U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
819 TAYLOR STREET, ROOM 8A36 300 E. 8TH STREET, ROOM 826
FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76102-9003 AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701

July 7, 2008

Refer to: HPP-TX

Joint Approval of February-March 2008
Quarterly Revisions to the FY 08-11 Statewide
Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Mr. James Randall, P. E.
Director, Transportation Planning and Programming Division
Texas Department of Transportation
125 E. 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Mr. Randall:

We have reviewed the February-March 2008 Quarterly Revisions to the FY 2008-2011 STIP transmitted by Mr. Amadeo Saenz's letter of June 17, 2008. Based upon our review the February-March 2008 Quarterly Revisions to the STIP, are hereby approved subject to the general and project specific comments noted in the enclosed

We have reviewed the document in light of the new year-of-expenditure (YOE) and total project cost requirements of the Statewide and Metropolitan planning regulations. Per the FHWA/FTA Joint Metropolitan Planning Regulations (23 CFR 450), issued on February 14, 2007, the YOE requirements were required to be addressed in STIP, TIP and Metropolitan Transportation Plans (MTP) adopted or amended after December 11, 2007.

The enclosed list of general and specific FHWA comments should be addressed by TxDOT and the MPOs as noted Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact either Mr. Kirk Fauver of the FHWA Texas Division at (512) 536-5952 or Ms. Lynn Hayes of FTA Region 6 office at (817) 978-0565 for additional information

Sincerely yours,

Peggy Crist, Director
Planning and Program Development
Federal Transit Administration

Michael T. Leary, Director
Planning and Program Development
Federal Highway Administration

MOVING THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

cc:

FHWA-HA-TX, HB-TX, HAM-TX
Peggy Crist, FTA, Region VI
Wayne Wells, TxDOT Design
Linda Olson, TxDOT Design
Michelle Conkle, TxDOT TPP(S)
Kelly Kirkland, TxDOT PTN

O:/1 LYNN/Final Feb- March Qtrly STIP Approval 07 07 08

General Comments:

- A copy of TxDOT's statewide public participation plan used in the preparation of the STIP and Statewide Transportation Plan in accordance with 23 CFR 450.210(a)(2), will need to be provided to our office prior to the approval of any subsequent STIP updates or amendments.

- Subsequent STIP updates/amendments should include documentation demonstrating how TxDOT has specifically addressed the eight (8) planning factors noted in 23 CFR 450.206(a) as part of the STIP development process.

- To maintain fiscal constraint of the FY 08-11 STIP, subsequent amendments will need to identify the source and reasonable availability of any additional revenue needed to fund the amendments. In-lieu of additional revenue being available, the revisions must demonstrate a "dollar for dollar" reduction in programmed funding required to off-set the additional cost of the amendments (i.e., deletion of projects).

- Based upon the information provided in the STIP financial summary it appears that local funding contributions are becoming a significant revenue source. Additionally, it is anticipated that local contributions may continue to grow in the future. As such subsequent STIP updates and amendments should include adequate documentation regarding the source and reasonable availability of local funding contributions.

- As previously noted, differences between the year of expenditure (YOE) project cost noted in the STIP and the project cost noted in the corresponding MPO Transportation Plans are considered substantial when the difference in costs is greater than fifty (50) percent of the cost noted in the MTP. Some of the following project specific comments note substantial differences between the STIP and MTP project costs. These discrepancies in project costs must be resolved prior to approval of the noted STIP revisions.

- The 'Introduction' section (page 26) of the FY 08-11 STIP includes a web link to various ongoing district construction projects (highway-related). However upon review the associated web site only a partial listing for nine (9) district office highway construction efforts appears to be reflected. This includes the nine TxDOT District Offices as follows: Austin, Beaumont, Bryan, Dallas, El Paso, Fort Worth, Houston, San Antonio, and Waco. Does TxDOT plan to make this GIS-web site accessible for the remaining sixteen (16) TxDOT District Offices in the future?

