MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

SUBJECT: Corridor Segment Committee #2 – Meeting #2

DATE: August 5, 2009

LOCATION: Polk County Economic & Industrial Development Corp./Chamber of Commerce, Livingston, Texas

ATTENDING: Attendants are listed on attached sign-in sheets

Meeting purpose:

The meeting was held to solicit input from the Corridor Segment Committee #2 (CSC 2) on the planning and development of an I-69 Corridor Program that will address local, regional and statewide transportation issues and needs. Meeting format followed the Agenda attached to these notes. The meeting was called to order and continued as follows:

Welcome/Introductions and Presentations:

Thanks were given to the host of the meeting, Polk County Economic & Industrial Development Corp./Chamber of Commerce. CSC 2 Members and TxDOT Staff then introduced themselves. TxDOT representatives explained that these meetings will be structured to obtain input for the I-69 planning process which will then be linked to the NEPA process. Input from each of the five CSCs will be used to ultimately develop an I-69 Corridor Program. The CSCs will also have an opportunity to provide input into the Program’s Public Involvement Plan. There is a focus to get I-69 on the ground and the solution might include multi-modal projects.

The following topics were covered in the presentation:

- Welcome/Introductions
- Role of Corridor Segment Committee in Developing the I-69 Corridor Program
- Transportation Needs – Identification of Transportation Problems and Challenges
- Existing and Planned Highways in the I-69 Corridor – What is Out There Today and What is Planned

1. Committee Member (Jim Wehmeier) questioned what impacts the last legislative session had on TxDOT and I-69.
   a. TxDOT responded by explaining that there were tools in place to encourage private investment in transportation before the legislative session. Now restrictions and limitations on the use of the tools are being imposed. However, TxDOT will continue to look for ways to generate “new money”. There are fewer funding tools, but no lack of desire to get I-69 “on the ground”. TxDOT also explained that the Comprehensive Development Agreement (CDA) discussion during the legislative session was
2. Committee Member (Lloyd Kirkham) asked about the availability of stimulus money for I-69 and the status of other states.
   a. TxDOT noted that construction is slow in other states because money is tight. Stimulus money is good news; however, the stimulus program has imposed time requirements for having a project ready for construction. As such, the available money lends itself to work better for getting small projects on the ground. It can be used to connect some dots but not enough to provide a substantial I-69 upgrade. Other funding possibilities include Tiger Grants; however, it is very competitive to obtain these types of Federal funds.

3. Committee Member (Lloyd Kirkham) asked about the possibility of Counties providing a percentage towards the funding and requesting a grant from the State.
   a. TxDOT noted that yes, it would be great to partner with the Cities and Counties for funding. TxDOT wants to help but the reality is that there is no large pool of transportation funds available.

4. Committee Member (Jay Snook) asked what TxDOT was considering as ways to fund I-69.
   a. TxDOT explained that gas tax money is spread thin and TxDOT is spending more on maintenance, so gas tax money is not readily available for added capacity projects (new construction). Solutions could include alternative funding mechanisms such as:
      i. User Fees / Tolls
      ii. Private Investment
      iii. Federal Legislation to earmark funds
      iv. Transportation Reinvestment Zones (TRZs)
      v. Taxing Districts (TIFs) created by Counties, Cities or Regions

5. Committee Member (Jay Snook) asked if TxDOT would be taking money from the FM roadway system to fund I-69.
   a. TxDOT explained TxDOT’s highest priority is maintaining the existing system. All projects are competing for the same funds, and there is just a limited amount of funds to be spread around equitably.

