



I-10 Texas Corridor Study East Working Group Meeting #4

Wednesday, May 3, 2023
9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. CDT
Port of Houston Authority

Attendees

County and City Representatives

- Honorable Jeff Branick – County Judge, Jefferson County (East Working Group Chair)
- Honorable Johnny Trahan – County Commissioner, Orange County
- Honorable Bob Ray – Mayor Pro-Tem, City of Brazos Country
- Sonya Bishop – City Manager, City of Flatonia
- Tamela Louvier – City Secretary, City of Flatonia
- Josh Brothers – City Planner/GIS Coordinator, City of Sealy
- Honorable Brandon Capetillo – Mayor, City of Baytown
- Honorable Lori An Gobert – Mayor, City of Columbus
- Honorable Milton Koller – Mayor, City of Weimar

MPOs, COGs, and Other Transportation Agencies

- Veronica Davis – Deputy Director, Transportation and Drainage Operations, City of Houston
- Patrick Nguyen – Senior Division Manager, Transportation and Drainage Operations, City of Houston
- James Moore – Senior GIS Analyst, South East Texas Regional Planning Commission

Ports and Port Authorities

- Bruce Mann – Director of Freight Mobility, Port of Houston
- Jeffrey Matter, Director of Real Estate, Port of Texas City/Houston Belt and Terminal Railway Company
- Lorrie Taylor – Executive Port Director/CEO, Port of Orange

Chambers of Commerce and EDC Representatives

- Chad Burke – President/CEO, Economic Alliance Houston Port Region
- Ida Schossow – President, Greater Orange Area Chamber of Commerce
- Macie Schubert – President/CEO, West Chambers County Chamber of Commerce
- Theresa (Terri) Wagner – Executive Director, Schulenburg Chamber of Commerce
- William Wagner – Schulenburg Chamber of Commerce

OUR VALUES: *People • Accountability • Trust • Honesty*

OUR MISSION: *Through collaboration and leadership, we deliver a safe, reliable, and integrated transportation system that enables the movement of people and goods.*

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Advocacy Organizations

- Honorable Ed Emmett – Chair, Texas Freight Advisory Committee/Former Harris County Judge
- Allen Kaminski – Vice President, Texas Farm Bureau
- Thomas Marian – Board Member/General Counsel, Greater Houston Port Bureau/Buffalo Marine Service, Inc.

Businesses/Other

- Gary Cole – President, U.S. Autologistics
- Lisa Haley – Vice President Supply Chain Strategy, NET Power
- Darrin Willer – Executive Vice President/National Transportation Business Line Leader, DCCM

TxDOT

TxDOT Divisions

- Lorena Echeverria de Misi – Corridor Planning Branch Manager, TPP Division
- Cary Karnstadt – I-10 Texas Corridor Study Project Development Manager, TPP Division

TxDOT Districts

- Lisa Collins, P.E. – TP&D Director, Beaumont (BMT)
- Stephen Gage – Planner, Houston (HOU)
- Lucean Kuykendall – Public Information Officer, Yoakum (YKM)
- Jeffery Vinklarek, P.E. – TP&D Director, YKM

I-10 Texas Corridor Study Consulting Team

- John Tompkins – TPP Statewide Corridor Planning Contract Manager, HNTB
- Brian Comer – I-10 Texas Corridor Study Project Manager, Associate Vice President, HNTB
- Joel Salinas – Deputy Project Manager, HNTB
- Will Smithson – Principal Planner, HNTB
- Kelsey Heavin – Public Involvement Manager, HNTB
- Lauren Read – Public Engagement & Communications Specialist II, HNTB (via Teams)
- Erin Perkins-Watry – President, Foresight
- Jefferson Grimes - Planning & Communications Technical Manager, Foresight
- Patricia Kelly – Planning & Communications Specialist, Foresight (via Teams)

MEETING AGENDA

1. Study Recap and Status Update
2. Validate Guidelines and Programs
3. Prioritize Plans and Projects
4. Next Steps
5. Questions and Closing Remarks

A complete copy of the PowerPoint presentation is attached.