- Please note that many of the TxDOT web links shown within the 'Introduction' section of the STIP document are not activated in the PDF format, so many of the web links shown in this section are not accessible to users by simply clicking on them (e.g., page 2- SAFETEA-LU web link, page 5- Rail State Safety and Security Oversight Program, page 6- State Safety and Security Oversight Program Standard, page 9- GIS Systems in Transportation and NEPA, page 27- Available GIS Data).

Specific Comments:

Abilene MPO/District:

No comments.

Austin MPO/District:

1. General: A review of the STIP funding summary tables and the Austin MPO TIP funding information (Excel file) indicates a discrepancy in Category 7 funding for FY 2009. This discrepancy should be verified and the MPO and STIP funding summaries revised accordingly. As the cost noted in the statewide fiscal constraint summary appears larger than that noted in the MPO TIP funding information (Excel file), fiscal constraint of the STIP is expected to be maintained.

2. CSJ 1539-01-005 and 1539-02-018: The year of expenditure project cost noted in the TIP is substantially more than that noted in the 2030 MTP (72.4 million vs. 39 million). Approval of this revision is withheld pending clarification of this discrepancy.

3. CSJ 3379-01-010: The year of expenditure project cost noted in the TIP appears to be substantially more than that noted in the 2030 MTP (73.1 million vs. 16 million). Approval of this revision is withheld pending clarification of this discrepancy.

4. CSJ 2211-01-023: The project limits noted in the TIP indicate FM 3405 to Ronald Reagan Blvd.; however it is unclear if this terminus is consistent with that noted in the 2030 MTP (i.e., FM 3405 to FM 970). Approval of this revision is withheld pending clarification of the project limits.

5. CSJ 0204-04-027: The project description noted in the TIP does not appear consistent with that noted in the 2030 MTP (4-lanes vs. 6-lanes). Approval of this revision is withheld pending clarification of this discrepancy.

6. CSJ 0914-05-150: The year of expenditure project cost noted in the TIP appears to be substantially more than that noted in the 2030 MTP (6.7 million vs. 2.5 million). Approval of this revision is withheld pending clarification of this discrepancy.

7. CSJ 0912-04-242: The year of expenditure project cost noted in the TIP appears to be substantially more than that noted in the 2030 MTP (9 million vs. 5.6 million). Approval of this revision is withheld pending clarification of this discrepancy.

8. CSJ 0914-05-139: The project scope and year of expenditure funding noted in the TIP do not appear consistent with the 2030 MTP (i.e., extension to SH 45 and 11.7 million vs. 2.2 million). Approval of this revision is withheld pending clarification of these discrepancies.

9. CSJ 0914-05-149: This project could not be located in the 2030 MTP. Additionally, the project description noted in the TIP is unclear (e.g., number of lanes). Approval of this revision is withheld.

10. CSJ 0265-01-080: The project description noted in the TIP appears inconsistent with that noted in the 2030 MTP (6-tolled lanes vs. 8-tolled lanes). Approval of this revision is withheld pending clarification of this discrepancy.

11. CSJ 0114-02-053: The year of expenditure project cost noted in the TIP appears to be substantially more than that noted in the 2030 MTP (504 million vs. 209 million). Approval of this revision is withheld pending clarification of this discrepancy.

12. CSJ 1200-06-004: The project description and year of expenditure project cost do not appear consistent with the 2030 MTP (i.e., 4-lanes vs. 6-lanes and 76 million vs. 43 million). Approval of this revision is withheld pending clarification of these discrepancies.

13. CSJ 0700-03-077: The year of expenditure project cost noted in the TIP appears to be substantially more than that noted in the 2030 MTP (133 million vs. 43.9 million). Approval of this revision is withheld pending clarification of these discrepancies.

Beaumont (JOHRTS) MPO/District:

General Comments:

The financial summary of the Beaumont (JOHRTS) FY 08-11 TIP includes costs for local funded projects however the STIP financial tables do not. This should be verified and the associated MPO TIP and STIP financial summaries should be revised accordingly. It is not anticipated that this omission in funding would impact fiscal constraint of the STIP as the funding is identified as Local Contributions and as such would appear in both the revenue and expenditure (programmed) costs. However, the funding summaries should be revised to reflect all programmed funding.

