 2002. The submitted corridors would be evaluated using the DRAFT formula and the results would be emailed to members for review.

No meetings were held in November or December partially due to the holidays but primarily due to the failure of TxDOT district offices and MPO representatives from five urban areas to submit the necessary corridor data for evaluation within the time agreed to.

The sixth meeting took place January 14 - 15, 2003. At this meeting the workgroup watched a video of the December 19, 2002 Transportation Commission meeting and received words of “encouragement” from Mr. Jim Randall, Division Director, Transportation Planning and Programming - TxDOT. Mr. Proctor informed the workgroup that based on the video and a meeting with Commissioner Nichols that the Commission would not approve our formula because it did not ensure that every urban area would receive some amount of funding (i.e., regional distribution). Mr. Proctor also told the workgroup that a process must be agreed to by February 1, 2003 so the public involvement timeline can be met. This gave the workgroup 13 days to complete its task. Mr. Proctor stated that our workgroups charge had been changed based on comments from the Commission. No written documentation of a change to the original charge was provided to the workgroup. Mr. Proctor then presented the Cat 2 WG funding distribution plan to our workgroup.

On January 29, 2003 the workgroup met and, based on comments from the Commission and the new February 1 deadline, finalized adoption of the Cat 2 WGs funding distribution plan.

### **We Can't Get There From Here**

The funding distribution approach submitted by the Cat 3 WG does not meet the charge issued by the CGWG. Specifically, CGWG charges 4 through 8 are not met.

Charge 4 is not met because projects have not been reviewed by the workgroup to determine whether they are eligible for consideration for prioritization. The projects were simply listed based on preliminary estimates and annual funding limits.

Charge 5 is not met because projects are not scored using the weighted criteria from the funds distribution plan. The criteria used in the funds distribution plan are based on the characteristics of the urban areas and are not applicable to individual corridors or corridor projects.

Charge 6 is not met because projects are not ranked or prioritized based on criteria scoring. The criteria only determine how much estimated funding will go to each urban area.

Charge 7 is not met because the Statewide Connectivity Corridor is not considered in the prioritization process. Projects will simply be built when and if an urban area has accumulated enough funds from Category 3 and/or other source(s).

Charge 8 is not met because while the funding distribution plan ensures that every urban area receives some funding it does not ensure, nor does it even consider, distribution across the highway system.

The criteria developed by the Cat 2 WG and utilized in the funds distribution plan simply determine how much funding a particular urban area is estimated to receive in a given year. Corridors are not prioritized based on merit or need because the projects do not compete against each other for prioritization as outlined by the Governor, the Legislature and the Commission. The projects submitted by Cat 3 WG are prioritized solely on the basis of how much funding is expected to be available during a given time period.

The justifications for these criteria that were submitted in the Category 3 Final Report were developed after the Cat 2 funds distribution plan was adopted, not as a part of the Cat 3 WGs deliberations. On this point the Cat 3 WG once again failed to perform its duties as directed by the CGWG.

## **Evaluation of Criteria**

The intention behind developing criteria was to have a means of evaluating corridors and prioritizing those corridors on a competitive basis between urban areas. The criteria developed and applied in the funds distribution plan are not used as a means of competition between corridors but rather as a way of determining what percentage of Category 3 funding a particular urban area will

receive. The need for or the merit of a corridor project in one urban area in relation to other corridor projects around the state is never addressed.

Population: This criterion equates transportation funding level to population. The argument is that the larger an urban areas population the more funding the area deserves. This approach gives little credit to the smaller urban areas that are situated along major freight routes, between significant points of interest or happen to be a popular destination. The traffic may not originate from the urban area population base but it does impact traffic operations within the urban boundary.

Lane miles: This criterion attempts to quantify system capacity without really measuring capacity. Areas with more lane miles are awarded more funding than an area with fewer lane miles.

