

# Ports-to-Plains Segment 2 Committee Meeting #3 Summary

**April 2, 2020, 8:00 a.m.**

**WebEx\***

*\*Note: WebEx was required due to COVID-19 shelter in place orders*

## Attendees

Segment Committee Member	Organization	Attendance
Guy Andrews	Economic Development Director, City of San Angelo	Present via WebEx
Mayor George Arispe	City of Eldorado	Not Present
Mayor John Baker	City of Tahoka	Not Present
James Beauchamp	President, MOTRAN Alliance, Inc.	Not Present
Brad Bouma	President, Select Milk	Not Present
Judge Mike Braddock	Lynn County	Present via WebEx
Judge Charlie Bradley	Schleicher County	Not Present
Bobby Burns	President and CEO, Midland Chamber of Commerce	Not Present
Kasey Coker	Executive Director, The High Ground of Texas	Not Present
Judge Bryan Cox	Martin County	Not Present
John Esparza	Texas Trucking Association	Present via WebEx
Judge Steve Floyd	Tom Green County Designee: Rick Bacon	Designee Present via WebEx: Rick Bacon
Donna Garrett	Executive Director, Sonora Chamber of Commerce	Not Present
Mayor Brenda Gunter, Segment 2 Committee Chair	San Angelo	Present via WebEx
Judge Kim Halfmann	Glasscock County	Not Present
Judge Debi Hays	Ector County	Not Present
Major Hofheins	Director, San Angelo Metropolitan Planning Organization	Present via WebEx
Judge Deborah Horwood	Sterling County	Not Present
Mayor Lane Horwood	City of Sterling City	Not Present
Judge Terry Johnson	Midland County	Not Present
H. David Jones	Director, Lubbock Metropolitan Planning Organization	Present via WebEx

Michael Looney	San Angelo Chamber of Commerce	Not Present
Eddie McBride	President and CEO, Lubbock Chamber of Commerce	Present via WebEx
Gloria McDonald	City Commissioner, City of Big Spring Designee: Big Spring Economic Development Corporation	Present via WebEx
Karen Mize	President, Lamesa Area Chamber of Commerce	Not Present
Judge Foy O'Brien	Dawson County	Not Present
John Osborne	Chairman, Ports-to-Plains Alliance Designee: Vice President of Membership and Marketing	Present via WebEx
Judge Curtis Parrish Segment 2 Vice-Chair	Lubbock County	Present via WebEx
Mayor Patrick Payton	City of Midland	Not Present
Tim Pierce	Executive Director, South Plains Association of Governments	Not Present
Mayor Dan Pope, Ports-to-Plains Advisory Committee Chair	City of Lubbock	Present via WebEx
Stephen Robertson	Executive Vice President, Permian Basin Petroleum Association Designee: Community Relations Coordinator	Present via WebEx
Mayor Wanda Shurley	City of Sonora Designee: City Manager	Not Present
Judge Stephen H. Smith, Ports-to-Plains Advisory Committee Vice-Chair	Sutton County	Not Present
Judge Hal Spain	Coke County	Not Present
Mayor Josh Stevens	City of Lamesa	Not Present
John Austin Stokes	Executive Director, Concho Valley Council of Governments	Not Present
Mayor Shannon Thomason	City of Big Spring Designee: Assistant City Manager John Medina	Present via WebEx
Fred Thompson	Director, Sterling City Economic Development Corporation	Present via WebEx
Mayor David Turner	City of Odessa Designee: Assistant City Manager Phillip Urrutia	Not Present
Debbye ValVerde	Executive Director, Big Spring Area Chamber of Commerce	Present via WebEx
Steve Verett	Executive Vice President, Plains Cotton Growers, Inc.	Designee Present via WebEx: Shawn Wade

	Designee: Director of Policy Analysis and Research, Shawn Wade	
Cameron Walker	Director, Permian Basin Metropolitan Planning Organization	Present via WebEx
Judge Kathryn Wiseman	Howard County	Not Present

### Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)

Caroline Mays	Steve Linhart
Roger Beall	Alvin New
Loretta Brown	Sheri Pifer
Carlos Calle	Roberto Rodriguez, III
Blake Calvert	Jared Shaffer
Emily Clisby	Randee Shields
Michael Haithcock	Peter Smith
Cliff Halford	John Speed
Krista Jeacopello	Akila Thamizharasan
Carl Johnson	Trent Thomas
Mark Jones	Steve Warren
Julie Jerome	

