

# **The Texas Transportation Commission's Public Hearing on TxDOT's Project Selection Process**

**Presented October 26, 2000**



Prepared by the Transportation Planning and Programming Division

Amended October 16, 2000

## Purpose of Hearing

In accordance with Texas Transportation Code, Section 201.602, the Texas Transportation Commission (commission) is to hold annual hearings concerning its project selection process and the relative importance of the various criteria on which the commission bases its project selection decisions. The purpose of this hearing is for the commission to receive data, comments, views, and / or testimony from any person, organization, group or their representatives.

In addition, Texas Transportation Code, Section 222.034 states that federal-aid for transportation purposes that is administered by the commission shall be distributed to the various parts of the state for a funding cycle through the selection of highway projects in the state in a manner that is consistent with federal formulas that determine the amount of federal-aid for transportation purposes received by the state. A distribution under this section of the Texas Transportation Code does not include deductions made for the state infrastructure bank or other federal funds reallocated by the federal government. The commission may vary from the distribution procedure provided it issues a ruling or minute order identifying the variance and providing particular justification for the variance.

The commission will consider comments made at this hearing. A minute order describing the commission's decisions relating to the project selection process and distribution of federal-aid will be made at a subsequent public commission meeting.

## Modes of Transportation

**TxDOT is multimodal** and relies on three major modes of transportation to address the needs of the public including:

- Transit Programs
- Aviation Program
- Highway Programs

**Transit Programs:** TxDOT does not own or operate transit services in Texas. It does, however, have a financial interest in most public systems through the allocation of federal and state funds.

- 1) Urbanized Areas (50,000+ population) Not Served by a Transit Authority
  - Agencies apply directly to Federal Transit Administration for federal funds.
  - State funds support capital, administrative and operating expenses
  - 90% of state funds distributed as directed by statute and the Transportation Code
  - 10% of state funds discretionary to the commission
- 2) Non-Urbanized and Rural Areas
  - Funds support capital, administrative and operating expenses

- Federal and state funds flow through TxDOT
  - 90% of federal and state funds distributed by statute or the Transportation Code
  - 10% of federal and state funds discretionary to the commission
- 3) Elderly/Disabled Transportation
- Funds support capital purchases, purchase of service and preventive maintenance
  - Federal funds flow through TxDOT
  - Federal funds allocated to Districts/Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) as directed by Title 43, Texas Administrative Code
  - Projects selected by TxDOT in consultation or cooperation with MPOs and local officials
  - No state funds provided
- 4) Metropolitan Transit Authorities (MTAs)
- TxDOT is not involved in the federal grant process for the metropolitan transit authorities in Austin, Corpus Christi, Dallas, El Paso, Fort Worth, Houston and San Antonio. The authorities are not eligible to receive state funds. MTAs rely on local sales taxes to support their activities.

**Aviation Facilities Development Program:** The Aviation Facilities Development Program provides assistance to public entities for the purpose of establishing, constructing, reconstructing, enlarging or repairing airports, airstrips, or navigation facilities. The planning process, which is documented in the Texas Airport System Plan (TASP), identifies those airports and projects which will best support attainment of the airport system plan objectives. The primary objective of the TASP is to develop a statewide system of airports that meets the goal of providing adequate access to the population and economic centers of Texas. Adequate access is expressed in terms of the driving time between activity centers and appropriate airport facilities:

- *Scheduled air carrier service* should be within a 60-minute drive for virtually all Texas residents.
- *Business jet aircraft access* should be within a 30-minute drive of significant population and mineral resource centers.
- *Light piston-engine aircraft access* should be within a 30-minute drive of agricultural centers.

Criteria for project selection is as follows:

- Identify need based on TASP objectives
- Sponsor commitment
- System priorities as identified in the TASP
- Availability of state and federal funds.

**Highway Programs** make up the majority of transportation programs TxDOT develops. These are the programs most familiar to the citizens of Texas. Projects in these programs are financed through both federal-aid and state funds.

## **Federal-Aid Highway Programs**

**The Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21)** is the current Federal transportation bill that authorizes the development and construction of Federal-aid projects. Several major programs are apportioned to Texas based on quantifiable data which compares Texas to other states and commonwealths of the United States. Those major Federal-aid highway funding categories that are apportioned to individual states include:

- Interstate Maintenance Program (IM)
- National Highway System Program (NHS)
- Surface Transportation Program (STP)
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)
- Highway Bridge Program (BR)
- Minimum Guarantee (MG)

Other TEA-21 programs authorize individual projects as approved by the Secretary of Transportation. Some of the programs that Texas is eligible for include:

- Emergency Relief
- Federal Lands Highway Programs
- National Corridor Planning and Development Program
- Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program

TEA-21 also authorizes the funding of individual projects listed in its High Priority Projects Program. The authorized funds for these projects can only be used for the specific projects listed in the authorization bill.