6. Committee Member (Lloyd Kirkham) asked if TxDOT had done studies for tolling I-69, and that he supports tolls as a funding mechanism.
   a. TxDOT explained that before any project moves forward as a toll road many studies are done. Houston and Austin are successful examples of how toll roads can generate funding revenue because of the volume of traffic and level of congestion in the areas. However, in Polk County it’s not known if toll roads would be successful. In some areas where traffic projections are low, tolling may not be feasible.
7. Committee Member (Kelly Ritch) asked if consideration is given to those who do not wish to pay tolls.
   a. TxDOT explained that by law, existing free roads cannot be converted to toll roads. TxDOT referred to US 59 as an example and explained that if lanes were added to a four-lane highway, those four lanes would remain un-tolled, and the additional lanes would have the potential to be tolled. The four lanes could function as frontage roads and the tolled lanes could function as mainlanes.

8. Committee Member (Royce Wells) asked if TxDOT was to implement toll roads, would it be just to recover costs or would tolls be collected forever.
   a. TxDOT referenced the DFW Turnpike. It paid itself off twenty years early and the tolls were removed. Today, the facility is expensive to maintain. Tolls could be used as a onetime solution to pay off bonds. However, they could also be used to maintain the roadway for which they are collected, as well as to leverage additional bonds to construct new facilities.
   b. Marc Williams noted that the Corridor Advisory Committee report explains funding options and this might be a topic to discuss at a future meeting.

9. Committee Member (Doug Spruill) noted that there was a need to eliminate the adversarial relationship between the State legislature and TxDOT. The State legislature should find funding sources since TxDOT does not have the ability to leverage the types of funding necessary for a transportation program. A full time committee should be developed with the power to obtain funds and work with TxDOT. Secondly, TxDOT inflamed Texans with the infamous picture of the Trans-Texas Corridor (TTC). TxDOT needs to inform the public that the TTC is gone and that TxDOT is working with local communities to identify transportation needs and develop solutions for their community.

10. Proxy Committee Member (Rose Hernandez) discussed Houston’s positive experience with toll roads, noting that while they have been successful in getting people where they want to go quickly and safely, an alternative free route has always been available. This strategy always minimizes conflicts. She also pointed out the availability of free lanes needs to be communicated to the public. Secondly, she noted that the I-69 Alliance has been discussing funding for twenty years, and the price has been going up as inflation increases.
    a. TxDOT referenced the US 77 Upgrades. In the communities of Driscoll and Riviera, tolled relief routes are being studied. The people utilizing relief routes would pay tolls but those that didn’t want to pay tolls could use the free lanes through town with direct access to local businesses.

11. Committee Member (Lloyd Kirkham) suggested that TxDOT needed to find a way to eliminate the engrained negative connotations regarding the TTC – including the purchase of highways by Spain, the Governor’s strategy to take privately held lands, etc.
    a. Marc Williams noted that media reports often sensationalize these items, and it’s an uphill battle to get a new message out. The TTC concept has been burned in people’s minds.
Brainstorming Session – Identification of Transportation Problems and Challenges:
Marc Williams explained the process for the brainstorming session. Each committee member will be asked to describe transportation problems and challenges to consider when developing the I-69 Corridor Program. The problems and challenges may be associated with safety, access, mobility and congestion inherent to their region. The committee members provided the following input during the brainstorming session:

1. Committee Member (Jim Wehmeier) – Identified safety issues such as:
   i. Increase in commercial and logging trucks mixing with passenger vehicle traffic is deteriorating highway safety. Accidents tend to be more severe that result from the mix of cars and heavy truck traffic.
   ii. Numerous existing at-grade rail crossings have the potential for car/train accidents and are safety hazard. Consider grade separating all rail crossings.
   iii. Increase in truck traffic has increased congestion on US 59.

2. Committee Member (Grimes Fortune) – Identified safety issues with the City of Corrigan such as:
   i. Undivided four lane roadway configuration increases the likelihood of head-on accidents and accidents with left turn movements into oncoming traffic. Large number of trucks also increases the potential for accidents.
   ii. Chemical trucks crossing US 59 at grade increase the potential for accidents and the risk for hazmat contamination.
   iii. Curve in the road within Corrigan is a driving hazard.

