MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

SUBJECT: Segment Four and Five Committees Meeting

DATE: March 16, 2011

LOCATION: TxDOT Laredo District Office, Laredo, TX

ATTENDING: Attendees are listed on attached sign-in sheets (Attachment 1)

Purpose:

The purpose of this meeting was to: 1) review the Segment Four and Five Committees February 2011 conference call notes; 2) solicit segment committee input on potential public involvement materials, strategies, and activities that should be considered when developing a public outreach plan; 3) present information on statewide and district transportation funding; 4) review the current motor vehicle traffic crash data along U.S. 59, U.S. 77, U.S. 281, and SH 44 as well as review traffic forecasts for year 2035 for the I-69 program sections within the Segment Four and Five Committees limits; and 5) discuss next meeting activities. The meeting agenda is included as Attachment 2.

Welcome/Introductions:

Art Garcia, Facilitator for the Segment Four and Five Committees, welcomed the committee members and had them introduce themselves.

Administrative:

Art Garcia inquired if the committee members had any comments on the February 2011 conference call notes contained in the meeting packet. No comments were offered at the time. Art requested that if the committee members had any comments that they be forwarded to him or Doise Miers within one week. Once finalized, the notes will be distributed to the segment committee members prior to posting on the website. He also asked the committee members to closely review the February conference call participant list to make sure all of the participants were included. Art then noted that the final January 2011 meeting notes are included in the meeting packet.

Public Involvement Activities

Joe Charest of Katz & Associates and Ken Thompson of Thompson Marketing introduced themselves and referred the members to the meeting packet which contains a profile of their respective companies. Joe explained that they will be working with the five I-69 Segment Committees to develop customized public outreach plans that will synthesize the public involvement recommendations of the committee members and present public involvement strategies and activities that the segment committees could use to engage and communicate with the public. He referred the members to the meeting packet which contains a handout
outlining a series of public outreach planning discussion items and starter ideas based on previous input from the committee (Attachment 3). He then requested that the members provide feedback to the following questions:

1) What is the public’s general awareness of the I-69 planning process?
2) What public outreach has occurred to date?
3) What types of public information materials would be useful?
4) Have the committee members held or participated in any community or other local meetings?
5) What public communication strategies would be effective?
6) What are the three most important messages and ideas you would like to convey to the public?
7) What activities are needed in the coming months to reach the public?

The segment committee’s feedback to these questions was captured and will be included in the draft public outreach plan to be presented at the next meeting. In summary, the feedback of the members focused on the following points:

- Probably community leaders and a small segment of the population are aware of the current planning efforts for I-69 and associated projects such as the U.S. 77 Upgrade project and the U.S. 281 at Premont project because public meetings have been conducted for both of those projects.
- The existing “Future I-69” signs have helped make people aware that a future interstate is planned for south Texas. However, probably a large portion of the general public is not aware of the current I-69 planning efforts and the work of the segment committees.
- A certain segment of the population believes that the I-69 planning efforts are taking too long because the “Future I-69” signs have been in place for several years with no definitive progress being demonstrated to the public.
- There remains confusion over the status of the Trans-Texas Corridor (TTC) that needs to be clarified.
- Concern has been expressed by several individuals in Odem over the potential routing of I-69.
- There is a perception that there is competition between designating either U.S. 77 or U.S. 281 as I-69.
- Need to convey consistent up-to-date information on the planning of I-69 in south Texas to the public.
- There should be regular updates in the newspaper reporting I-69 planning activities including updates on the efforts of the segment committees. Updates based on the discussions at commissioner’s court are being reported.
- The segment committee’s update report has been useful.
- Need to investigate public involvement strategies for gathering input that have been successful in other communities.
- Important messages to communicate to the public include: the development of I-69 will utilize the footprint of existing highways to the greatest extent possible; the priority projects of the segment committees; a realistic timeline for developing I-69 projects; and the importance of I-69 to South Texas and the Rio Grande Valley relative to improving accessibility and safety, supporting economic development, and serving as an important emergency evacuation route.
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- Need to develop a consistent up-to-date message so that all the segment committee members are on the same page in delivering a clear message to their constituents regarding the status of I-69, the processes involved in developing I-69, and an anticipated timeline.
- In advance of any public involvement activities, it is important to develop responses to anticipated public questions regarding I-69, such as how will it be funded and when will the funding become available which in turn will influence the responses to questions like: when will I know where it will be located and will I be impacted.
- Some of the committee members expressed reluctance over holding public meetings at this stage until a plan on how the development of I-69 may proceed and how it would be funded is prepared.
- Suggestions on how to engage the public in the coming months include: developing brief fact sheets for publication in the newspaper, printing I-69 business cards for the segment committee members, selecting four or five people from each segment committee to inform local communities about I-69 and listen to their issues and questions, issuing press releases and newsletters, developing a dedicated I-69 website, and possibly holding smaller venue stakeholder meetings.