Texas Transportation Code, Section 222.034, requires the commission to distribute Federal-aid funds to various parts of the state in a manner consistent with the Federal formulas that determine the amount of Federal-aid Texas receives, unless the commission issues a minute order or ruling that identifies the variance and provides particular justification for the variance. The distribution formulas used in TEA-21 often do not recognize factors the commission and TxDOT desires to address in the allocation of funds to the TxDOT districts and MPOs (such as pavement distress, volume of commercial truck traffic or traffic congestion). Some of the Federal allocation formulas use data that cannot be quantified at a TxDOT district level (such as contributions to the Highway Trust Fund). In some cases, the Federal allocation formulas that distribute the funds to the states could not be used at a state level since they do not address the particular restrictions outlined in each specific Federal-aid program (such as set-asides for safety or transportation enhancements in the STP program). An individual examination of each Federal-aid apportionment program is in order.

**Interstate Maintenance Program** funds are allocated to Texas based on the following quantifiable data as compared with the total of the other states:

- 33-1/3% Lane miles of Interstate System routes open to traffic
- 33-1/3% Vehicle miles traveled on Interstate System routes open to traffic
- 33-1/3% State's annual contributions to the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) attributable to commercial vehicles

TxDOT proposes to vary from the Federal distribution for the following reasons:

- Individual TxDOT district or regional contributions to the Highway Trust Fund cannot be quantified.
- The Federal formula does not account for pavement distress.
- The Federal formula does not account for the volume of commercial truck traffic.
- The Federal formula does not account for a region's need to build new Interstate or add capacity to the existing Interstate.

TxDOT proposes to use its IM funding for seven specific areas:

- Category 1 - High Priority Interstate Corridors
- Category 2 - Interstate Maintenance
- Category 3A - NHS Mobility
- Category 3B - Texas Trunk System
- Category 3C - NHS Rehabilitation
- Category 3D - NHS Traffic Management Systems
- Category 3E - NHS Miscellaneous

The allocation and ranking formulas for these categories can be found on Pages 10 through 11 in the attached *Summary of Categories*.

**National Highway System Program** funds are allocated to Texas based on the following quantifiable data as compared with the total of the other states:

- 25% Lane miles of principal arterial routes (excluding Interstate System routes)
- 35% Vehicle miles traveled on principal arterial routes (excluding Interstate System routes)
- 30% Total diesel fuel used on highways
- 10% The quotient obtained by dividing the total lane miles on principal arterial highways by the total population

TxDOT proposes to vary from the Federal distribution for the following reasons:

- Individual TxDOT district or regional usage of commercial diesel fuel is not quantifiable.
- The Federal formula does not account for pavement distress.
- The Federal formula does not address TxDOT's strategy of system development and preservation.

- The Federal formula does not address specific TxDOT district or regional needs such as congestion relief, improved operations and pavement rehabilitation needs.

TxDOT proposes to use its NHS funding for five specific areas:

- Category 3A - NHS Mobility
- Category 3B - Texas Trunk System
- Category 3C - NHS Rehabilitation
- Category 3D - NHS Traffic Management Systems
- Category 3E - NHS Miscellaneous

The allocation and ranking formulas for these categories can be found on Pages 10 through 11 in the attached *Summary of Categories*.

**Surface Transportation Program** funds are allocated to Texas based on the following quantifiable data as compared with the total of the other states:

- 25% Total lane miles of Federal-aid highways
- 40% Vehicle miles traveled on Federal-aid highways
- 35% Tax payments attributable to highway users paid into the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account)

TEA-21 requires TxDOT to allocate funds in a manner that differs from the Federal distribution formula. TEA-21 outlines specific set-asides for safety, transportation enhancements, urbanized areas with populations greater than 200,000 and rural areas. What funds remain after these set-asides are flexible.

