



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 78701-3255

June 22, 2009

Refer to: HPP-IX

Joint Approval of May 2009
Quarterly Revisions to the FY 2008-2011
Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Mr. James L. 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 May 2009 Quarterly revisions to the FY 2008-2011 STIP transmitted by Mr. Amadeo Saenz's letter of June 17, 2009. Based upon our review, the May 2009 Quarterly revisions to the STIP are hereby approved subject to the enclosed comments.

Should you have any questions concerning this approval, please contact Mr. Jose Campos of the FHWA Texas Division at (512) 536-5932 or Ms. Lynn Hayes of FIA Region 6 office at (817) 978-0565.

Sincerely yours,

Peggy Crist
Planning Director
Federal Transit Administration

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

Enclosure



cc: FHWA-HA-IX, HB-IX, HAM-IX
Peggy Crist, FTA, Region VI
Wayne Wells, TxDOT Design
Lori Morel, TxDOT TPP(S)
Kelly Kirkland, TxDOT PTN
Karen Dunlap, TxDOT PTN

ENCLOSURE
May 2009 Quarterly STIP Revision Comments

FY 2008-2011 STIP Financial Summary:

1. The financial summaries indicating the programmed funding amounts by category and fiscal year appear to be inconsistent with the information provided in the corresponding MPO financial summaries. Please verify the funding amounts reflected and revise the STIP financial summaries as appropriate. Specific inconsistencies are noted below:
 - a. FY 2009, Austin MPO: The noted amount of category 1 funding does not appear consistent with the MPO TIP financial summary.
 - b. FY 2009, Austin MPO: The noted amount of total funding (federal and non-federal) does not appear consistent with the MPO TIP financial summary.
 - c. FY 2011, Houston MPO: The STIP financial summary does not appear to include funding for categories 6 and 8, as noted in the MPO financial summary.
 - d. FY 2009, 2010, 2011 Laredo MPO: The funding amounts noted in the STIP financial summaries do not appear consistent with the MPO TIP financial summary (i.e., amount and category of funds).

Atlanta District:

1. A review of the District funding summary appears to indicate several funding discrepancies. As such approval of the May 2009 STIP revisions is withheld pending the clarification of these discrepancies. Specific inconsistencies are noted below:
 - a. Funding by Category Table: No ARRA funds are shown in the table. We understand that this is due to TxDOT's decision to apply the District's ARRA funds to grouped category projects. However, the March 20th OOC revision showed FY10 with \$500,000 of ARRA funds programmed. We also understand the FY10 \$500,000 is coming off the US 59 project. Therefore, this funding amount should be adjusted and an amendment to remove those ARRA funds completed. Please revise the project listings and financial summary to accurately reflect the programming of ARRA funds as appropriate.
 - b. Funding by Category Table: It appears that this revision includes the first changes to the amounts programmed for FY09 since the Nov 08 revision. The amounts for Category 11 and Other(R) between the two versions are different (11/08 Cat 11 \$16,550,000; Other(R) \$9,242,000 and 5/09 Cat 11 \$11,750,000; Other(R) \$2,602,000). The May 09 revision does not include project listings for the programming of FY09 funds. Please clarify what project/funding changes have occurred to reflect the new amounts. If there have been substantive changes, the STIP project listings should be updated.

- c. Funding by Category Table: The FY10 project listings (CSJ 0610-10-002) show the programming of Cat 1 funds that do not appear in the summary table. Pending resolution to comment “2” below, please revise either the summary table or the project listings to be accurate and consistent.
 - d. Funding by Category Table: The FY10 project listings show programming of \$10,897,424 of Cat 11 funds while the summary table shows programming of \$38,286,025 of Cat 11 funds. Please reconcile this inconsistency.
 - e. Funding by Category Table: The FY10 project listings show a total of \$142,478,892 programmed while the summary table shows a total of \$169,867,492. Please reconcile this inconsistency.
 - f. Funding by Category Table: It appears that the total for FY08-11 for the rural area has increased substantially from previous revisions. The Feb/Mar 08 had \$174,280,119 programmed and the Nov 08 revisions had \$155,619,237 programmed. No other intervening revision until the current one showed changes for the rural area. The current revision shows \$300,793,908 programmed for the rural area. Please explain/clarify and revise the funding summary as appropriate.
 - g. Funding Participation Source Table: Shows \$5,000 in ARRA funds for FY08. It looks like this was supposed to be Other(R) funding. Please revise as appropriate.
2. CSJ 0610-06-076 (IH 30 from Spur 86 to FM 560) and CSJ 0610-10-002 (SP 594 from IH 30 to US 82 in Hooks): These projects appear to include \$1 placeholders. As previously noted (March 27, 2009 email from FHWA to TxDOT (Lori Morel)), we cannot accept \$1 placeholders on projects. The STIP should reflect all funding (including funding for potential cost overruns) assigned to a project. Approval of these revisions is withheld pending the removal of the \$1 placeholder and any necessary revisions to show the total amount of funding available and necessary for the project.

Austin MPO:

1. CSJ 0113-08-060: This CSJ does not appear to correspond to the project described based upon previous versions of the Austin MPO TIP. This revision is approved contingent upon the verification/clarification of the project CSJ.
2. MPO TIP Financial Summary: It is noted that the 2009 programmed funding amounts reflected in the financial summary for Categories 11 and 12 appear to be reflected as negative amounts (i.e., shown in parenthesis). Please explain the intent of this notation and/or revise the summary as appropriate.