3. Committee Member (Jay Snook) – Identified safety issues within Polk County such as:
   i. Median openings pose concerns for cross traffic mixing with through traffic.
   ii. Trucks mixing with passenger vehicle traffic is deteriorating highway safety. Consideration should be given to separate truck lanes.

4. Committee Member (Clark Evans) – Identified safety issues with the City of Livingston such as:
   i. US 190 from its intersection with US 59 to FM 350 experiences safety issues related to congestion that is associated with:
      • Traffic of new High school
      • Prison Traffic during shift changes
      • Traffic related to numerous retail facilities to the west of US 59. (Median needed but retailers love the left turn lane).
      • Lake area traffic during weekends.
   ii. There are plans for a proposed East/West Corridor (possibly bypass to the North).
   iii. There is motorist confusion with left turn green arrow traffic signal vs. the green yield to oncoming traffic signal on US 190 causing safety issues.

5. Committee Member (Kelly Ritch) indicated that the existing Livingston bypass appears to have sufficient room to increase capacity. However, if a new location north/south bypass is considered, a location east of Livingston should be evaluated.
6. Committee Member (Royce Wells) – Identified transportation related issues within San Jacinto County such as:
   i. The number of accidents related to truck and passenger vehicles has led to a local news channel (Channel 2) to deem it “bloody 59”. Traffic on US 59 was estimated as 35M vehicles per year with large truck volumes.
   ii. There are a limited number of at-grade crossings with RR line in town. School buses have difficulty safely crossing both the RR and US 59.
      a. TxDOT requested that they provide names and phone numbers so that TTA could contact people to get information about school bus routes.
   iii. Delaying highway improvement projects after ROW acquisition could cause a financial impact on small communities as many parcels of land along the facility have been removed from the tax rolls.
   iv. During emergency situations such as hurricane evacuations, San Jacinto County faces a unique situation. Traffic from the south travels northward through the county purchasing supplies from local stores, thus leaving the local population with no supplies (replenishment of the supplies is limited due to the nature of the situation).
   v. San Jacinto County weigh stations are converted during hurricane evacuations to provide support.

7. Committee Member (Doug Spruill) – Identified safety issues with the City of Humble such as:
   i. Recent upgrade to US 59 is good.
   ii. Frontage roads and cross roads along US 59 are congested need to be upgraded. Items of note are signs, signals and speed.

8. Committee Member (Kim Icenhower) – Identified transportation related issues with Fort Bend County such as:
   i. Safety issues related to heavy truck traffic.
   ii. Limited options for bypass due to urbanized residential areas.

9. Committee Member (Tom Paben) – Identified transportation related issues such as:
   i. Safety issues related to traffic congestion in cities and towns.
   ii. Agricultural properties divided by a new location facility need access roads to link their property.
   iii. Farm equipment crossing at-grade along highway facilities increases the risk for accidents because of the mix of high speed vehicles and slow moving farm equipment.
   iv. The increasing size of farm equipment requires consideration during project development because of the greater clearance requirements.

10. Proxy Committee Member (David Rodgers) indicated that HGAC is conducting an Origin/Destination Study for freight that will also examine safety issues. It will examine factors such the long-term and short-term impact of accidents on loss of productivity and extended healthcare.

11. Proxy Committee Member (Rose Hernandez) – Identified transportation related issues in Harris County such as:
   i. Congestion / Traffic
   ii. Air Quality
iii. Consider diverting traffic off US 59 to SH 99 or another facility to the east to improve access to the port.

12. Committee Member (Spencer Chambers) – Identified transportation issues related to the Port of Houston (POH) such as:
   i. The increase in truck traffic accessing POH facilities deteriorates safety conditions on local roadways.
   ii. Need efficient connectivity to POH facilities.
   iii. POH Authority facilities are limited to Barbours Cut Terminal and Bayport Terminal. The entire POH Region encompasses POHA plus 150 private entities.
   iv. Air quality issues associated with congestion.