TxDOT proposes to use its STP funding for seven specific areas:

- Category 4A - STP Safety
- Category 4B - STP Transportation Enhancements
- Category 4C - STP Metropolitan Mobility and Rehabilitation
- Category 4D - STP Urban Mobility and Rehabilitation
- Category 4E - STP Rural Mobility and Rehabilitation
- Category 4F - STP Rehabilitation in Urban and Rural Areas
- Category 4G - STP Railroad Grade Separations

The allocation and ranking formulas for these categories can be found on Pages 11 through 12 in the attached *Summary of Categories*.

**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program** funds are allocated to Texas based on the total of all weighted non-attainment and maintenance area populations as compared with the total of the other states.

Currently Dallas-Fort Worth, Houston-Galveston, El Paso and Beaumont-Port Arthur are listed as non-attainment areas. The Environmental Protection Agency is expected to

add Tyler-Longview, San Antonio and Austin to the list next year. TxDOT will allocate funds to all qualifying areas by the same formula.

The allocation and ranking formulas for Category 5 can be found on Page 12 in the attached *Summary of Categories*.

**Highway Bridge Program** funds are allocated to Texas based on the relative share of the total cost of deficient bridges as compared with the total of the other states.

TxDOT proposes to vary from the Federal distribution for the following reasons:

- The Federal allocation formula does not address the selection of the most functionally obsolete and structurally deficient bridges.
- The Federal allocation formula does not assure that minimum funding levels required by TEA-21 for off-system bridges are achieved.

TxDOT proposes to use its Highway Bridge Program funding for two specific areas:

- Category 6A - Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation - On State System
- Category 6B - Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation - Off State System

The ranking formulas for Categories 6A and 6B can be found on Page 13 in the attached *Summary of Categories*.

**Minimum Guarantee** funds have been established by TEA-21 to ensure each state receives a minimum amount of apportionments for the aforementioned Federal allocation programs. Texas is to receive a minimum of 7.2131% of the national total. Since no specific Federal allocation formula is used, the commission will direct the use of flexible Minimum Guarantee funds as it sees fit to supplement any or all of the following TxDOT categories:

- Category 1 - High Priority Interstate Corridors
- Category 2 - Interstate Maintenance
- Category 3A - NHS Mobility
- Category 3B - Texas Trunk System
- Category 3C - NHS Rehabilitation
- Category 3D - NHS Traffic Management Systems
- Category 3E - NHS Miscellaneous
- Category 4A - STP Safety
- Category 4B - STP Transportation Enhancements
- Category 4C - STP Metropolitan Mobility and Rehabilitation
- Category 4D - STP Urban Mobility and Rehabilitation
- Category 4E - STP Rural Mobility and Rehabilitation
- Category 4F - STP Rehabilitation in Urban and Rural Areas
- Category 4G - STP Railroad Grade Separations
- Category 5 - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement
- Category 6A - Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation - On State System

- Category 6B - Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation - Off State System
- Category 12 - Strategic Priority (Federal-aid portion only)
- Category 13B - Hurricane Evacuation Routes (Federal-aid portion only)
- Category 15 - Congressional High Priority Projects
- Category 16 - Miscellaneous (Federal-aid portion only)
- Category 18 – Candidate Turnpike Projects (Federal-aid portion only)

## State Funded Highway Programs

Although numerous programs have been established by TEA-21 to address the preservation and enhancement of the Texas transportation system, TxDOT has established several categories to use State funds to supplement Federal-aid programs.

TxDOT categories for these programs are as follows:

- Category 7 – State Preventive Maintenance
- Category 8A – Rehabilitation of Texas Farm to Market Roads
- Category 8B – Texas Farm to Market Roads System Expansion
- Category 9 – State Park Roads
- Category 10A – Traffic Control Devices
- Category 10B – Rehabilitation of Traffic Management Systems
- Category 11 – State District Discretionary
- Category 12 – Strategic Priority (State portion only)
- Category 13A – State Funded Mobility
- Category 13B - Hurricane Evacuation Routes (State portion only)
- Category 13C – Border Trade Transportation Projects
- Category 13D – Urban Streets
- Category 14 – State Rehabilitation
- Category 16 – Miscellaneous (State portion only)
- Category 17 – State Principal Arterial Street System
- Category 18 – Candidate Turnpike Projects (State portion only)

The allocation and ranking formulas for these categories can be found on Pages 13 through 16 in the attached *Summary of Categories*.