Specific Comments:

1. A review of the funding noted for each FY 2009 project indicates a total programmed amount $99,137,019, however the MPO financial summary indicates a total programmed amount of 89,747,242. This discrepancy should be verified and the MPO and STIP funding summaries revised accordingly. Based upon the amount of the discrepancy and the statewide funding balance noted for FY 2009, fiscal constraint of the STIP is expected to be maintained.

2. CSJ's: 3510-10-900, 0338-12-002, 3510-10-012 projects are not approved. As discussed with the District we would defer to the Houston–Galveston MPO TIP to identify these projects and not the Beaumont TIP.

3. CSJ: 0305-05-901, this project is not approved as a $1 placeholder is used. Need to identify a project cost.

Corpus Christi MPO/District:

1. CSJ 0916-35-151 (MPO ID S109C0107) shows in FY 2009 Appendix section a YOE cost of $500k, however no costs are shown in terms of total project cost data (only $1 is shown) in the left-hand column. Please identify the summary of total project costs to show the various funded project phases and the source of State and local match. Project approval is withheld pending revised cost total project costs and the applicable sources of State and local match.

2. CSJ 0101-06-902 (MPO ID S105C0107) shows a YOE cost of $23.2 M, however the left hand column does not show any total project cost information and only Category 6 funds are shown for the federal source. Please identify the other total project costs associated with this project and the source of State and local match. Project approval is withheld pending revised total project costs and the applicable sources of State and local match.

3. CSJ 0916-35-152 (MPO ID S077C0107) shows a re-planking of a railroad crossing shows a federal share of $170k in federal-aid funds in Category 8, however no total project cost information is shown in the left-hand column by various phases of work. In addition, please identify the sources of State and local match funds for this project as well as the total project costs. Project approval is withheld pending revised total project costs and the applicable sources of State and local match.

Dallas-Fort Worth MPO/Dallas and Fort Worth Districts:

General Comments:

1. Unresolved comments from previous letters still apply (e.g., October 2007 (2008-2011 STIP/TIP, original) and December 2007 (2008-2011 STIP/TIP, November revision)).

2. Comparing MPO project information to corresponding Excel funding information, it appears Authorized Funding (versus YOE) was used to demonstrate fiscal constraint. As this is unexpected, please verify and revise accordingly (i.e., fiscal constraint is expected to be based upon YOE project costs). Given Authorized Funding amounts are generally higher, fiscal constraint is not expected to be adversely affected.

Specific Comments:

Dallas District:

1. There is a design concept and scope inconsistency between the MTP/Mobility 2030 (4/4 and 6/6) and the MPO TIP (2/6 and 2/6) on TH1 3.3 and TH1 3.4 (p. VII-181).

2. There is a design concept and scope inconsistency between the MTP/Mobility 2030 (2/4) and the MPO TIP (3/6) on TH1 218.2 (p. VII-187).

3. There is a design concept and scope inconsistency between the MTP/Mobility 2030 (6/6) and the MPO TIP (2/4) on TH1 222.0 p. VII-189).

4. CSJ 0918-00-925 is approved. Please note, operating costs are only eligible for three years.

5. CSJ 0918-00-971 is not approved. More information is needed regarding project scope.

6. CSJ 0918-24-099 is approved. Please note, proposed CMAQ funded highway-related projects are limited to eligible Transportation Control Measures (section 108(f)(1)(A) of the Clean Air Act). Streetscape and/or street enhancements that are only a small part of an eligible project's scope would also be eligible for CMAQ funding. However, should streetscape or landscape improvements become more than an incidental part of the project, CMAQ funding for these activities would need to be restricted.

7. CSJ 0918-45-772 is not approved. More information is needed regarding project scope (e.g., how emissions will be reduced.)

8. CSJ 0918-45-920 is not approved. Additional clarification is necessary concerning scope of work (e.g., what is "landmark treatment of street corners" and "enhanced sidewalks"?)