13. Committee Member (Lloyd Kirkham) – Identified transportation issues related to the City of Cleveland such as:
   i. Safety issues associated with substandard trucks travelling from Mexico.
   ii. POH truck traffic travels north bypass via Grand Parkway and intersects with US 59 south of Cleveland which will increase traffic in the area.
   iii. Developing a loop for SH 105 bypassing Cleveland.
   iv. Supports tolls as a funding mechanism due to revenue raised by local toll authorities.

14. Committee Member (Don Brandon) – Identified transportation issues related to Chambers County such as:
   i. SH 99 is already partially developed in the County and has resulted in industrial development and increased truck traffic.
   ii. County wants to keep trucks on major roads and off small county roads.

15. TxDOT Houston District noted:
   i. There are congestion related accidents in downtown Houston and on IH 610 Loop.
   ii. Truck diversion around downtown and IH610 would improve safety.

16. Committee Member (Jim Wehmeier) indicated that controlled access facilities are good but frontage roads are needed to access undeveloped land.

17. Committee Member (Grimes Fortune) indicated that transportation improvements need to avoid land locking individual parcels. He expects growth to the West of Corrigan.

18. Committee Member (Jay Snook) indicated that transportation improvements need to provide access across highways to properties which are divided by a project. He also indicated a need to address congestion issues.

19. Committee Member (Clark Evans) identified the following transportation related issues:
   i. The intersection of US 190 and US 59 is congested, and there is congestion to the west on US 190.
   ii. Prison traffic causes congestion problems in the mid afternoon (during shift change) on US 190 and at the US 190/US 59 Intersection. A new high school is expected to open in fall of 2011 and could increase this problem. There is also local congestion due to growth west of town (both commercial and residential).
iii. Weekend and holiday traffic west of town accessing Lake Livingston causes congestion on local roadways. Also, Lake traffic congestion occurs during summer months (May through September).

20. Committee Member (Kelly Ritch) identified the following transportation related issues:
   i. US 190 has heavy traffic (prison and future high school).
   ii. Extensive development on the west side of the US 190/US 59 Intersection has resulted in congestion and mobility challenges.
   iii. Keep the funding for the FM roads.
   iv. If there is a north/south bypass of Livingston, it should be located east of town (per survey of town).
   v. Consider a truck bypass to alleviate congestion due to heavy truck traffic.
   vi. Truck traffic uses US 190 to access IH 45.
   vii. US 190 is known as the military employment corridor.
   viii. US 59 and SH 190 are evacuation routes.

21. Committee Member (Royce Wells) identified the following transportation related issues:
   i. Trinity River serves as a natural barrier in the area.
   ii. The trains on the railroad (manmade barrier) and associated train derailments can cut off access across town. The limited number of railroad crossings restricts traffic circulation in town.
   iii. Three fatalities have occurred between two schools along US 59.
   iv. Experiencing drainage problems in the area.
   v. To help development, access and drainage improvements need to be made known early on.

22. Committee Member (Doug Spruill) identified the following transportation related issues:
   i. Improvements to collector routes will improve access.
   ii. Need to add minor interchanges to improve mobility.
   iii. Single lane collectors result in congestion problems.
   iv. Transportation improvements should include adequate access ramps and interchanges need to be included as part of the Program – local governments cannot afford to add later. Minor intersections cannot be ignored in order to save money during construction. HGAC noted that they would be available to partner with local governments to examine access needs and “hot spot” areas.

23. Committee Member (Kim Icenhower) identified the following transportation related issues:
   i. US 59 Improvements are ongoing, and construction is causing bottlenecks.
   ii. Relief routes should avoid residential areas.
   iii. To improve mobility, provide continuity in the number of lanes south on US 59.