Centerline miles: Additional capacity available on a four-lane facility as opposed to a two-lane facility is not taken into account under this criterion. The use of both centerline miles and lane miles amounts to “double counting”. Again areas that have a larger existing highway system and more capacity are awarded more funding.

The use of lane miles and centerline miles might be justifiable if maintenance were the issue being addressed; however, these two criteria are not appropriate for addressing mobility issues.

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT): This criterion is used to quantify the volume of traffic being served by a given area. Areas with high VMT but lower percent trucks on their system relative to other areas are still awarded a larger percentage of funding.

Truck VMT: This criterion is an attempt to quantify the impact of trucks on the transportation system. Areas with higher truck volumes are allotted more funding relative to other urban areas.

Before adopting Cat 2 WGs funds distribution plan, the Cat 3 WG decided to use Level of Service (LOS) in its DRAFT formula, rather than VMT or Truck VMT, because it is universally accepted as a measurement of congestion.

Population below the Poverty Level: This criterion has no impact on the operational performance of the transportation system. This criterion awards areas with larger populations below the poverty level with more funding. Currently the data used for this criterion would be developed at the county level even though the Census Bureau makes it available at the Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) level. This means that an entire county's subject population is credited to an MPO even if only a small portion of the county is within the MPO study area boundary. In some cases there are multiple MPOs in one county. In this situation both MPOs receive credit for the entire subject population in the county thus

double counting that data. These two circumstances result in an artificially inflated “total” population under the poverty level value that is used to calculate an urban area’s percentage of the subject population. The results are thus skewed, further punishing areas with smaller populations under the poverty level.

Injury and Fatal Accidents: This criterion is addressed as a safety issue and is already covered by Category 8 funding. In addition the problems related to this criterion are typically single point improvements, not corridor based. In the past the data used to evaluate this type project was based on a three-year trailing average of incidents. This is not a good basis upon which to determine funding for projects expected to go to construct authority sometime after the year 2013. This data would be developed at the county level also; therefore, the previous arguments related to this point apply.

### **How To Paint An Apple Orange**

Following are some suggestions for improving the funds distribution plan so the criteria will reflect factors that more directly impact system performance. Note that members of the Cat 3 WG made some of these suggestions at the January 14<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> meetings but they were dismissed because of the February 1 deadline placed on the workgroup and the high level of frustration the workgroup was experiencing.

Replace VMT, Truck VMT and Lane Miles with VMT (adjusted for percent trucks) divided by Lane Mile. This criterion would better address the issue of capacity and would account for the impact of heavy trucks on system operations and maintenance.

Eliminate Centerline Miles as a criterion or use the inverse of this criterion so that areas with less existing capacity receive more funding.

Eliminate Population Below the Poverty Level as a criterion. This criterion has no direct correlation to traffic demand or operations. Another option would be to use the inverse of this criterion to allocate funding. This would be justified on the basis that individuals in the subject group have a lower ownership and utilization of automobiles and therefore have little impact on system operations.

Eliminate Accident Data as a criterion. This issue is addressed under a separate funding category and using data on a countywide basis is inequitable.

Add a minimum allocation component. A minimum allocation of \$2 million per year would have a significant positive impact for small urban areas while still allowing the larger urban areas to pursue needed projects.

## **The End of The Road**

The Cat 3 WG DRAFT formula met the charges as laid out by the CGWG. The DRAFT formula was developed by consensus and met the direction provided by the Governor, the Legislature, the Commission and the CGWG. The DRAFT formula accomplished this by including a statewide prioritization of corridor level projects selected by competition and based on criteria that quantified need. The Cat 2 funds distribution plan submitted by the Cat 3 WG does not fulfill the goals of the UTP Restructuring Process but it does distribute funds to every urban area and allows the public involvement timeline to be met.

Faults in the process:

- Lack of communication between the Commission, TxDOT and the Workgroups
- Failure to develop a realistic timeline
- Lack of commitment to the process established
- Lack of faith in the workgroups.