## Summary of TxDOT Construction Categories

Attached is a summary of all of TxDOT’s construction categories in the Unified Transportation Program. The summary contains the TxDOT category name/number; the entity responsible for project selection; the funding type (Federal, State and/or Local); whether the program is treated as a bank balance program or is authorized as individual specific projects; the allocation or ranking formula; the last year the category was revised; and a brief summary of the type of work the program addresses.

## Proposed Programming Levels

**Programming and Funding** Another important factor in the project selection process is the amount of funds available to build projects. In order for TxDOT's project development process to maintain its efficiency, projects must be selected several years in advance of their actual funding. TxDOT uses funding forecasts to predict future available revenues from federal and state sources. TxDOT then programs, or selects projects, corresponding to the projected levels. When the dollars become available, the programmed projects are then funded. Programming is a commitment to construct the project when forecasted funds become available.

TxDOT's proposed programming levels for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005 can be found on pages 17 through 18. Proposed programming levels are subject to change.



## SUMMARY OF CATEGORIES

CATEGORIES NUMBER, NAME AND YEAR ESTABLISHED	PROGRAMMING AUTHORITY	FUNDING	BANK BALANCE (Yes/No) RESPONSIBLE ENTITY	RANKING INDEX OR ALLOCATION FORMULA AND YEAR LAST REVISED	BRIEF SUMMARY, RESTRICTIONS, ETC
1 High Priority Interstate Corridors 1999	Commission approval. Project specific. High Priority Interstate Corridor construction sequencing recommended regionally by districts.	Federal 80% State 20%	No	None 2000 UTP	Mobility projects (added capacity and new location) on High Priority Interstate Corridors established by TEA-21 (IH 27, IH 35 and IH 69).
2 Interstate Maintenance 1992	Commission allocation by formula. Bank balance to districts. Projects selected by districts.	Federal 90% State 10%	Yes, Districts	45% IH ESAL-Mi 10% IH Ln-Mi 45% IH Ln-Mi W/Sub Distress Scores 1998 UTP	Rehabilitation of existing Interstate Highway System main lanes, frontage roads, structures, construction of HOV lanes, rehabilitation of signs, pavement markings, striping, etc. Funds may be used for the construction of interchanges, but may not be used for the construction of new SOV lanes.
3A National Highway System (NHS) Mobility 1992	Commission approval. Project specific. Selected statewide based on Cost Effectiveness Index (CEI).	Federal 80% State 20%	No	Cost Effectiveness Index (CEI) 1997 UTP	Mobility (added capacity) projects on NHS. Projects ranked in three major groups, expansions, interchanges, and new loops & bypasses, and in three sub-groups based on population (counties greater than 200,000 in TMAs; counties between 200,000 and 50,000; and counties less than 50,000. Projects prioritized by cost effectiveness index.
3B Texas Trunk System 1992	Commission approval. Project specific. Phase 1 corridors construction sequencing recommended regionally by districts. Non-Phase 1 corridors selected statewide based on CEI.	Federal 80% State 20%	No	Phase 1 corridor project funds are allocated to regions based on unfunded Phase 1 corridor construction in the region. Non-Phase 1 corridor projects ranked by CEI. 1999 UTP	Added capacity projects on the Texas Trunk System. Category limited to the expansion of rural highways from two lane to four lane divided. Phase 1 corridor projects are sequenced by districts within regions having the respective Phase 1 corridor. Non-Phase 1 corridor projects are prioritized by cost effectiveness index.