24. Committee Member (Tom Paben) identified the following transportation related issues:
   i. Develop transportation improvements to handle future traffic volumes.
   ii. Provide for property access.
   iii. Need to maintain minor intersections for mobility.

25. Proxy Committee Member (David Rodgers) identified the following transportation related issues:
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i. A local government hot topic is “access management” such as improvements to include left turn bays and right turn bays to provide improved access.
ii. Air Quality can be affected by access and congestion.
iii. HGAC is looking at ways to improve circulation and mobility in the area.
iv. Gulf Coast Freight Rail District – 50 trains per day results in idling vehicles waiting at at-grade rail crossings which deteriorates Air Quality.
v. Need to establish local partners to identify areas of concern.

26. Proxy Committee Member (Rose Hernandez) identified the following transportation related issues:
   i. Need to work with HGAC to determine projections for growth and to resolve future transportation problems.
   ii. Harris County population is expected to double in 20 years resulting in increased access, congestion and mobility problems.
   iii. I-69 needs to be built to accommodate heavy truck traffic and improve safety.

27. Committee Member (Spencer Chambers) identified the following transportation related issues:
   i. There is demand for transportation improvements on the east side of Harris County near Highway 225 and Highway 146.
   ii. Trucks will travel the path of least resistance.
   iii. An increase in containerized cargo is expected with the expansion of the Panama Canal. Ports on the west coast are full. The POH has the largest container terminal on the Gulf resulting in an increase in truck traffic.

28. Committee Member (Lloyd Kirkham) identified the following transportation related issues:
   i. City of Cleveland has four exits.
   ii. Proposition 14 is out there for vote to complete the SH 105 Loop.

29. Committee Member (Don Brandon) noted that Chambers County is good.

30. TxDOT Houston District noted:
   i. Two-way frontage roads are a safety issue as well as at-grade crossings.
   ii. Transit component needs to be addressed with any transportation improvements.

31. Committee Member (Royce Wells) asked about tolling existing lanes and about reclassifying lanes as truck toll lanes.
   a. TxDOT explained that State law prohibits tolling existing lanes. He also said a three lane highway can restrict trucks from using the far left lane but does not think it’s possible to toll just trucks. Also TxDOT noted that the Katy Tollroad express lane is a good example of lane management.

Conclusion and Adjourn:

1. TxDOT requested contact information for school district bus routes and emergency routes.
2. Doise Miers concluded the meeting.
   a. Next meeting will be in October and at that time a committee chair will be elected.
b. She suggested the possibility of a Yahoo Group for email communication and there were no objections.
c. Those who wish to be a chair candidate will need to submit bios.
d. Punched packets of materials will be given at future meetings so there is no need to bring notebooks to every meeting unless committee members wish to do so.
e. Committee members should review their contact information and provide updates.
f. She requested volunteers for hosting future meetings.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Attachments:
1. Agenda
2. Sign-In Sheet
3. Handouts

Meeting Staff included:
Ed Pensock-TxDOT/TTA, Doug Booher-TxDOT/TTA, Dieter Billek-TxDOT/TTA, Doise Miers-TxDOT/GPA, Marc Williams-Consultant, Lori Cole-Consultant, Tina Brown-Consultant, Ariel Carmona-Consultant, Michael Sexton-Consultant
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August 5, 2009
Livingston, Texas

Welcome / Introductions

Marc Williams - Facilitator

Role of Corridor Segment Committee in Developing the I-69 Corridor Program

Ed Pensock, P.E. / Doug Booher
Texas Turnpike Authority Division
Role of Corridor Segment Committee in Developing the I-69 Corridor Program

• How do we make this an Interstate facility?
• When do we upgrade existing roadways?
• When do we develop new relief routes?
• What roadways connect to the facility?
• How do we pay for these facilities?

Role of Corridor Segment Committee in Developing the I-69 Corridor Program

• Identify Transportation Problems and Challenges
• Identify What Highways and Other Transportation Facilities Should be Considered in Developing the I-69 Corridor Program
• Update Inventory of Planning Features

Role of Corridor Segment Committee in Developing the I-69 Corridor Program (Contd.)