A separate funding category should be created for interstate highways in metropolitan and urban areas. These projects simply cost too much to be included in the urban mobility category. Urban mobility funding should be reserved for projects that address local mobility on the state system and the connectivity between the state and local systems.

**On Official Waco MPO Stationery**

March 24, 2003

Mr. Todd B. Carlson  
Associate Transportation Researcher  
Urban Analysis Program  
Texas Transportation Institute  
The Texas A&M University System  
110 N. Davis Dr., Suite 101  
Arlington, TX 76013

RE: UTP Restructuring Work Group - Category 3

Dear Mr. Carlson,

This letter is in response to the process developed by the UTP Category 3 Work Group (C3WG). Although developed through a consensus of the members, my belief is that this process does not meet the original charge given to the work group to identify and complete critical corridors within urban areas between 50,000 and 200,000 in population. Additionally, my belief is that this process results in the expenditure of federal highway dollars on projects that are of lesser importance to the state while critical projects remain unfunded.

When the C3WG began work, the initial charge was to identify key urban corridors that would compliment the statewide corridors and eliminate obvious gaps within the state highway system. Funding for these corridors and the programming year would then be determined by criteria chosen by the C3WG. The only caveat to this was that the C3WG should avoid a situation where one or more urban areas receive no funds.

As part of the original charge, the Waco MPO identified 4 corridors that we believed met the objective of complimenting the statewide corridors and eliminate obvious gaps within the system. These corridors followed the priorities identified within our Metropolitan Transportation Plan as adopted and later amended by our Policy Board. These corridors competed well according to the criteria initially identified by the C3WG. The one problem with the initial criteria is that some areas received little or no funding over the 15 year period within which the C3WG was to distribute funds. This problem could have been overcome by providing a minimum allocation level for each urban area. Instead, the C3WG chose to completely change category 3 into a bank balance program by distributing funds based upon county statistics rather than the merits of individual corridors.

With a bank balance type program each urban area may decide for themselves how to spend their pot of money without regard to how their projects

fit with the statewide corridors. Additionally, since corridors no longer must compete based on their own merits, urban areas may now fund projects that do not fit within any logical corridor or are not significant on anything but the local level. A primary concern is that instead of eliminating system gaps, the chosen procedure is likely to create them.

For the Waco Area, we chose to remain with the 4 corridors initially identified as part of this process. With the new proposed allocations for category 3, we could not completely fund any of these 4 corridors within the FY 2015 to 2029 period. In order to ensure that the most important aspects of each corridor could be completed, we split each of these corridors into multiple phases, in some cases as many as 3 or 4 phases. The final outcome as agreed to by the C3WG leaves these vital and important gaps in the Waco and the state transportation network unfunded until after the year 2030.

In creating a bank balance program, the C3WG identified several regional criteria to determine how to distribute funds to the various urban areas. These criteria include population, lane miles, centerline miles, vehicle miles traveled, vehicle miles traveled by trucks, population living below the poverty level and total number of accidents involving injuries or fatalities. Many of these criteria are at best questionable as to identifying the areas with the greatest highway needs. Lane miles, centerline miles and population living below the poverty level are especially questionable.

Lane miles and centerline miles are meaningless as measures of highway capacity without taking into account factors such as facility type, speed, cross streets and driveway access. In addition, these criteria are usually only a measure of land area. For instance, Hudspeth County (Population 3,344) has more lane miles on the state system (756.4) than does Brazos County (Population 152,415 - Lane Miles 692.5). Hudspeth County does not have a greater need for additional highway capacity than does Brazos County, however, under this criteria they would receive more funds.

Use of the population living below the poverty level as a criterion for highway construction is also problematic. As income decreases, access to automobiles also decreases. Persons living in poverty who have access to an automobile make fewer trips by automobile and those trips tend to be shorter in length. Persons living in poverty do, however, utilize mass transit at a far greater rate than the population as a whole; walk more and for greater distances and utilize bicycles more frequently. Clearly the best method to increase mobility for persons below the poverty level is to provide additional funds for transit and for bicycle and pedestrian projects, not highways.