Statewide and District Funding Presentation

Art introduced the TxDOT District Engineers that were in attendance to make the presentation on statewide and district transportation funding. They included Albert Quintanilla, TxDOT Laredo District Engineer, and Mario Jorge, TxDOT Pharr District Engineer. Mario Jorge gave the TxDOT Transportation Funding PowerPoint presentation (Attachment 4), a copy of which was included in the meeting packet. Brochures were also provided which contained information on statewide transportation funding projections as well as on the priority projects with funding needs within the TxDOT Laredo and Pharr Districts (Attachment 5).

Several committee members then expressed concern over the continual delays in completing the U.S. 281 at Premont project. TxDOT responded that the environmental document was under review by the environmental division. They raised certain environmental issues which are now being addressed. As a result of this situation, the project schedule has been delayed. TxDOT agreed to keep the segment committee members aware of the ongoing project activities and schedule for the U.S. 281 at Premont project.

I-69 Program Priority Factors Review

Marc Williams reviewed the most current motor vehicle traffic crash data along U.S. 59, U.S. 77, U.S. 28, and SH44 as well as 2035 traffic forecasts for the I-69 program sections within the Segment Four and Five Committees limits. Marc referred the members to two graphics in the meeting packet that depict this data (Attachment 6). He also explained that these graphics will continually be updated as additional information becomes available.

Other Meeting Discussions and Next Meeting Activities

Stanley Laskowski, Segment Four Committee member and I-69 Alliance member, provided a summary of the I-69 Alliance meeting with Washington, D.C. officials regarding funding for the
I-69 program. He informed the committee members that they made a PowerPoint presentation which he will provide to Doise Miers so that it can be posted on the Listerve for the committee members to review.

Art Garcia noted that committee members are encouraged to e-mail any additional public involvement ideas to Doise Miers. The next meeting will be held on April 20th at 1:30 p.m.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Attachments:
1. Sign-In Sheet
2. Agenda
3. Public Outreach Planning Discussion and Starter Ideas Outline
4. Statewide Transportation Funding Presentation
5. Statewide Transportation Funding Brochure and Regional Projects for the Laredo and Pharr Districts