9. CSJs 0918-00-960, 0918-45-667, 0918-00-959, 0918-45-968 and 0918-45-969 are not approved. More information is needed regarding project scope (e.g., is TAP providing for implementation of operational strategies (only) or does project also include study/assessment of corridors to determine if need for improvements exist?) In general, planning activities (e.g., studies) that do not lead to the direct implementation of an improvement to reduce emissions are not eligible for CMAQ funding.

10. CSJ 0918-24-144 is not approved. More information is needed regarding project scope (e.g., what are "vehicular enhancements"? and how emissions will be reduced with implementation.)

11. CSJ 1068-04-142 is not approved. Additional clarification is necessary concerning scope of work. Please note, construction of general purpose lanes is not eligible for Cat 5/CMAQ funding.

12. CSJ 0196-02-068 is not approved. Additional clarification is necessary concerning scope of work.

13. CSJ 0918-45-821 is not approved. Additional clarification is necessary concerning scope of work. Please note, construction of additional general purpose lanes or reconstruction of existing lanes is not eligible for Cat 5/CMAQ funding.

14. CSJ 0918-46-209 is not approved. Additional clarification is necessary concerning scope of work (e.g., what is included with the pedestrian plaza and how emissions will be reduced with implementation.).

15. CSJ 0918-46-928 is not approved. Additional clarification is necessary concerning scope of work (e.g. how emissions will be reduced.)

16. CSJ 1068-04-926 is not approved. Additional clarification is necessary concerning scope of work.

17. CSJ 2374-01-068 is not approved. Additional clarification is necessary concerning scope of work. Please note, construction of additional general purpose lanes or reconstruction of existing lanes is not eligible for Cat 5/CMAQ funding.

18. CSJ 0581-02-121 is not approved. Additional clarification is necessary concerning scope of work. Please note, construction of additional general purpose lanes or reconstruction of existing lanes is not eligible for Cat 5/CMAQ funding.

19. CSJ 2351-01-013 is approved. Please note, CMAQ funding is limited to eligible activities (e.g., left turn lanes.).

20. CSJ 3392-01-008 is approved. Please note, CMAQ funding is limited to eligible activities (e.g., intersection improvements.).

21. CSJ 0196-02-068 is not approved. Additional clarification is necessary concerning scope of work. Please note, construction of additional general purpose lanes or reconstruction of existing lanes is not eligible for Cat 5/CMAQ funding.

22. CSJ 0918-45-973 is not approved. Additional clarification is necessary concerning scope of work. Please note, construction of additional general purpose lanes or reconstruction of existing lanes is not eligible for Cat 5/CMAQ funding.

Fort Worth District:

1. There is a design concept and scope inconsistency between the MTP/Mobility 2030 (4/4) and the MPO TIP (4/6) on TH1 106.1 (p. VII-179).

2. Cat 5/CMAQ monies should not be used for "Reconstruct Freeway" (e.g., D.4; 0364-05-025 and -026.) Please note, we understand these are Appendix D projects and much more information will be provided prior to including them within the four years of the TIP.

3. CSJs 0902-38-074, 0902-48-952, 0902-48-953, 9902-48-902, 0008-03-093 and 0902-50-951 are not approved. More information is needed regarding project scope (e.g., is TAP providing for implementation of operational strategies (only) or does project also include study/assessment of corridors to determine if need for improvements exist?) In general, planning activities (e.g., studies) that do not lead to the direct implementation of an improvement to reduce emissions are not eligible for CMAQ funding.

4. CSJ 0902-48-536 is approved given the detailed information provided by NCTCOG staff on May 23, 2008. As a reminder, proposed CMAQ funded highway-related projects are limited to eligible Transportation Control Measures (section 108(f)(1)(A) of the Clean Air Act). Streetscape and/or street enhancements that are only a small part of an eligible project's scope would also be eligible for CMAQ funding. However, should streetscape or landscape improvements become more than an incidental part of the project, CMAQ funding for these activities would need to be restricted.