CATEGORIES NUMBER, NAME AND YEAR ESTABLISHED	PROGRAMMING AUTHORITY	FUNDING	BANK BALANCE (Yes/No) RESPONSIBLE ENTITY	RANKING INDEX OR ALLOCATION FORMULA AND YEAR LAST REVISED	BRIEF SUMMARY, RESTRICTIONS, ETC
3C NHS Rehabilitation 1992	Commission allocation by formula. Bank balance to districts. Projects selected by districts.	Federal 80% State 20%	Yes, Districts	30% Non-IH NHS ESAL-Mi 30% Non-IH NHS Ln-Mi 35% Non-IH NHS Ln-Mi w/Sub Distress Scores 5% square footage of bridge deck area w/ sufficiency rating between 50 and 80. 1999 UTP	Rehabilitation of existing main lanes and structures on non-Interstate portions of the National Highway System.
3D NHS Traffic Management Systems 1992	Commission approval. Project specific. Selected statewide based on Traffic Management Index.	Federal 80% State 20%	No	Traffic Management Index (TMI) 1993 PDP	Traffic management systems on NHS <u>only</u> in areas of air quality attainment. Projects prioritized by traffic management index.
3E NHS Miscellaneous 1992	Commission approval. Project specific.	Federal 80% State 20%	No	Identified Need 1993 PDP	Relatively small miscellaneous projects associated with other mobility (added capacity) projects on NHS. Projects prioritized by identified need.
4A Surface Transportation Program (STP) Safety - Federal Hazard Elimination Program 1992	Commission allocation. Statewide bank balance. Selected statewide by federally mandated safety indices.	Federal 90% State 10%	Yes, Traffic Operations Division	Safety Improvement Index (SII) 1993 PDP	Safety related projects - on and off state highway system. Projects are evaluated using three years of accident data, and ranked by Safety Improvement Index.
4A STP Safety - Federal Railroad Signal Safety Program 1992	Commission allocation. Statewide bank balance. Selected statewide from prioritized listing.	Federal 90% State 10%	Yes, Traffic Operations Division	Railroad Crossing Index 1997 UTP	Installation of automatic railroad warning devices at hazardous railroad crossings on and off state highway system, selected from statewide inventory list which is prioritized by index (# of trains per day, train speed, ADT, type of existing warning device, train-involved accidents within prior five years, etc.)
4B STP Transportation Enhancements 1992	Commission selection and approval. Project Specific. Recommended by local governmental entities. Committee review.	Federal 80% State 20% or Federal 80% Local 20%	No	Committee Recommendation 1994 PDP	Projects above and beyond what normally is expected for transportation enhancements - twelve general activities as outlined in TEA-21. Projects recommended by local government entities, reviewed and recommended by committee, selected by Texas Transportation Commission.

CATEGORIES NUMBER, NAME AND YEAR ESTABLISHED	PROGRAMMING AUTHORITY	FUNDING	BANK BALANCE (Yes/No) RESPONSIBLE ENTITY	RANKING INDEX OR ALLOCATION FORMULA AND YEAR LAST REVISED	BRIEF SUMMARY, RESTRICTIONS, ETC
4C STP Metropolitan Mobility/ Rehabilitation 1992	Commission allocation. Allocation based on population (1990 Census). Bank balance to Districts. Projects selected by MPO.	Federal 80% State 20% or Federal 80% Local 20% or	Yes, Districts & MPOs	Population 1993 PDP	Transportation needs within metropolitan area boundaries with populations of 200,000 or greater. Projects selected by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs)
4D STP Urban Mobility/ Rehabilitation 1992	Commission allocation. Allocation based on population (1990 Census). Bank balance to Districts. Districts/MPOs select.	Federal 80% State 20% or Federal 80% Local 20%	Yes, Districts	Population 1993 PDP	Transportation needs in urbanized areas with populations less than 200,000 and greater than 5,000. Projects selected by the District in consultation with the MPO.
4E STP Rural Mobility/ Rehabilitation 1992	Commission allocation. Allocation based on population (1990 Census). Bank balance to Districts. Projects selected by Districts.	Federal 80% State 20%	Yes, Districts	Population 1993 PDP	Transportation needs in rural areas (in cities of less than 5,000 population and outside any city limits). Projects selected by District.
4F STP Rehabilitation in Urban and Rural Areas 1992	Commission allocation by formula. Bank balance to Districts. Projects selected by Districts.	Federal 80% State 20%	Yes, Districts	30% Non-IH ESAL-Mi 30% Non-IH Ln-Mi 35% Non-IH Ln-Mi W/Sub Distress Scores 5% square footage of bridge deck area w/ sufficiency rating between 50 and 80. 1999 UTP	Rehabilitation of highways in urban and rural areas on the state highway system which are functionally classed greater than a local road or a minor collector.
4G STP Railroad Grade Separations 1993	Commission approval. Project specific. Evaluated statewide by cost-benefit.	Federal 80% State 20%	No	Vehicle & train traffic, accident rates, vertical clearance, roadway characteristics 1996 PDP	Replacement of existing highway-railroad grade crossings, and the rehabilitation or replacement of deficient railroad underpasses on the state highway system. Specific locations evaluated by cost-benefits derived index (benefits such as improved traffic flow, accident/fatality reduction.)
5 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement 1992	Commission allocation. Allocation based on percent of population in non-attainment areas. Bank balance to Districts. Projects selected by MPO.	Federal 80% State 20%	Yes, Districts & MPO	Non-attainment area population weighted by air quality severity 1993 PDP	Addresses attainment of national ambient air quality standard in the non-attainment areas (currently Dallas-Fort Worth, Houston, Beaumont and El Paso). Funds cannot be used to add capacity for single occupancy vehicles.