Meeting Staff included:
Doug Booher-TxDOT/TTA, Roger Beall-TxDOT/TTA, Doise Miers-TxDOT/GPA, Marc Williams-Consultant, Lori Cole-Consultant, Steve Lindsey-Consultant, Art Garcia-Consultant, Nancy Ledbetter-Consultant, Joe Charest-Consultant, Ken Thompson-Consultant
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Sign-In Sheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Appointing Entity</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benavides</td>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>Cameron County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brogan, P.E.</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Port of Corpus Christi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantu</td>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Kleberg County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardenas, P.E.</td>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>City of Corpus Christi</td>
<td>Gabrielle Escamilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coker</td>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Nueces County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Jim Wells County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>Teclo J.</td>
<td>City of McAllen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garza</td>
<td>Noe</td>
<td>Hidalgo County MPO</td>
<td>Maria Champine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Eddy</td>
<td>Brownsville MPO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huff</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Live Oak County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Wesley</td>
<td>City of Falfurrias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>City of Harlingen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskowski</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>City of Kingsville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liston</td>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Harlingen-San Benito MPO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>Sergio T.</td>
<td>Port of Brownsville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedbalek</td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>Texas Farm Bureau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niskala</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Corpus Christi MPO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Joseph F.</td>
<td>Hidalgo County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramirez</td>
<td>Raul M.</td>
<td>Brooks County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rios, P.E.</td>
<td>Daniel O.</td>
<td>Lower Rio Grande Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>San Patricio County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turcotte, III</td>
<td>Louis E.</td>
<td>Kenedy County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Live Oak County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Appointing Entity</td>
<td>Int.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainsworth, Sr.</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Corpus Christi MPO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bierstedt</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>City of Freer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borchard</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Port of Corpus Christi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clower</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Nueces County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Los Santos, Jr.</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>City of Alice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizondo</td>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td>Duval County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerra Martinez</td>
<td>Rosalva</td>
<td>Zapata County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huff</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Live Oak County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knolle</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Texas Farm Bureau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>Nelda</td>
<td>City of Corpus Christi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Josephine</td>
<td>San Patricio Economic Development Corporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon, Jr.</td>
<td>Rodrigo</td>
<td>City of Robstown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saenz</td>
<td>L. Arnold</td>
<td>Jim Wells County</td>
<td>ATTENDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Corpus Christi Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selman</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>City of Laredo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selman</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Laredo Urban Transportation Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>San Patricio County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>City of George West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teal</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>McMullen County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Port of Laredo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (Please Print)</td>
<td>Agency/Company</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah Drake</td>
<td>El Zale Ranch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Koole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Burleson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Townsend Jr.</td>
<td>Mission EDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art C. Bernard</td>
<td>Cameron Corp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie C.</td>
<td>City of L.A. Jovita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (Please Print)</td>
<td>Agency/Company</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Cole</td>
<td>I-69 GEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raul Leal</td>
<td>TXDOT Laredo Dist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Ramirez</td>
<td>TXDOT-LR9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Quintanilla</td>
<td>TXDOT-LR9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Garcia</td>
<td>I-69 MP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Williams</td>
<td>I-69 MP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Charest</td>
<td>KARI+HARK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Thompson</td>
<td>Thompson Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Graham</td>
<td>TXDOT-LAD Env.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Beall</td>
<td>TXIOT-ITA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario R Jorge</td>
<td>U-Pharr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lindsey</td>
<td>I-69 GEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Mullen</td>
<td>TXDOT-Laredo</td>
<td>Chris Kess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Bell</td>
<td>TXDOT-ITA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise Hayes</td>
<td>TXDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos G. Rodriguez</td>
<td>TXDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Lortzbetter</td>
<td>I-69 GEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Salazar</td>
<td>TXDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Garcia</td>
<td>Cameron County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie Carson</td>
<td>I-Joy H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Please Print)</th>
<th>Agency/Company</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Bean</td>
<td>TXDOT / SAG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paolo Salas-Evans</td>
<td>TXDOT / CEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Please Print)</th>
<th>Agency/Company</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attachment 2
Agenda
I-69 Segment Four and Five Committees Meeting
March 16, 2011
1:30 PM – 4:00 PM

Welcome/Introductions

Administrative

• Review January 2011 Meeting Notes and February 2011 Conference Call Notes

Public Involvement Activities

Statewide and District Funding Presentation

I-69 Program Priority Factors Review

• Motor vehicle crash data
• 2035 Traffic Forecasts

Discussion of Next Meeting Activities

www.txdot.gov/public_involvement/committees/i69/default.htm
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Attachment 3
Public Outreach Planning Discussion and Starter Ideas Outline
Discussion Objective: Capture sufficient information from Segments Four and Five committee members to enable effective local communications during the project, including local background, potential issues, communication objectives, strategic priorities and logistics

1. General update
   a. Current community awareness of I-69
   b. Current community opinions, both negative and positive
   c. Communities with specific concerns and suggestions on local projects
   d. Current status: what has changed since November Update Report?