• Establish Program Goals and Objectives
• Refine the Public Involvement Plan
• Determine the Types of Transportation Improvements Needed
Role of Corridor Segment Committee in Developing the I-69 Corridor Program (Contd.)

• Set Criteria for Determining the Need to Consider Relief Routes
• Determine the Criteria to use in Defining and Prioritizing Individual Projects for the I-69 Corridor Program

Role of Corridor Segment Committee in Developing the I-69 Corridor Program (Contd.)

• Develop Program Funding Criteria
• Review I-69 Corridor Program of Projects

Transportation Needs – Identification of Transportation Problems and Challenges
Project Need – WHY?

- The project need defines the current and future transportation problems and challenges to be addressed.
- It answers the questions... WHY a project should be developed, WHY it's necessary to impact environmental resources, and WHY the expenditure of funds is necessary and worthwhile.

Project Need – Problem Definition Principles

- It describes the transportation problems and challenges that an area, transportation corridor, or specific network faces
- It does NOT identify solutions to resolve a problem
- It is supported by data that helps to define the problem(s)

Existing and Planned Highways in the I-69 Corridor – What is Out There Today and What is Planned

Dieter Billek, P.E.
Director, Advanced Project Development
Texas Turnpike Authority Division
Interstate Design Standards

- Controlled Access
- Grade Separated Interchanges
- On- and Off-Ramps to the Mainlanes
- No driveways onto the Mainlanes

Interstate Design Standards (Contd.)

- Center Median
- Minimum Lane and Shoulder Widths
- Designed for Higher Speeds

Existing Controlled Access Highways – I-69 Corridor
Brainstorming Session

Marc Williams - Facilitator

Brainstorming Session – Part 1

• Identification of Transportation Problems and Challenges to Consider in Developing the I-69 Corridor Program

Brainstorming Session – Part 2

• What Highways and Other Transportation Facilities Should be Considered in Developing the I-69 Corridor Program
Committee Organization and Wrap Up

Doise Miers
Legislative Analyst
Government and Public Affairs Division, TxDOT
Construct an I-95 grade separation interchange in Jacksonville.

Construct SH 20 grade separation interchange at exit 70.

Construct US 190 grade separation interchange at exit 105.

From: US 90

Construct US 90 grade separation interchange at exit 133.

From: I-10

Construct a new SH 295 interchange. From: 1 mi. south of FM 304

Construct US 59 grade separation interchange at exit 125.

From: I-10

Construct SH 99 to US 59 bridge.

From: I-45

Construct US 90 grade separation interchange at exit 133.

From: US 90

Construct US 290 grade separation interchange at exit 163.

From: US 90

Construct US 77 grade separation interchange at exit 133.

From: I-10

Construct SH 99 grade separation interchange at exit 145.

From: US 290

Construct SH 99 grade separation interchange at exit 163.

From: US 290

Construct US 290 grade separation interchange at exit 163.

From: US 287

Construct US 90 grade separation interchange at exit 133.

From: I-10

Construct US 290 grade separation interchange at exit 163.

From: US 290

Construct SH 99 grade separation interchange at exit 163.

From: US 290

Construct US 90 grade separation interchange at exit 133.

From: I-10

Construct US 90 grade separation interchange at exit 133.

From: I-10

Construct SH 99 grade separation interchange at exit 163.

From: US 290

Construct US 90 grade separation interchange at exit 133.

From: I-10

Construct US 90 grade separation interchange at exit 133.

From: I-10

Construct US 90 grade separation interchange at exit 133.

From: I-10

Construct US 90 grade separation interchange at exit 133.

From: I-10

Construct US 90 grade separation interchange at exit 133.

From: I-10

Construct US 90 grade separation interchange at exit 133.