CATEGORIES NUMBER, NAME AND YEAR ESTABLISHED	PROGRAMMING AUTHORITY	FUNDING	BANK BALANCE (Yes/No) RESPONSIBLE ENTITY	RANKING INDEX OR ALLOCATION FORMULA AND YEAR LAST REVISED	BRIEF SUMMARY, RESTRICTIONS, ETC
6A Bridge Replacement/ Rehabilitation - On State Highway System 1992	Commission approval. Project specific. Selected statewide based on Texas Eligible Bridge Selection System (TEBSS).	Federal 80% State 20%	No	Texas Eligible Bridge Selection System (TEBSS) 1996 PDP	Replacement or rehabilitation of eligible bridges on state highway system (functionally obsolete or structurally deficient).
6B Bridge Replacement/ Rehabilitation - Off State Highway System 1992	Commission approval. Project specific. Selected statewide based on Texas Eligible Bridge Selection System (TEBSS).	Federal 80% Local 20% or Federal 80% State 10% Local 10%	No	Texas Eligible Bridge Selection System (TEBSS) 1996 PDP	Replacement or rehabilitation of eligible bridges on state highway system (functionally obsolete or structurally deficient).
7 State Preventive Maintenance 1992	Commission allocation by formula. Bank balance to districts. Projects selected by districts.	State 100%	Yes, Districts	80% Lane-Miles 10% Vehicle Miles Traveled per Ln-Mi 10% Ln-Mi W/Sub Distress Scores 1999 UTP	Preventive Maintenance to preserve existing state highway system. Up to 20% of a district's yearly allocation can be used for non-preventive maintenance work, provided administrative approval is first obtained from the Maintenance Division.
8A Rehabilitation of Texas Farm to Market Roads 1995	Commission allocation. Allocation formula. Bank balance to districts. Projects selected by districts.	State 100%	Yes, Districts	30% FM ESAL-Mi 30% FM Ln-Mi 35% FM Ln-Mi W/Sub Distress Scores 5% square footage of bridge deck area w/ sufficiency rating between 50 and 80. 1999 UTP	Reconstruction and rehabilitation of existing Farm to Market Roads outside of urbanized areas of populations of 50,000 or more, except for those projects on an existing Farm to Market Road stub section into an urbanized area. Funds (up to \$600,000) for reconstruction or rehabilitation to provide access to new prison site.
8B Texas Farm to Market Roads System Expansion 1995	Commission approval. Project specific. Selected statewide by cost efficiency.	State 100%	No	Cost Per Vehicle Mile 1996 UTP	Construction of new Farm to Market Roads (outside urbanized areas of 50,000 or more). Funds will not be utilized to add capacity (additional through lanes) to existing Farm to Market Roads. Funds (up to \$600,000) for construction of road to provide access to new prison site.
9 State Park Roads 1992	Commission allocation Statewide bank balance. Projects selected by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TP&WD).	State 100%	Yes, Transportation Planning & Programming Division	None, Selected by TP&WD 1993 PDP	Construction and rehabilitation of roadways within or adjacent to state parks, fish hatcheries, etc. subject to Memorandum of Agreement between TxDOT and TP&WD. Locations selected and prioritized by TP&WD.