2. Past public outreach: what has been done? What has worked?
   a. Written materials
   b. Media
   c. Other

3. Information Plan
   a. The top three messages and ideas
   b. Supporting information
   c. Q&A

4. Outreach objectives: what would you like to see?
   a. Materials
   b. Meetings with officials, organizations
   c. Website
   d. Electronic
      i. Existing databases?
      ii. Email sources?

5. Spokespersons for the segment / Segment committee involvement, leadership
   a. Suggestions for committee spokesperson(s)
   b. Segment committee availability
   c. Media workshops

6. Public gatherings
   a. Community meeting options
   b. If community meetings, which communities?

7. Logistics (if community meetings)
   a. Meeting locations
   b. Committee member attendance
PUBLIC OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

STARTER IDEAS

Materials
- I-69 program fact sheet
- Segment Committee fact sheet
- I-69 brochure
- FAQ document
- Information kits
- Newspaper inserts
- Advertising
- Message cards/pocket cards
- PowerPoint presentations

Mass Distribution
- Advertising (e.g., meeting notices)
- Media relations (media releases, story ideas, appearances)
- Website content
- Flier distribution
- Public service announcements (radio, TV)
- Partnerships (e.g., companies helping distribute information)

Direct Contact
- City council meetings
- Speakers bureau (e.g., Rotary, Chambers)
- Community events (booths, handouts)
- Library displays
- Community open houses
- Community forums
Attachment 4
Statewide Transportation Funding Presentation and
2030 Committee findings

- Need $315 billion to keep up (not improve)
- Expect to have about half that amount available
- Updated estimate: needs through 2035 will be about $370 billion
NEEDS AND COSTS

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE NEEDS

- Urban mobility needs: $243 billion
- Rural mobility, pavement, bridge, safety, and connectivity needs: $127 billion

SOURCE: Adapted from 2020 Committee Report

CHALLENGES

2011 TxDOT BUDGET: $9 Billion

- State Infrastructure Bank: $1.080B
- New Projects: $1.85B
- Maintenance: $2.70B
- Overhead and Project Development Costs: $1.19B
- Payments on Existing Projects: $2.11B

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

- Base
- Temporary Funding
- Debt
CHALLENGES

HIGHWAY CONTRACTS

contracts Funded by
Traditional Sources

realistic


CHALLENGES

TEXAS POPULATION GROWTH, 1970-2030

(source: Texas State Data Center)
**Funding Challenges**

- Inflation
- Fuel efficiency
- Federal funding
- Aging infrastructure
- Other uses of funds

**Points to Consider**

- Maximize traditional resources:
  - Address other uses of State Highway Fund currently supporting other state services
  - Improve TxDOT efficiency

*TxDOT does not advocate any particular option.*
Points to Consider

• Create new capital:
  – Increase vehicle registration fees
  – Index/increase fuel tax
  – Local options
  – Vehicle miles traveled fee
  – Increase federal rate of return
  – Explore other resources

_TxDOT does not advocate any particular option._

Points to Consider

• Continue or expand programs:
  – Public-private partnerships
  – Bonding
  – Tolling
  – Transportation Reinvestment Zones

_TxDOT does not advocate any particular option._
Conclusion

- Complex problem
- No simple solution
- Transportation vital to economy/quality of life
- Must consider rail, public transportation, aviation, other modes
- Public, elected officials will determine priorities
Stay up-to-date with your projects and TxDOT’s performance
www.txdot.gov

Project Tracker

TxDOT Tracker
Attachment 5
Statewide Transportation Funding Brochure and Regional Projects for the Laredo and Pharr Districts
TRANSPORTATION NEEDS AND COSTS

In 2008, the Texas Transportation Commission appointed a 12-member committee of Texas business, academic and civic leaders to determine independently the state's transportation needs through 2030. According to the committee, Texas needs to invest $315 billion between now and 2030 to maintain the existing infrastructure, prevent—not improve—worsening traffic congestion in urban areas, and ensure rural mobility and safety.