5. CSJ 0902-48-729 is not approved. More information is needed regarding project scope (e.g., what type of rail service is being improved? how will emissions be reduced?).

6. CSJ 0902-48-908 is not approved. More information is needed regarding project scope (e.g., is implementation of the information system included? If not, how and when will the information system be implemented. How will this activity reduce emissions? Is this project an initial phase of 0902-48-930?).

7. CSJ 0902-48-925 is not approved. More information is needed regarding project scope (e.g., how emissions will be reduced.).

8. CSJ 0902-48-699 is approved given the detailed information provided by NCTCOG staff on May 23, 2008. As a reminder, proposed CMAQ funded highway-related projects are limited to eligible Transportation Control Measures (section 108(f)(1)(A) of the Clean Air Act). Streetscape and/or street enhancements that are only a small part of an eligible project's scope would also be eligible for CMAQ funding. However, should streetscape or landscape improvements become more than an incidental part of the project, CMAQ funding for these activities would need to be restricted.

9. CSJ 0902-48-582 is not approved. More information is needed regarding project scope (e.g., what is entailed within this pedestrian district?) Please note, proposed CMAQ funded highway-related projects are limited to eligible Transportation Control Measures (section 108(f)(1)(A) of the Clean Air Act). Streetscape and/or street enhancements that are only a small part of an eligible project's scope would also be eligible for CMAQ funding. However, if they become more than a minor part of the project, CMAQ funding would need to be restricted.

Houston MPO/District:

1. The following projects are proposed for CMAQ funding, however the proposed scopes of work do not provide sufficient information to determine the projects' eligibility for CMAQ funding. Approval of these projects is withheld pending clarification of the proposed scopes of work and a determination of eligibility for CMAQ funding:

   CSJs: 2941-02-903, 0912-00-920, 0912-00-948, 0912-37-902, 0912-71-622

2. CSJ 0912-00-909: This project is proposed for CMAQ funding, however no estimate of emissions reductions is provided. Approval of this project is withheld pending the provision of estimated emission reductions.

3. CSJ 0912-00-952: This project is proposed for CMAQ funding, however it is unclear how this project differs from CSJ 0912-00-907. Approval of this project is withheld pending the clarification of the project's description of work.

4. CSJ 0912-72-053: This project is proposed for CMAQ funding, however based upon previous discussions with the TxDOT Houston District, we have determined this project ineligible for CMAQ funding. This project is not approved.

5. CSJ 0912-71-925: This project is proposed for CMAQ funding. The description of work provided for this project is different than that noted in previous versions of the Houston FY 2008-2011 TIP. As such we cannot determine that previously reported emissions reductions estimates remain applicable. Additionally, the noted scope of work includes railroad-crossing equipment. The eligibility of the proposed railroad crossing equipment for CMAQ funding is unclear. Approval of this project is withheld pending the clarification of emissions reductions estimates and eligibility of the proposed scope of work (i.e., railroad equipment).

6. CSJ 0912-00-949 and 0912-00-945: The scopes of work for these projects indicate completion of studies. General studies not leading to the direct implementation of a project are not eligible for CMAQ funding. Approval of these projects is withheld pending the clarification of the proposed scope of work and a determination of eligibility for CMAQ funding.

7. CSJ 0027-12-114: This project is proposed for CMAQ funding. The scope of work for this project indicates the construction of two-way HOV lanes. Will the proposed HOV lanes also be managed lanes? Approval of this project is withheld pending clarification of the operation of the proposed HOV lanes.

8. CSJ 0271-14-220: The scope of work for this project indicates "right-of-way acquisition." However, it is unclear if the proposed right-of-way acquisition is related to a subsequent construction project. Approval of this project is withheld pending the clarification/verification of subsequent projects.

9. CSJ 0271-05-028: The cost information summary for this project indicates the use of Federal funds however no category of funding is identified. Approval of this project is withheld pending the identification of a category of funding.

10. CSJ 0912-72-947: The scope of work for this project is unclear. Approval of this project is withheld pending the clarification of the scope of work.