Welcome, Introductions, and Safety Minute

Slides 1 - 3: Intro and Opening Remarks

The first slide presented initial information for participants to view as they entered the meeting. Brian Comer, I-10 Texas Corridor Study Project Development Manager, started the meeting by introducing himself and welcoming participants. Brian then introduced the TxDOT personnel in attendance. He thanked the Port of Houston Authority for hosting the in-person working group meeting. Bruce Mann, Director of Freight Mobility at the Port of Houston, welcomed the working group members and gave a brief safety minute. Next, Brian welcomed the Honorable Judge Jeff Branick, the East Working Group Chair.

Judge Branick (Jefferson County) welcomed the East Working Group members and thanked everyone for attending. He said it is a great opportunity to work on such a meaningful and important project for Southeast Texas and all of Texas. The meeting will be used to consider the future of this strategic highway and ensure concerns about congestion, connectivity, economic development, hurricane evacuation, and more are addressed. Judge Branick noted that in its last three meetings, the East Working Group discussed and provided input on safety, economic development, congestion, hurricane evacuation, and several other important topics. He said that improving travel on I-10 is not just about widening highways and adding more lanes. It is about a broader vision of planning to meet the rapidly changing world of transportation.

Judge Branick asked the consultant team and the working group members to introduce themselves. Lorena Echeverria de Misi, TPP Division Corridor Planning Branch Manager, thanked the working group members for attending and their participation throughout the study.

Slide 4: Safety Minute

Brian presented the safety minute on safe driving and speed.

Slide 5: Meeting Agenda and Purpose

Brian reviewed the meeting agenda. He stated the purpose of the meeting was to discuss and seek consensus from stakeholders, including the TxDOT Districts, on recommended implementation strategies that have been drafted from previous stakeholder input. He noted that a significant portion of the meeting would focus on reviewing the proposed guidelines and programs and discussing and prioritizing plans and projects.

Slide 6: Coffee Talk: Recent Developments

Participants were asked to provide input on the following “Coffee Talk” (interactive discussion) question:

What are some recent developments within the greater East Segment Region that may impact transportation needs along the I-10 Corridor?

Participants provided the following responses:

- Ed Emmitt (Texas Freight Advisory Committee) stated that LaDOTD will be replacing an I-10 bridge in Baton Rouge and closing it down to one lane for the next year and a half beginning later this year. Traffic will likely be diverted to US 90 and will impact traffic coming into and leaving Texas.
- Judge Branick (Jefferson County) shared that Jefferson, Chambers, and Orange Counties are experiencing exponential growth. For instance, there is an 11,000-acre development in Chambers County across from the Port of Houston. In Jefferson County, there is \$69 billion invested in planned chemical plants and other fuel projects. There are also 200,000 acres of onshore leases, many of them north of US 90 and south of I-10.
- Judge Branick also stated that in Orange County, Chevron has announced a new plant that will have hydrogen abilities. The city of Orange will have the Chevron plant on one side and the Synergy plant on the other side. There is massive growth in the region with \$10 billion more in investments coming. This amount of growth is changing transportation needs.
- Bruce Mann (Port of Houston) added that there is a massive influx of containers coming into the ports. I-10 is moving goods out of Corpus Christi, Houston, and Sabine. More goods will be flowing in from the Panama Canal. As more goods flow into the ports, more people will move into the area as new jobs are created.
 - A participant stated that there is 3% growth at the Port.
- A participant stated that cities west of Houston are experiencing growth driven by ports and rail. Every time they drive to San Antonio there is a new distribution center. They said that redirecting commerce traffic to I-10 with rail or port to reduce congestion needs to be considered.
 - Will Smithson (HNTB) stated the percentage of trucks on I-10 between Houston and San Antonio is nearly 50%.