That's $315 billion if state and local partners could make those improvements today. Current state revenue projections show less than half of that amount will be available over the next two decades. Since the initial report was released, the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) has updated the transportation needs figure to the year 2035. According to TTI, total statewide needs are now about $370 billion.

With inflation, and adding in the Texas Department of Transportation's (TxDOT) other state responsibilities—like ferry service on the Gulf Coast, engineering and planning—that amount increases to more than $480 billion over the next 20-plus years.

Although filling that funding gap is a daunting prospect, exploring funding solutions for our most critical transportation needs is a realistic starting point. As state leaders explore those long-term financial solutions, TxDOT will continue working to balance the needs with available resources.

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE NEEDS

This map is a visual compilation of the statewide transportation funding needs through 2035 as identified by the Texas Transportation Institute.

TENNESSEE POPULATION GROWTH, 1970-2030

SOURCE: Texas State Data Center

HIGHWAY CONTRACTS

1 This includes the State Highway Fund which comprises state and federal motor fuel taxes, vehicle registration fees and federal reimbursements.

2 This includes Proposition 12 bonds, Proposition 14 bonds, Texas Mobility Fund, toll partnerships and federal stimulus dollars.

SOURCE: Texas Department of Transportation
WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES?

Traditional transportation funding sources – primarily motor fuels taxes and registration fees – have remained static for many years, and have not kept pace with mounting transportation demands.

Since the early 1990s, Texans have continued to pay 38.4 cents per gallon in state and federal motor fuel taxes while the state’s population has grown by more than 6 million, and vehicle miles traveled have increased by more than 50 percent. Population growth is projected to continue, and although more Texans should mean more money in transportation coffers, there are some factors to keep in mind:

- **Fuel efficiency.** By 2030, Texans will likely be driving passenger cars and trucks that could average about 34 miles per gallon. And fewer gallons purchased translate into fewer available dollars for transportation.

- **Inflation.** In Texas, construction inflation increased 65 percent between 2002 and 2008. Since the downturn in the national economy, prices have dipped. But as the economy improves, it is likely that prices will continue their upward trend.

- **Federal funding issues.** Texas is a donor state. For every federal motor fuel tax dollar Texans send to Washington, D.C., the state gets back about 70 cents for highways and 8 cents for transit. Additionally, federal funding is increasingly unreliable, making it difficult to plan for future transportation needs.

- **Aging infrastructure.** Many Texas roads and bridges have exceeded their intended lifespan and require extensive rehabilitation.

- **Other uses.** A portion of state transportation funds supports other important functions of government. In the 2010 to 2011 biennium, $1.15 billion in state highway fund revenues were allocated to other programs.

---

**CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE PURCHASING POWER**

Since one dollar in 1997 equals 61 cents today, a $20 million project built in 1997 would cost more than $32 million today.

---

**2011 TxDOT BUDGET: $9 Billion**

- Committed Projects that Began Prior to Biennium: $1.188 billion
- Maintaining and Replacing Existing System: $2.701 billion
- Pay Back Borrowed Funds: $0.938 billion
- Project Development Costs: $0.727 billion
- New Construction from Traditional Funding: $0.506 billion
- Other Modes and Services: $0.238 billion
- New Projects from Borrowed Funds (Prop 12 & 14): $0.708 billion
- Administration and Support: $0.100 billion
- St. H 121 Funds (Dallas District only): $0.658 billion

SOURCE: TxDOT, Finance Division
SO WHAT'S THE DISCUSSION?

The search for acceptable solutions is challenging, and no single action is likely to address all of the state's transportation needs. Several proposals are part of the public dialogue. Some of these are:

MAXIMIZE TRADITIONAL SOURCES

- Address other uses. Dedicating all state motor fuels tax revenue to transportation would provide additional revenue each biennium, but other essential state services that are currently supported with state highway fund revenues would need new funding sources.

- Improve TxDOT efficiency. TxDOT is continually maximizing its existing budget by streamlining operations. The department also secured an outside consultant to conduct a top-down audit to recommend further efficiencies.