CATEGORIES NUMBER, NAME AND YEAR ESTABLISHED	PROGRAMMING AUTHORITY	FUNDING	BANK BALANCE (Yes/No) RESPONSIBLE ENTITY	RANKING INDEX OR ALLOCATION FORMULA AND YEAR LAST REVISED	BRIEF SUMMARY, RESTRICTIONS, ETC
10A Traffic Control Devices 1995	Commission allocation by formula. Bank balance to districts. Projects selected by districts.	State 100%	Yes, Districts	50% Non-IH Lane Miles 50% Population 1996 PDP	Installation and rehabilitation of non-Interstate signs, pavement markings, traffic signals, and illumination systems including minor roadway modifications to improve operations. Funds can also be used to install new traffic signals as well as modernize existing traffic signals.
10B Rehabilitation of Traffic Management Systems 1995	Commission allocations by formula. Bank balance to districts. Projects selected by districts.	State 100%	Yes, Districts	Sophistication of equipment installed, type of control center and miles of system under control. 1997 UTP	Rehabilitation and maintenance of operational traffic management systems.
11 State District Discretionary 1992	Commission allocation by formula. Bank balance to districts. Projects selected by districts. Rider 41 to TxDOT's apportionments, Article 7 of House Bill 1, passed by the 75 <sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature requires a minimum \$2 million allocation to each TxDOT district.	State 100%	Yes, Districts	70% Vehicle Miles traveled on/off system 30% Registered vehicles (Each district receives a minimum \$2 million allocation) 1998 UTP	Miscellaneous projects on state highway system selected at the district's discretion.
12 Strategic Priority 1992	Commission selection. Project specific.	Federal 80% State 20% or State 100%	No	None, Selected by Transportation Commission 1993 PDP	Commission selected projects which promote economic development, provide system continuity with adjoining states and Mexico, or address other strategic needs as determined by the commission.
13A State Funded Mobility 1992	Commission selection. Project specific.	State 100%	No	None, Selected by Transportation Commission 1993 PDP	Commission selected projects on state highway system developed without federal participation.
13B Hurricane Evacuation Routes 1995	Commission approval. Project specific. Recommended by consensus of coastal districts.	Federal 80% State 20% or State 100%	No	None, Recommended through the consensus of coastal districts. 1996 PDP	Expansion, reconstruction, rehabilitation, etc. of hurricane evacuation routes to increase safety, access and mobility for transportation of people and goods in coastal areas in emergency situations.

CATEGORIES NUMBER, NAME AND YEAR ESTABLISHED	PROGRAMMING AUTHORITY	FUNDING	BANK BALANCE (Yes/No) RESPONSIBLE ENTITY	RANKING INDEX OR ALLOCATION FORMULA AND YEAR LAST REVISED	BRIEF SUMMARY, RESTRICTIONS, ETC
13C Border Trade Transportation Projects 1999	Commission approval. Project specific. Recommended by consensus of Texas-Mexico border districts.	State 100%	No	None, Recommended through the consensus of Texas-Mexico border districts. 2000 UTP	Projects on the state highway system to address demands on transportation infrastructure in border area districts because of projected increases in international trade resulting from ratification of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).
13D Urban Streets 1995	Commission allocation. Allocated by population in urbanized areas. Bank balance to MPOs. Projects selected by MPO.	State 80% Local 20% (on participating items of work)	Yes, MPOs	Allocation based on urbanized area population 1996 PDP	Reconstruction, restoration and added capacity of certain city streets (classified as collector or higher) in urbanized areas with populations of 50,000 or more. Reconstruction and added capacity projects must be developed to American Association of State Highway and Transportation Official's (AASHTO) standards.
14 State Rehabilitation 1992	Commission allocation by formula. Bank balance to districts. Projects selected by districts.	State 100%	Yes, Districts	30% Non-IH ESAL-Mi 30% Non-IH Ln-Mi 35% Non-IH Ln-Mi W/Sub Distress Scores 5% square footage of bridge deck area w/ sufficiency rating between 50 and 80. 1999 UTP	Rehabilitation needs on the state highway system. Rehabilitation might not qualify for federal funding.
15 Congressional High Priority Projects  Category established prior to ISTEA.	Commission approval to participate. Project specific. Projects listed in TEA-21, ISTEA or other Federal legislation.	Federal 80% State 20%	No	None. Projects listed in Federal Authorization and Appropriation Bills.	Projects listed in TEA-21, ISTEA or other Federal legislation.
16 Miscellaneous - Railroad Grade Crossing Replanking Program 1992	Commission allocation.  Statewide bank balance. Selection based on conditions of riding surface.	State 100%	Yes, Traffic Operations Division	Condition of crossing's riding surface and cost per vehicle using crossing 1993 PDP	Replacement of rough railroad crossing surfaces on the state highway system (approximately 140 installations per year statewide). Project selection based on conditions of the riding surface (highway, railroad and drainage) and cost per vehicle using the crossing.
16 Miscellaneous - Railroad Signal Maintenance Program 1992	Commission allocation.  Statewide bank balance. Contributions to maintain signals.	State 100%	Yes, Traffic Operations Division	Number of crossings and type of automatic devices present at each. 1993 PDP	Contributions to each railroad company based on number of crossings and type of automatic devices present at each crossing.