### Consultant Team

Wendy Travis	Garver	Sean Wray	Garver
Susan Chavez	Garver	Sophie Cohen	WSP
Michele Lopez	Garver	Rachel Lunceford	HG Consult
Tracy Michel	Garver	Robert Ryan	Blanton & Associates

### Other Attendees

Chris Allen	Lubbock Economic Development Alliance
Virginia Belew	Permian Basin Regional Planning Commission
Paula Dowell	Cambridge Systematics
Duffy Hinkle	Ports-to-Plains Alliance
Joe Kiely	Ports-to-Plains Alliance
Emma Kraybill	Scenic Mountain Medical Center

### Welcome

Mayor Brenda Gunter of San Angelo, Chair of Segment Committee #2 called the meeting to order.

Roger Beall, TxDOT Deputy Director of the Transportation Planning and Programming Division, thanked everyone for participating in the meeting online. He said safety is of utmost importance which is why we are meeting online. He also said he looked forward to the discussion.

Caroline Mays, TxDOT Freight, Trade and Connectivity Section Director, thanked Mr. Beall and handed the meeting over to Mayor Pope for opening remarks.

The Advisory Committee Chair and Lubbock Mayor Dan Pope acknowledged these are unusual times and people are making difficult decisions and implementing some of those difficult decisions right now, so he thanked everyone for their time and for being at the meeting. He said there have been a couple changes since the Segment Committee last met. After spending time with Caroline, Peter, and TxDOT leadership after the last Advisory Committee Meeting, they decided it was best to focus our study on what an interstate route would look like compared to the current route, and not evaluate the modified 4-lane divided highway scenario like we were previously. Mayor Pope said when this was first shared with him, he had a few questions including whether it fit into House Bill 1079, and it certainly does. His next thought was it was brilliant since that's what we want and the case we want to make. He thinks this simplifies things and streamlines decision-making. Texas Transportation Commissioner Alvin New also agreed. He believes the Committee will find that a positive change. He reminded the Committee there's a short timeframe of only 90 days. We need to be thinking about recommendations today. Late Monday, we saw the economic numbers and those need some more work and we need to simplify them, so it is appropriate we do not discuss those today and we will be pushing that to May. We will also talk about cost data today. He stated these new costs are good numbers that are bottoms up, and Wendy and the team will talk about how they came up with those numbers. We need to base our case on fact. He said he thinks this is a more authentic approach for moving forward. Mayor Pope thanked Mayor Gunter for her time and level of attention and dedication to this effort.

Mayor Gunter thanked and supported what Mayor Pope said. She said she felt the numbers are good and feels that the time was well spent for more bottoms up numbers. Unfortunately, at the same time, the oil and energy sector are exploding, and we want to plan for a perfect storm. She stated the committee has 90 days to make recommendations, and everyone's input is very important. Now is our time to ask important questions. So that when all this is done, we believe these recommendations are the correct recommendations. I ask for your input, support, and contribution at all levels to get this done.

Ms. Mays reviewed the agenda items with the committee.

### **Recap of Previous Segment Committee Meeting**

Ms. Mays explained the changes in the alternatives studied. She discussed the different analysis scenarios and mentioned the original scenarios are now revised to include a baseline (no build) and the interstate highway scenario.

Ms. Mays provided a recap of the February 5<sup>th</sup> Segment Committee meeting. At that meeting, the Committee reviewed forecasted conditions, planned and programmed projects, identification of gaps, preliminary corridor feasibility analysis, and reviewed Chapters 1 and 2. Ms. Mays gave a brief recap of each of the agenda items, highlighting the overview of findings for each topic. Ms. Mays explained the report chapter outline had changed. Nothing was lost, but the chapters were streamlined to avoid redundancy and repetition. She said there is less than 90 days to get committee recommendations and June 30<sup>th</sup> is when the Committee's report is due to the Advisory Committee.

Mayor Gunter asked what level detail is required for the recommendations.

Ms. Mays said they will provide examples from the I-69 segment committees and will discuss the level of information later in the meeting.

### **Determination of Areas Preferable and Suitable for Interstate Design**

Akila Thamizharasan, TxDOT Corridor Planning Branch Manager, started the presentation by reviewing a cross section of an interstate with and without frontage roads. She described the differences between the two options. Next, she explained federal guidance on interstate designation. She said there are three methods to obtain interstate designation.