CREATE NEW CAPITAL

- Increase vehicle registration fees. Each $10 increase in motor vehicle registration fees should yield almost $200 million annually in additional revenues.

- Index or increase the motor fuel tax. Any changes to the tax could yield additional funding for the state. For example, if the current fuel tax were indexed (e.g., to the Consumer Price Index), each one percent increase would add about $20 million a year to the State Highway Fund. A 1 cent increase in the tax would generate about $100 million a year in revenue. Any additional gains, however, will eventually be tempered by higher fuel efficiency.

- Local options. A proposal discussed during the 81st Session of the Texas Legislature would have permitted voters to allow certain local governments the option to raise fuel taxes and other fees to address their specific transportation needs.

- Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) tax. Replacing the current per-gallon fuel tax with a VMT system would accurately reflect road usage, and could compensate for future fuel efficiency.

- Increase the federal rate of return. If Texas were no longer a donor state, it would receive an estimated $500 million more a year in highway funding under current formulas.

- Other possibilities. Some legislative leaders have discussed using other state revenue sources to fund needed projects. Those ideas include using a portion of the state’s oil severance and vehicle sales taxes. In 2008, the vehicle sales tax raised $3 billion for Texas’ General Revenue Fund.

CONTINUE/EXPAND PROGRAMS

- Public-Private Partnerships. Partnering with the private sector brings in additional money and allows projects to be built sooner, rather than waiting until traditional funding is available.

- Bonding. In recent years, the Texas Legislature has approved borrowing against future general and state highway fund revenues to accelerate projects statewide, saving money on future inflation costs and putting projects on the ground sooner.

- Tolling. Toll authorities play a significant role in developing transportation solutions. While toll roads cannot be the sole solution to the state's transportation challenges, they offer drivers alternative routes and time-saving choices.

- Transportation Reinvestment Zones (TRZ). Strengthening TRZs provides another local funding option. Increased property tax revenue generated within the improved zone is used to finance transportation projects.

NOTE: These funding sources are not all-inclusive. TxDOT does not advocate any particular solution. Final decisions about transportation funding options belong to state legislators and members of Congress.
The Texas population will increase over the next couple of decades. And with all that growth will come more demand on the transportation system, demand for more and improved infrastructure that can’t be built within existing revenue streams. While every region of the state has important transportation projects that need funding, specific projects are important to the state’s overall economic well-being. Below are just a few. (Projects subject to change.)

   - Upgrade existing roadways to interstate status
   - $16.4 billion (Estimate is preliminary and is based on suggested improvements from Segment Committees.)

2. I-35 in the Waco and Temple areas
   - Expand to eight lanes
   - $497 million

3. Interstate 10 in Jefferson, Chambers and Orange counties
   - Widen roadway
   - $200 million

4. Harbor Bridge in Corpus Christi
   - Replace bridge
   - $600 million

5. Grand Parkway (Segment A through I-2)
   - Construct new location roadway
   - $5 billion

6. South Padre Island Causeway
   - Construct second connection to the island
   - $562 million

7. Loop 1604 in San Antonio
   - Add capacity to roadway
   - $2.76 billion

8. Loop 49 in Smith and Gregg counties
   - Continue building tolled loop around Tyler
   - $1.65 million

9. Northeast Parkway
   - Construct new location roadway
   - $359 million

10. I-35E in Dallas and Denton counties
    - Reconstruction and expansion
    - $5.5 billion

11. U.S. 54
    - Upgrade to 4-lane divided between NM and OK
    - $155 million

12. Ports-To-Plains Corridor
    - Various road improvements
    - $1.9 billion (Estimate is preliminary for 4-lane divided facilities.)

---

**Stay up-to-date with your projects and TxDOT’s performance.**

The best decisions can only be made with access to the right information. Project Tracker and TxDOT Tracker can be found at www.txdot.gov.
CONCLUSION

Demand on our transportation system is outpacing available revenue, and we're trying to meet 21st century demands with 20th century dollars. Today's challenges of inflation, population growth, aging infrastructure and more fuel-efficient vehicles have stretched available funds to their limits.