The use of accident injury and fatality statistics poses yet another problem. Accident statistics are only useful if applied to specific corridors where the positive or negative impact of a project can be directly measured. Given the



bank balance nature of the proposed process, there is no guarantee that these funds will be used for anything that will actually decrease highway injuries or fatalities within a given urban area.

Finally, all of the criteria used are in the form of static numbers that describe current conditions. Given that each urban area has a traffic model developed in cooperation with the TP&P section of TxDOT capable of forecasting future traffic conditions, serious consideration should have been given to addressing future, as well as existing conditions.

The State of Texas is estimated to have only enough funds to address approximately one-third of the State's transportation needs. With that in mind, it is critically important that those projects with the greatest need should be funded first. A bank balance approach, which was only arrived at in the final weeks of the C3WG efforts and under considerable pressure to finish quickly, does ensure that all urban areas receive some level of funding, but does not ensure that important regional corridors are completed. Additionally, problems such as high accident locations, traffic bottlenecks and system gaps are not addressed by the coarseness of regional statistics. For these reasons, I cannot support the recommendations of the Category 3 Work Group.

Respectfully,

<original signed>

Christopher Evilia, AICP  
Acting Director

Cc: Waco MPO Policy Board



Metropolitan Planning Organization  
(940) 761-7451

March 17, 2003

Commissioner John Johnson  
Texas Transportation Commission  
125 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, TX 78701-2483

**Re: Category 3 Proposal**

Dear Commissioner Johnson:

As an appointed member of the Category 3 Workgroup, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to be involved with such a diverse and professional group. In addition, I salute the Commission's efforts to streamline a cumbersome process.

While I support the efforts of the 34-member group to come up with a formula for funding distribution to the 17 urban areas, I wish to go on record as questioning the results of the formulas when applied to all 17 areas.

Rather than re-create the wheel, the Category 3 workgroup applied formulas developed by the Category 2 group. I support this approach in theory. However, after running the formulas to determine the results of distribution to the urban areas, the discrepancies in the formula were highlighted. That is, urban areas with a smaller population were receiving considerably more money than areas of higher population, such as the Wichita Falls urbanized area. I feel that the source of this problem is those areas being allowed to count pass-through traffic on major US and Interstate highways (i.e. I-20, I-30, I-35, US 75, etc.). Now that we have identified the problem from our perspective, I wish to provide two possible solutions for your consideration.

Option 1

Only allow the counting of locally generated traffic or traffic with a local destination. These numbers would be different for each area and would result in a pro rata of traffic counts on identified major highways. The remaining traffic (pass-through) should be picked up by Category 4, Statewide Connectivity.

Option 2

Ensure that each of the 17 urbanized areas receive at least \$1 million per year and prorate the remainder based on the formula.

As you realize, we were under time constraints to complete this project. These constraints did not allow us to test these options and put the results before the membership.

It could rationally be argued that the 17 urbanized areas are more diverse in their needs, socioeconomic factors and demographics than the combined TMAs. Therefore, while I support the formula in theory (i.e. one-size-fits-all), I would argue that there are inequities built into the formulas, which happens when formulas are used with extremes in variables. While the formula variables are questionable for application to all 17 urbanized areas, Option 2 appears to present the potential to more equitably distribute funding and would still allow application of the formula. In other words, Option 2 would dilute the discrepancies. In addition, Option 2 would not require additional meetings.

Respectfully submitted,



Steve Seese, AICP  
MPO Director  
Member, Category 3 Workgroup

cc: Mr. Michael Behrens, P.E., Executive Director, TxDOT  
Mr. Joe Nelson, P.E., WFS District Engineer  
Mr. John Barton, P.E., WFS Director of TP&D  
Mr. Todd Carlton, Texas Transportation Institute