Rachel Lunceford with the consultant team provided more detail about each method. In Segment #2, I-27 and I-20 are designated interstate and are not evaluated because they already meet criteria. The rest of the corridor were evaluated to identify if it met standards. Under Method 1, the key takeaways were there were about 27 miles of access-controlled freeway. There is a distinction between access-controlled freeway and interstate. It may not meet the design criteria for interstate. There is a stretch in Lubbock south of I-27 that does meet interstate standards; however, there is guidance on whether you can get interstate designation and that stretch does not meet those criteria. The remaining 383 miles of corridor does not meet interstate standards and is not eligible for interstate designation by the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT).

Next, she discussed the six criteria that corridors need to meet to be designated as a future interstate facility under Method 2. For Method 2, existing I-27 is already designated interstate, the remaining Segment #2 would need to meet criteria 1-6 under Method 2 and be subject to TxDOT and FHWA approval. Method 3 will involve a Congressional act to designate the corridor as an interstate facility.

For the remaining Segment #2, Ms. Lunceford presented the six criteria under Method 2. In Segment #2, with the exception of I-27 and I-20, the remaining corridor will need to meet criteria 1 through 6 under Method 2 and be subject to TxDOT and FHWA approval.

Mr. Osborne asked whether the committee could recommend Methods 2 and 3.

Ms. Mays responded yes. The only method that TxDOT's name cannot be attached to is Method 3 because TxDOT cannot lobby for a Congressional act.

Mayor Gunter asked about the 100,000 population criteria and how to discuss from San Angelo to Sonora, as the farther south you go the smaller the population. She asked whether it is an issue of point A to B or in between. Or does it matter since we are connecting San Angelo to Del Rio?

Ms. Lunceford stated it is connecting to Sonora because of the interstate and not because of the population of Sonora since I-10 is considered a major traffic generator.

Ms. Mays added that Segment #2 is different from Segment #1 because you have the advantage of having I-20 and I-10 and can have logical termini. She stated that Ms. Lunceford mentioned the

logical sections for the committee to consider. There are big sections of the corridor and you must think of manageable projects as you look at recommendations later in the meeting.

### **Preliminary Cost Estimates**

Ms. Lunceford continued the presentation by discussing cost estimates. She explained the costs are in 2020 dollar and that a new software system (Concept Station) was used. It assumes a 75-mile per hour design speed, uses TxDOT bids from each district for labor and prices, and it does not include costs for existing I-27 and I-20.

Mayor Gunter asked how it was handled for including both routes (US 87 from Sterling City to Lamesa; State Highway 158 from Sterling City to I-20 to State Highway 349 to Lamesa).

Ms. Lunceford stated both routes are included and are in the total. The estimates assume relief routes and include two estimates, one for frontage roads throughout the entire segment, and one for frontage roads in cities and towns. These include high-level estimates for utilities and right-of-way (ROW).

Mr. Osborne asked whether it includes a complete reconstruction and what level of construction is reflected in the estimate.

Ms. Lunceford responded it reflects full reconstruction because we cannot assume the condition of pavement considering the 30-year period of this study.

Mayor Pope asked whether this is a worst-case scenario because there are parts of the corridor that are new and there has been quite a bit of work on some pieces of the road. He noted this is a most conservative way to look at the corridor.

Ms. Lunceford agreed and stated that a good planning cost estimate becomes more refined as you get further into design.

Ms. Mays added this is a planning level cost estimate and does not include refined details of a design estimate. At the design level, the TxDOT Districts would assess the existing roadway condition and developed a more refined cost.

Ms. Lunceford presented two estimates for the corridor with frontage roads throughout and one estimate with frontage roads for just urban areas.

Mr. Osborne asked why frontage roads in rural areas were not looked at in more detailed to determine where they were needed and where they were not.

Ms. Mays stated that was a good point and said the study team had talked with the TxDOT districts. What we heard from TxDOT districts, and they can talk about how frontage roads are determined, that it is a project by project basis. This is the cost estimate for two different scenarios.

Mr. Osborne added that thinking about I-35 and how many times it has been expanded and it has helped that they had enough ROW for frontage roads. It is easier to get ROW now instead of catching up later.