Just as the problem is multifaceted, so is the solution. Public officials are working diligently to develop options that are practical and acceptable to the public.

Transportation is essential to Texas' future. Investing in a balanced, regionally determined, multimodal transportation network stimulates economic activity. It also creates employment opportunities and gives Texas communities choices to address their growing and changing populations.

The information and ideas presented in this brochure discuss the needs of highway and road funding in the state of Texas. But there are other, equally important, modes of transportation—from rail to public transportation to aviation—that need to be considered in developing a solution for Texas' transportation challenges. Meeting our future needs will require a multi-level approach, and every Texan needs to be involved in the dialogue. We hope you add your voice to the discussion. If you have any questions or comments, please email us at AskTxDOT@txdot.gov.

Find out more: www.txdot.gov

Sources used in this report: http://www.txdot.gov/about_us/funding_sources.htm
REGIONAL PROJECTS

So what would the effect of additional funding be on the eight-county region within the Laredo District of TxDOT? Here are just some of the area’s major needs that are waiting for construction funding.

Consider this simply a snapshot of some possibilities. Different types of funding come with specialized spending requirements, and priorities within a region shift from time to time.

For further information, please contact Raul Leal at 956-712-7416 and Raul.Leal@txdot.gov.

UNFUNDED REGIONAL PRIORITIES

1. Loop 20 — Jacaman Rd.
   - Overpass
   - $37.1 million

2. Loop 20 — University Blvd.
   - Overpass
   - $28.8 million

3. Loop 20 — Del Mar Blvd.
   - Overpass
   - $17.9 million

4. Loop 20 — Shiloh Blvd. to International Blvd.
   - Overpass
   - $32.1 million

5. Loop 20 — McPherson Rd.
   - Overpass
   - $26.9 million

6. Loop 20 — I-35
   - Overpass
   - $23.8 million

7. U.S. 277 (Val Verde County)
   - Reconstruct and widen to 4 lanes
   - $207.2 million

8. U.S. 277 (Val Verde/Maverick counties)
   - Reconstruct and widen to 4 lanes.
   - $173.2 million

9. SL 480 (Eagle Pass/Maverick County)
   - Construct north section
   - $12 million

10. U.S. 277 (Maverick/Dimmitt counties)
   - From Eagle Pass Relief Route to 0.891 Miles North of SL 517
   - Widen existing highway
   - $131.1 million

11. U.S. 83 (Dimmit/Webb counties)
   - Widen to 4 lanes
   - $263.7 million

12. U.S. 59 (Webb/Duval counties)
   - Upgrade to interstate standards
   - $117.3 million

13. SH 44 (Duval County)
   - Widen to 4 lanes
   - $81 million

---

Stay up-to-date with your projects and TxDOT's performance.
The best decisions can only be made with access to the right information. Project Tracker and TxDOT Tracker can be found at www.txdot.gov.
So what would be the effect of additional funding be on the eight-county region within the Pharr District of TxDOT? Here are just some of the area’s major needs that are waiting for construction funding.

Consider this simply a snapshot of some possibilities. Different types of funding come with specialized spending requirements, and priorities within a region shift from time to time.

For further information, please contact Amy Rodriguez at 956-702-6102 and Amy.Rodriguez@txdot.gov.

**UNFUNDED REGIONAL PRIORITIES**

1. **U.S. 281 (Brooks and Hidalgo counties)**
   - Upgrade Highway to interstate standards
   - $750 million

2. **U.S. 77 (Kenedy and Willacy counties)**
   - Upgrade Highway to interstate standards
   - $220 million

3. **U.S. 83 (Zapata County)**
   - Rehabilitate and add passing lane
   - $27 million

4. **U.S. 83 at Arroyo Veileen (Zapata County)**
   - Replace bridge
   - $1.5 million

5. **U.S. 83 La Joya Relief Route (Hidalgo County)**
   - Construct new location toll road
   - $1.56 million

6. **SPI 2nd Access (Cameron County)**
   - Construct second causeway to South Padre Island
   - $465 million