11. CSJ 3538-01-030: The noted YOE cost of this project is substantially higher than that noted in the Houston-Galveston Area Council's (H-GAC) 2035 RTP ($36.4 million vs. $19.9 million). Approval of this project is withheld pending the resolution of this funding discrepancy.

12. CSJ 0912-70-910: The scope of work for this project is unclear. Approval of this project is withheld pending the clarification of the scope of work.

13. CSJ 0912-71-427: The project limits noted do not appear consistent with those noted in the H-GAC 2035 RTP. Approval of this project is withheld pending the resolution of this discrepancy in project limits.

14. CSJ 3510-06-004 and 3510-07-004: The descriptions of work for these projects indicate "environmental preservation." These projects are approved contingent upon clarification of "environmental preservation."

15. CSJ 0912-72-944: The scope of work for this project is unclear (i.e., added capacity). Approval of this project is withheld pending the clarification of the scope of work.

16. CSJ 0338-12-001: This project could not be located in H-GAC's currently conforming 2035 RTP. This project is not approved.

17. CSJ 0523-10-016: A proposed letting date of June 1, 2008 is indicated for this project. It is noted that the current conformity determination for the H-GAC 2035 RTP indicates that this project will be open to traffic by the end of calendar year 2009. This project is approved contingent upon the verification that the project will be completed in accordance with the current H-GAC 2035 RTP conformity determination.

18. CSJ 1986-01-049: A proposed letting date of March 1, 2008 is indicated for this project. It is noted that the current conformity determination for the H-GAC 2035 RTP indicates that this project will be open to traffic by the end of calendar year 2009. This project is approved contingent upon the verification that the project will be completed in accordance with the current H-GAC 2035 RTP conformity determination.

Pharr District:

General Comments:

Each of the Pharr District MPOs had projects or a group of projects in which one or more of the funding category amounts were less than what was specified in the TIP financial summary and the STIP financial summary. The TIP financial summary category amounts and the STIP financial summary category amounts were always the same. These discrepancies should be verified and the MPO and STIP funding summaries revised accordingly. These discrepancies are not anticipated to affect the fiscal constraint of the STIP (i.e., more funding programmed than reflected for the project).

Specific Comments:

Hidalgo MPO (Pharr District):

Review based on MTP project list received on 4/24/08 entitled "*Final MTP Project List_w_9_07 Revisions.*"

1. FYI, project named "Reg Access Multi Modal" (0921-02-183) shows total project cost (TPC) of $3,179,912 million and MTP shows $8.8 million.

2. Military Hwy (0220-01-024) indicates TIP TPC is approx. $8.14 million with construction cost of approx. $6.75 million. This project is about ¼ of the total project length in MTP (which has a construction cost of approx. $15.06 million). Project's MTP and TIP cost estimates are not consistent. Project approval is withheld pending cost estimate revision of project in MTP.

3. Ware Road (2094-01-038) TIP TPC is approx. $14.25 million with construction cost of approx. $8.44. This project is about ½ the length of the project listed in the MTP which indicates construction cost of approx. $8.623 million. Project's MTP and TIP cost estimates are not consistent. Project approval is withheld pending cost estimate revision of project in MTP.

4. Ware Road (2094-01-039) TIP TPC is approx. $19.9 million with construction cost of approx. $8.999. This project is about ½ the project listed in the MTP which indicates cost of approx. $8.623 million. Project's MTP and TIP cost estimates are not consistent. Project approval is withheld pending cost estimate revision of project in MTP.

5. Military Hwy (0220-01-023) indicates TPC is approx. $17.3 million with construction cost of approx. $14.6 million. This project is about ¼ of the total project length in MTP which has a cost of approx. $15.06 million. Project's MTP and TIP cost estimates are not consistent. Project approval is withheld pending cost estimate revision of project in MTP.

6. Pharr Intl Bridge (0921-02-193) TIP TPC is approx. $6.85 million with construction cost of approx. $5.6. MTP dose not list a cost estimate for this project. Project's MTP and TIP cost estimates are not consistent. Project approval is withheld pending cost estimate revision of project in MTP.