Commissioner New commented about the practical view on ROW. We don't live in an environment where the price is no option. He said when you try to get an interstate built running from north to south, you must have some practical consideration of a price tag. It's a lot less expensive for an off-interstate system road that connect to overpasses and ramps than it is rural access roads with frontage roads. Where there are gaps, it may be necessary to acquire ROW. When you drive I-10 there are large areas with no frontage roads. Imagine the cost for holding land for the state of Texas and not building any roads. It is a good thought; however, it is impractical to have enough money to acquire ROW right now to avoid it later.

Mayor Pope added that a practical sense is to have frontage roads between Lubbock and Lamesa where you have agriculture and cotton farming than farther south where it does not make a lot of sense.

Commissioner New said he has heard from ranchers saying they can't get to market and can't get access. He said there might be stretches where you need frontage roads because you can't get them to another access point. He is not saying none, but some. If we plan for now, we just need to be careful of what we ask for. He stated to be mindful of Proposition 1 which is likely to be under pressure when this comes through. Just be mindful of the mindset of people to vote on getting something built for a certain cost.

Ms. Lunceford continued the presentation by discussing the ROW as a percentage of construction cost. The study went with the ROW as a percentage of construction cost and included major utility relocation and adjusted the costs to account for planned and programmed projects.

Ms. Lunceford continued the presentation by reviewing the differences between the 2015 Initial Assessment Report and the current study.

The cost estimate for the entire corridor as interstate with frontage roads is \$27.886 billion and \$18.857 billion for interstate with frontage roads in urban areas only. The Segment #2 cost estimate is \$14.586 billion for interstate with frontage roads in urban and rural areas and \$9.918 billion for interstate with frontage roads only in urban areas.

Lastly, Ms. Lunceford provided a cost comparison of Segment #2 per mile cost to the I-69 Implementation Strategy and the I-35 Statewide Corridor Plan.

Mr. Osborne asked whether the I-69 corridor number is for the remaining to be constructed and is it both frontage roads situation.

Ms. Lunceford stated that there are more differences in the assumptions between the studies. It is not a true "apples-to-apples" comparison because in I-69, they can reuse existing pavement and are further along on their study.

Mr. Osborne asked for I-35 whether the estimate is for expansion purposes only.

Ms. Lunceford replied that it is for their long-range plan and is for construction of the entire corridor.

Mr. Osborne added that because it is an existing corridor, it is likely for expansion purposes.

Ms. Lunceford said yes.

Mayor Pope stated he had a hard time buying the I-35 numbers and referenced a section of I-35 recently reviewed that would be much higher than estimate provided. He assumed that the number may be more reflective of other less dense areas but is not reflected of the I-35 corridor through Austin.

Ms. Lunceford agreed and stated this is an average estimate for the entire corridor, and that obviously some areas would be more expensive than others.

Commissioner New asked when was the I-69 study done.

Ms. Lunceford said 2018, but that they did go back and adjusted for inflation for 2020 dollars.

Commissioner New stated as he remembers it was done in 2017 using available numbers that may have been 2015. It is not “apples to apples” and is doing just the best you can. The reality is that you have software now that wasn’t available before. He stated that it is important that these aren’t glossed over but looking at these numbers and how each of these studies were put together. These would be tough discussions and have good data that is very relevant.

Mr. Osborne stated this slide is going to be looked at. All the slides and in the report. And we need to get it closer. This is the talking point if the Legislature wants to do it or not. It would be helpful if this is a closer comparison.

Ms. Mays said there are lots of things not the same as I-69 such as access rights and costs of materials that varies for different parts of the state.

Commissioner New said he’s not questioning these Ports-to-Plains numbers, but where there is a lot more water, trees, and population that the I-69 study goes through, it is not at the same level as our study. When past studies are compared with current studies and versus 2020, these numbers are bigger numbers. Then it follows at I-69 needs to be updated and question their methodology.

Mayor Gunter stated that obviously we needed a comparison. She was glad that those numbers were provided. She further stated we will be fighting for dollars. Dollars would help dictate the decisions that are made. She noted the amazing comparison of 2015 to 2020 is \$1 million per mile versus \$21 million per mile. She noted the better committee understands these numbers and what makes them up, the more comfortable we will be about what we need to be doing in terms of our recommendations.

Ms. Mays agreed, and suggested the Committee could look at a scenario where select rural areas of the segment are considered for frontage road construction that is included with the urban area estimate. In rural areas, we generally don't build a highway section with full frontage roads; however, each project is different. The Committee can look at potential areas of not a 100 percent buildout, but a select area build out.