Dallas-Fort Worth MPO:

Dallas:

1. CSJ 0281-02-039 is not approved due to STIP/MTP/2007 Transportation Conformity inconsistencies as confirmed on June 16 to June 19, 2009 by NCTCOG staff.
2. CSJ 0549-03-018 is not approved due to STIP/MTP/2007 Transportation Conformity inconsistencies as confirmed on June 16 to June 19, 2009 by NCTCOG staff.
3. CSJ 0918-24-976 is not approved due to STIP/MTP/2007 Transportation Conformity inconsistencies as confirmed on June 16 to June 19, 2009 by NCTCOG staff.
4. CSJ 0135-02-901 is not approved due to STIP/MTP/2007 Transportation Conformity inconsistencies (i.e. the MTP ref reflects 6-lanes to 6-lanes while the STIP reflects 4-lanes to 6-lanes.)
5. CSJ 1015-01-018 is not approved due to STIP/MTP/2007 Transportation Conformity inconsistencies (i.e. the MTP ref includes 2-lanes to 6-lanes while the STIP reflects 2-lanes to 4-lanes.)
6. CSJ 1290-02-017 is not approved due to STIP/MTP/2007 Transportation Conformity inconsistencies (i.e. the MTP ref includes 2-lanes to 6-lanes while the STIP reflects 2-lanes to 4-lanes.)
7. CSJ 1290-03-016 is not approved due to STIP/MTP/2007 Transportation Conformity inconsistencies (i.e. the MTP ref includes 2-lanes to 6-lanes while the STIP reflects 2-lanes to 4-lanes.)
8. CSJ 1290-03-020 is not approved due to STIP/MTP/2007 Transportation Conformity inconsistencies (i.e. the MTP ref includes 2-lanes to 6-lanes while the STIP reflects 2-lanes to 4-lanes.)
9. Appendix D (dated April 24, 2009): The following CSJs are not approved due to STIP/MTP/2007 Transportation Conformity inconsistencies as confirmed on June 16 to June 19, 2009 by NCTCOG staff.

0009-11-129	0047-06-108	0047-14-046	0047-14-065
0047-14-902	0094-07-015	0094-07-020	0095-02-096
0095-03-080	0095-10-033	0196-01-056	0196-01-074
0196-03-138	0261-01-037	0261-02-044	0353-02-037
0353-02-060	0353-04-056	0353-06-025	0353-06-050
0353-06-054	0442-02-088	0581-02-077	0918-45-272
0918-45-365	2374-01-138	2374-01-139	2374-03-057
2374-04-049	2681-01-012	2964-01-022	2964-01-037
2964-06-011	2964-06-012	2964-10-002	3148-01-006

Fort Worth:

1. CSJ 0902-48-963 is approved subject to clarification/revision of “ROW acquisition” versus “corridor preservation.”
2. CSJ 1978-01-927 is not approved due to STIP/MTP/2007 Transportation Conformity inconsistencies (i.e. MTP ref. 120.6 has 6-lanes by YR 2015; the STIP has widen to 4-lanes). In addition, the TIP description should reflect the specifics of the Cat 5/CMAQ funded activities.
3. Appendix D (dated April 24, 2009): CSJ 0718-02-045 is approved subject to a TIP description revision to match the MTP description. Specifically, the TIP includes an ultimate of 6-lanes while the MTP refers to 4-lanes.)
4. Appendix D (dated April 24, 2009): CSJ 1978-01-927 is not approved due to STIP/MTP/2007 Transportation Conformity inconsistencies (i.e. MTP ref. 120.5 has 4-lanes each year while the STIP has widen 2- to 4-lanes). In addition, the STIP description should reflect the specifics of the Cat 5/CMAQ funded activities.

Houston District/MPO:

1. Amendment 109, CSJ 3538-01-030: This revision proposes to delay this project, however the current transportation conformity documentation indicates that the proposed project is expected to be “open to traffic” by 2009. If the proposed direct connectors are part of an added capacity improvement (e.g., new toll road), transportation conformity must also be addressed. Approval of this revision is withheld pending clarification concerning the scope of this project (i.e., added capacity).
2. Amendment 109, CSJ 8170-12-006: This revision proposes to delay this project from 2008 to 2010 however the project cost is noted to decrease by approximately 34 percent. Such a decrease in funding is unexpected for a project that is being delayed. This revision is approved contingent upon clarification of the funding decrease.

Laredo MPO:

1. MPO Financial Summary: It is noted that the MPO financial summary does not reflect any “authorized” funding amounts. Please explain/clarify.

San Angelo District:

1. District Financial Summary: It is noted that the MPO financial summary does not reflect any “authorized” funding amounts. Please explain/clarify.

San Antonio MPO/District:

1. General: The revisions appear to indicate only the construction (CONSTR) phase of work for each individual project listed. No other phase of work, including right-of-way acquisition (ROW) or preliminary engineering (PE), appears to be programmed during the same fiscal year. This is unexpected. Please verify/clarify the programming of only the CONSTR phase of work.
2. CSJ 0915-12-904: The revisions show a total project cost of \$9.655 M and a YOE cost of \$8 M in FY 2010; however this project is described in the 2030 MTP as a \$4 M project under MPO ID No. 3776. This revision is not approved until the MTP has been updated to reflect the current YOE and TPC costs consistent with the FY 08-11 STIP/TIP. In addition, the project description differs between the 2030 MTP and the revision.