7. **West Parkway (Cameron County)**
   - Construct new toll road
   - $1.79 million

8. **FM 2220 (Hidalgo County)**
   - Widen to 6 lanes
   - $21 million

9. **FM 1925 (Hidalgo County)**
   - Widen to 4-lane divided highway
   - $26 million

10. **U.S. 83 Business (Hidalgo County)**
    - Widen to 4 lanes
    - $12 million

11. **U.S. 281 (Cameron County)**
    - Widen to 4 lanes
    - $13 million

12. **FM 803 (Cameron County)**
    - Re-align and widen to 4 lanes
    - $7 million

13. **U.S. 83 Rio Grande City/Roma Relief Route ( Starr County)**
    - Construct new location toll road
    - $208 million

*Costs are planning numbers and could change as project develops.

---

**Stay up-to-date with your projects and TxDOT’s performance.**

The best decisions can only be made with access to the right information. Project Tracker and TxDOT Tracker can be found at www.txdot.gov.
Attachment 6
Segment Four and Five Committees Crash Rates 2005-2009 Average Graphic and Forecasted 2035 Average Daily Traffic Graphic
CSC 4 Crash Rates - 2005-2009 Average

Crash Rate
- < 0.75 Statewide Average
- Between 0.75 to 1.25 times Statewide Average
- > 1.25 Statewide Average
- US 281 Section ID
- SH 44 Section ID
- US 59 Section ID
- Redesignate to Interstate Section ID

Other
- Commercial Airport
- Primary Deep Draft Seaport
- Border Crossing
- Highway - Interstate
- Highway - US Marked
- Highway - State Marked

Potential Project Section Designations are based on the CSC input to date

Source: TxDOT Crash Records (2005-2009)
CSC 5 Crash Rates (2005-2009 Average)

Crash Rate
- < 0.75 Statewide Average
- Between 0.75 to 1.25 times Statewide Average
- > 1.25 Statewide Average

Other
- Commercial Airport
- Primary Deep Draft Seaport
- Shallow Draft & Barge Port
- Landport
- Border Crossing
- Highway - Interstate
- Highway - US Marked
- Highway - State Marked
- Urban Area
- County

Note: Section Crash Rates are compared with 2009 Statewide Average Crash Rates for US Highways (Urban=137.71, Rural=55.74). Urban Sections are based on 2009 population exceeding 50,000.

Source: TxDOT Crash Records (2005-2009)
**Corridor Sections**
- Upgrade of Existing US 281 Alignment
- US 281 - Under Construction
- Upgrade of Existing US 77 Alignment
- Upgrade of Existing SH 44 Alignment
- Upgrade of Existing US 59 Alignment
- Redesignate to Interstate
- Redesignate to Interstate Section ID

**Other**
- Commercial Airport
- Primary Deep Draft Seaport
- Border Crossing
- Highway - Interstate
- Highway - US Marked
- Highway - State Marked

**Urban Area**

**County**

**Map Scale**
1 Inch = 13 Miles

**Potential Project Section Designations**
- Upgrade of Existing US 281 Alignment
- US 281 Section ID
- Redesignate to Interstate
- US 281 - Under Construction
- Upgrade of Existing US 77 Alignment
- Upgrade of Existing SH 44 Alignment
- Upgrade of Existing US 59 Alignment
- Redesignate to Interstate Section ID

**Note:** Forecasts are derived from 2009 Average ADT using a combination of historic traffic growth, forecasted population growth, and TxDOT's Statewide Analysis Model outputs.

**Source:** 2009 TxDOT Traffic Counts

**Corresponding Traffic Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section ID</th>
<th>Total Traffic</th>
<th>Truck Traffic</th>
<th>% Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,600</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,900</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,100</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103,600</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34,100</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31,900</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107,100</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Map Notes:**
- County
- Urban Area
- Commercial Airport
- Primary Deep Draft Seaport
- Border Crossing
- Highway - Interstate
- Highway - US Marked
- Highway - State Marked

**Working Draft**
Potential Project Section Designations are based on the CSC input to date.