John Speed stated that moving in between programming level estimates and project level estimates, it seems like this is well within that range and looks like the right process to him.

Steve Warren stated he felt the cost estimate methodology that was used is solid and thought for many years of an estimate of \$20 million a mile to do this entire corridor. It's a solid estimate and best that we could do now. He referenced the Marsha Sharp freeway through Lubbock which came in with a cost of \$35 million a mile. He thinks this is a good estimate and that you are adding ROW and utility relocation as well. He thinks the estimate is in the right ballpark.

Michael Haithcock, TxDOT Abilene District, said his concern before was ROW costs which we discussed about before because ROW will be very expensive. Ms. Mays said Ms. Lunceford made some adjustments to the cost estimates based on the District's comments from last week.

John DeWitt with the TxDOT San Angelo District, said they are working with Garver on two planning studies in Sonora and San Angelo. We are beginning to pull those cost estimates together. He had some concerns about the methodology for a total corridor perspective with a lot of uncertainty and things we can't really address until we get into a schematic level design. He said he understands the concern of total comparison level at the UTP level. He felt comfortable with the number for now for Segment #2.

Mr. Speed asked whether the cost estimate include ancillary costs such as oversight, design and development of the projects.

Ms. Lunceford said the engineering and preliminary design were calculated and are part of the cost.

Rick Bacon with Tom Green County stated he doesn't think anyone disagrees with the methodology, but asked whether it is in the Committee's best interest to look at percentages, as realistically that we are going to have issues on where those frontage roads go. For estimate purposes, if we could get somewhere in between with one cost estimate for comparison, that might help get us a little further down the road.

Ms. Mays said certainly it was up to the Committee to consider.

Mr. Osborne asked whether we wanted to do these two estimates or a hybrid of a percentage.

Ms. Mays said yes, the Committee needs to determine what number goes into the report. We can't put both numbers, but just one number so that we could add that to the total corridor number for the Advisory Committee.

Mr. Osborne agreed that it be a smaller percentage than 80 or 50 but asked if the Judges from the rural counties could comment on that. He said he would like the input from rural areas.

Judge Mike Braddock from Lynn County said frontage roads were necessary in rural areas, and he asked whether the frontage roads would be one-way or two-way frontage roads.

Ms. Mays said in terms of frontage roads themselves, FHWA would not approve two-way frontage roads for interstate development. They would have to be one-way frontage roads.

Mr. Osborne stated that he would suggest going with a 50 percent estimate for frontage roads if no one else had any other suggestions or comment and asked Ms. Mays.

Ms. Mays stated that is up to Mayor Gunter and the Committee.

Ms. Mays asked if the study goes back to the TxDOT districts and gets their input since they would know best and provide valid suggestions regarding the frontage roads to the Committee.

Mayor Gunter thinks that would be correct.

Ms. Mays said she would run some numbers of the recommendation of what percentage of rural frontage roads and share that with the Committee. Once those numbers are run, the Committee's input would be needed quickly to include in the chapter.

Mayor Gunter agreed.

Ms. Lunceford added that the ROW estimate includes access to driveways, and she wanted the Committee to understand driveways would still be provided access even without frontage roads being built.

Ms. Mays added that the ROW estimate would remain the same, but the construction cost would change.

### **Preliminary Committee Recommendations**

Ms. Mays started the discussion of Committee recommendations. She provided a brief overview of important data to consider from the forecasted data including population demographics, freight, traffic, and safety. She also reviewed recommendations from the previous meetings.

Robert Ryan with the consultant used an interactive map to capture the Committee's preliminary recommendations. The Committee decided to create a sub-committee to make specific recommendations along the corridor.

As members were making recommendations, there were also four Mentimeter questions asked. The questions and results are as follows:

**Mentimeter Question #1: What added capacity improvements and locally preferred routes would you recommend from Abernathy to Lamesa?**

Responses included a possible relief route at Garden City and a turn-around at FM 213, O'Donnell, and Lamesa.

**Mentimeter Question #2: What added capacity improvements and locally preferred routes would you recommend from Lamesa to south of Sterling City?**

Responses included access and frontage roads from Lamesa to Midland and from Lamesa to Big Spring, frontage roads from Water Valley to San Angelo, a relief route at Sterling City, and frontage roads between Big Spring and Sterling City.