Brownsville MPO (Pharr District):

Review completed using MTP project listing revised on 8/07.

1. FM 3248 (2717-01-017) TIP TPC is approx. $11.39 million including construction costs of $8,112,000. MTP indicates construction cost of $1.5 million. Project's MTP and TIP cost estimates are not consistent. Project approval is withheld pending cost estimate revision of project in MTP.

2. BSIF-LOS TOMATES (0921-06-207) TIP TPC is approx. $24.6 million including construction costs of $16.6 million. MTP indicates construction cost of $ 9.6 million. Project's MTP and TIP cost estimates are not consistent. Project approval is withheld pending cost estimate revision of project in MTP.

Harlingen MPO (Pharr District):

Review completed based on MTP project list received from MPO dated 4/24/08.

1. FM 1479 (1425-04-020) shows TPC of approx. $5.03 million and construction cost of approx. $3.12 million. MTP shows construction cost of approx. $1.3 million. Project's MTP and TIP cost estimates are not consistent. Project's MTP and TIP cost estimates are not consistent. Project approval is withheld pending cost estimate revision of project in MTP.

2. FM 732 (1057-02-021) in TIP shows TPC is approx. $7.06 million and construction cost of $3.59 million. MTP indicates cost of approx. $1.5 million. Project's MTP and TIP cost estimates are not consistent. Project approval is withheld pending cost estimate revision of project in MTP.

3. FM 732 (1057-02-023) in TIP shows TPC is approx. $3.69 million and construction cost of $1.9 million. MTP indicates cost of approx. $925K. Project's MTP and TIP cost estimates are not consistent. Project approval is withheld pending cost estimate revision of project in MTP.

4. Primera Road (0921-06-187) in TIP shows TPC is approx. $10.5 million and construction cost of $6.3 million. This project is about ½ of the project listed in the MTP which indicates cost of approx. $5 million. Project's MTP and TIP cost estimates are not consistent. Project approval is withheld pending cost estimate revision of project in MTP.

Laredo MPO/District:

1. CSJ 0922-33-096: The project description provided in the TIP and 2030 MTP is unclear (i.e., number of lanes). This project is approved contingent upon the clarification of the scope of work.

2. CSJ 0922-33-071: The project description provided in the TIP and 2030 MTP is unclear (i.e., number of lanes). This project is approved contingent upon the clarification of the scope of work.

3. CSJ 0066-14-046: The project description provided in the TIP is unclear (i.e., number of lanes). This project is approved contingent upon the clarification of the scope of work.

4. Laredo MPO Financial Summary: The "programmed" amount shown for Category 3 funding in FY 2009 appears to be $2 million less than the actual funding amounts noted for the individual projects. This discrepancy should be verified and the MPO and STIP funding summaries revised accordingly. Based upon the funding balance noted for FY 2009 in the FY 2008-2011 STIP Analysis, fiscal constraint of the STIP is expected to be maintained.

Lubbock MPO/District:

No comments.

Sherman-Denison MPO/Paris District:

1. CSJ 0091-01-037 and -038 are approved, however, "Year of Expenditure Cost" and the "Type of Work" should be reconciled as part of the project descriptions.

2. For statewide consistency, "Appendix-Grouped Statewide Projects" and "Grouped Projects" individual listings should be reversed.

San Antonio MPO/District:

No comments.

Tyler District/Longview MPO:

No comments.

Tyler District/Tyler MPO:

1. CSJ 3847-02-007 and 0910-16-095 are approved, however, the $55,000/local contribution and $247,498/other funds should be reconciled with the Financial Summary.

2. CSJ 0190-04-900 is approved, however, confirmation of the funding source (e.g., local, state, federal) is necessary. The the MPO project description reflects federal/state, the MPO Financial Summary reflects RMA-Toll Equity/Bonds while the Statewide Financial Summary reflects local.

Wichita Falls MPO/District:

No comments.