CATEGORIES NUMBER, NAME AND YEAR ESTABLISHED	PROGRAMMING AUTHORITY	FUNDING	BANK BALANCE (Yes/No) RESPONSIBLE ENTITY	RANKING INDEX OR ALLOCATION FORMULA AND YEAR LAST REVISED	BRIEF SUMMARY, RESTRICTIONS, ETC
16 Miscellaneous - Construction Landscape Programs 1992	Commission allocation by formula. Bank balance to districts. Projects selected by districts.	State 100%	Yes, Districts	Varies between programs. 1993 PDP	New landscape development projects such as typical right-of-way landscape development, rest area/picnic area landscape development, and erosion control and environmental mitigation activities.
16 Miscellaneous (Federal) 1992	Commission approval to participate. Federal allocations.	Federal 100% or Federal 80% State 20%	No	None  Not Applicable	Federal programs such as Forest Highways, Indian Reservation Highways, Federal Lands Highways, and Ferry Boat Discretionary.
17 State Principal Arterial Street System (PASS) (Contains both PASS and PASS Metro Match) 1988	Commission approval. Project specific. Pre-ISTEA program.	State 100% or State 50% Local 50%	No	None 1988	Only projects which were approved in the previous Urban System / Principal Arterial Street System (PASS) programs.
18 Candidate Turnpike Projects 1999	Commission approval upon recommendation of the Texas Turnpike Authority Board or appropriate tolling entity. Project specific.	Federal, State, Local, Private and Revenue Bonds. Participation varies on individual projects.	No	Projects are evaluated based on the results of feasibility studies considering various factors including projected revenues and ridership volumes. 2000 UTP	Turnpike projects are generally considered when other methods of tax funding are not readily available and a potential revenue stream exists.



## PROPOSED FY 2005 PROGRAMMING LEVELS

Category Number	Category Name	FY 2004*	Proposed FY 2005
1	High Priority Interstate Corridors	\$40,000,000	\$40,000,000
2	Interstate Maintenance	\$273,723,000	\$277,562,000
3A	NHS Mobility	\$275,000,000	\$275,000,000
3B	Texas Trunk System	\$150,000,000	\$150,000,000
3C	NHS Rehabilitation	\$75,000,000	\$75,000,000
3D	NHS Traffic Management Systems	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000
3E	NHS Miscellaneous	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000
4A	STP Safety	\$57,119,000	\$58,016,000
4B	STP Transportation Enhancements	\$73,979,000	\$75,141,000
4C	STP Metro Mobility/Rehabilitation	\$200,000,000	\$200,000,000
4D	STP Urban Mobility/Rehabilitation	\$130,000,000	\$115,000,000
4E	STP Rural Mobility/Rehabilitation	\$41,368,000	\$41,368,000
4F	STP Rehabilitation in Urban and Rural Areas	\$200,000,000	\$200,000,000
4G	STP Railroad Grade Separations	\$45,000,000	\$45,000,000
5	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement	\$137,063,000	\$139,208,000
6A	Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation On State Highway System	\$132,865,000	\$134,945,000
6B	Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Off State Highway System	\$44,288,000	\$44,982,000
7	State Preventative Maintenance	\$250,000,000	\$250,000,000
8A	Rehabilitation of Texas Farm to Market Roads	\$50,000,000	\$50,000,000
8B	Texas Farm to Market Roads System Expansion	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000
9	State Park Roads	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
10A	Traffic Control Devices	\$20,000,000	\$30,000,000
10B	Rehabilitation of Traffic Management Systems	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
11	State District Discretionary	\$75,000,000	\$75,000,000
12	Strategic Priority	\$225,000,000	\$225,000,000
13A	State Funded Mobility	\$0	\$0
13B	Hurricane Evacuation Routes	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000
13C	Border Trade Transportation Projects	\$100,000,000	\$100,000,000
13D	Urban Streets	\$0	\$0



## PROPOSED FY 2005 PROGRAMMING LEVELS (continued)

Category Number	Category Name	FY 2004*	Proposed FY 2005
14	State Rehabilitation	\$175,000,000	\$175,000,000
15	Congressional High Priority Projects	\$86,190,000	\$87,914,000**
16	Miscellaneous	\$11,000,000	\$11,000,000
17	State Principal Arterial Street System	\$0	\$0
18	Candidate Turnpike Projects	\$100,000,000	\$100,000,000
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$3,054,595,000</b>	<b>\$3,062,136,000</b>

Notes:

\* FY 2004 programming shown for information and comparison only.

\*\* Estimate of Congressional selections in next federal transportation appropriations act.