**Mentimeter Question #3: What added capacity improvements and locally preferred routes would you recommend from north of San Angelo to south of Sonora?**

Responses included study the need for location of frontage roads between cities.

**Mentimeter Question #4: What safety/operational improvements would you recommend?**

No responses

### **Funding Sources**

Susan Chavez from the consultant team presented a review of funding sources. Funding sources include federal state, and local funds.

Mr. Osborne asked for the federal sources funding to add formula funds from the National Highway Freight Program, the FAST Act averages about \$110 million a year to Texas which would be good to know. He suggested a description about the eligibility of rural and multi-state corridor to meet the criteria and funding goals for some of these federal sources would be good to add. Also, on the state funding, with the UTP and its 12 funding categories, he would like to add how the corridor could benefit from current and future UTPs.

Ms. Mays said we can add UTP funding categories but need to think about how the corridor could potentially qualify for several funding categories. Again, the TxDOT districts are using several different categories to fund projects.

Ms. Chavez continued the presentation by discussing private funding sources that include Permian strategic partnership, county energy transportation reinvestment zone, and public/private partnerships.

### **Review and Discussion of Report Chapters 3 and 4**

Ms. Mays reviewed changes made to the Segment Committee Report outline before asking committee members for comments and questions on draft Chapters 3 (Forecasted Conditions) and 4 (Corridor Feasibility Analysis). Ms. Mays reviewed the chapters with the Committee. She asked the

Committee what the key messages are they want in Chapter 3 and what is the big picture in those chapters. Ms. Mays asked the Committee to provide comments because she reminded them that this report is to be given to the Advisory Committee and needs to come from the Segment Committee.

Mayor Gunter stated that based on past conversations, the reality is if you look at the benefits of the corridor being developed as an interstate, it's so significant. We need to use the numbers to tell the story. There is a need for a north/south route. It's too great a distance from other corridors. These numbers are relevant.

Ms. Mays agreed and said that is exactly what she meant by the key messages to include in the chapters. She said the report needs to articulate those key messages.

Mayor Gunter stated the situation that the story continues to be about national security. With what is going on in the world today, food, fuel, and fiber in Segment #2 becomes an even bigger story.

Mr. Osborne asked if it was okay if he submits written comments after the meeting.

Ms. Mays said it was fine, but we would like to have a dialogue today as a body and hear what each other is thinking because there is not a lot of time to take ownership of the review of the document and to make sure you are comfortable of the language of the report.

Mr. Bacon said there is an area he didn't notice in these two chapters. He said it was the comparison to highways that could be built versus other highways in the state, that you can get a lot more done in this corridor when dollars are tight.

Mayor Gunter stated that if we don't do interstate designation, this corridor will not experience those benefits. She added the Committee must be able to use the analysis to justify the corridor as an interstate.

Ms. Mays agreed and said you can see on the slide on what is in chapter 4, which is the heart of the study.

Mayor Gunter said she would create a subcommittee to put more in detail on what we would like to put into the plan.

Ms. Mays extended the deadline for committee members to provide comments to TxDOT on the two draft chapters to April 10, 2020. All comments received by the April 10 deadline will be added to a comment matrix to ensure each was addressed.

### **Next Meeting**

Ms. Mays stated the next meeting is proposed to be held Wednesday, May 13 by WebEx.

Mayor Pope he stated he knows there are many other and more important things going on, but this is important work and he appreciates the willingness of the Committee to participate today. He appreciated TxDOT, the consultants and particularly Mayor Gunter for keeping this going.

Commissioner New said thank you and to have a good day.

Mayor Gunter said thank you to everyone for participating and for keeping this moving. She said we certainly want MPO's to also be on these subcommittees, districts, TxDOT directors, mayors, and chambers. I'm going to need all your input. City by city, route by route, the best possible input and choices. She said each member's input will make that possible and knowing where the needs are for the frontage roads. She thanked everyone.

The meeting adjourned at 11:48 a.m.

**Action Items:**

- Mayor Gunter will put together a sub-committee meeting to develop specific recommendations.
- TxDOT will revise the cost estimates for the frontage roads in rural areas.
- The TxDOT and consultant team will work with the districts and subcommittee to detail recommendations.
- Committee members will send all written comments to TxDOT by April 10, 2020.
- The next Segment Committee Meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 13, 2020.