Study Recap and Status Update

Slides 7 - 9: Study Area Overview, Purpose, and Scope

Brian provided a recap of the I-10 Texas Corridor Study and the importance of I-10 to the nation and within Texas. He also discussed the nationwide importance of I-10 to critical freight links as well as its military importance as a national defense corridor. The East Segment of the corridor is approximately 243 miles long and spans ten counties. Brian then highlighted the specific features and characteristics of the East Segment of I-10 and the purpose and scope of the study.

Slide 10: I-10 Texas Corridor Vision

Brian presented the vision statement for the I-10 Corridor as follows:

I-10 is an ever-improving lifeline corridor for Texas. It provides safe, reliable, multimodal transportation from state line to state line. I-10 is accessible and

well-maintained, connecting communities and supporting the national and state economies by efficiently moving people and goods throughout the state and beyond.

Slide 11: Goals for the I-10 Corridor

Brian shared the goals for the I-10 Corridor, which included the following:

- Enhance mobility to support safer, more efficient, and reliable travel along the I-10 corridor.
- Improve safety for passenger and freight travel on the I-10 corridor.
- Increase resiliency and connectivity between communities, borders, ports, and activity centers along I-10 and with other critical highways on the state roadway network.
- Maintain and preserve the I-10 corridor in a state of good repair.
- Invest in the I-10 corridor to support the state and national economies and increase opportunities for Texas' businesses, employees, and communities to grow and prosper.
- Preserve and protect the character, culture, history, values, and natural resources of the communities along the I-10 corridor.
- Provide a broad range of reliable, innovative, and multimodal transportation options and technologies along the I-10 corridor to meet diverse user needs and future demand.

Slide 12: I-10 Texas Corridor Study Status Update

Brian reviewed the study milestones. He noted that the study team has reviewed the existing conditions and identified needs and gaps. The team has also identified initial improvement strategies based on socio-economic and traffic analyses and input received from the second round of stakeholder meetings and the public survey. He stated that high-level costs and potential funding sources have been developed for some of the proposed improvement strategies. Brian said that the potential economic impacts of the agreed-upon proposed transportation investments and improvement strategies will be analyzed and prioritized as part of the next phase. He noted that this fourth round of stakeholder engagement meetings was added to prioritize and develop consensus on the implementation strategies associated with study programs, plans, and projects.

Slide 13: Overview of Proposed Improvement Strategies

Brian gave an overview of proposed improvement strategies. He said the recommendations were broken down into four categories: guidelines, programs, plans, and projects. Brian provided a brief definition of each, as follows:

- Guidelines are broad recommendations to guide decisions on future corridor investments based on identified goals. Brian noted policies had been changed to guidelines after the last round of meetings to provide more flexibility.

- Programs are a set of related initiatives or investments designed to advance identified guidelines.
- Plans are broad or conceptual-level initiatives that require further study and refinement to advance identified guidelines.
- Projects are specific initiatives or infrastructure investments with defined geographic limits, scope, and costs to advance identified guidelines.

Slide 14: What We've Done Since Round 3

Brian reviewed the work of the study team since the third round of working group meetings:

- Reviewed and incorporated input from Working Group and Steering Committee meetings into proposed improvement strategies.
- Held project review meetings with TxDOT Districts to refine proposed plans and projects.
- Held coordination meetings with TxDOT Divisions to refine proposed guidelines and programs.

Slide 15: Connecting Texas

Brian reviewed the multimodal corridor slide to reinforce that TxDOT is addressing issues with multiple plans, studies, and strategies. He said the study team coordinated with TxDOT divisions to discuss the issues and how I-10 needs could be addressed through ongoing plans. Brian stated that the divisions discussed ongoing and upcoming initiatives with the study team. The study team also received a summary of current plans and projects from the districts along the corridor. Many of the issues the stakeholders have raised during the previous I-10 Corridor meetings are being studied and addressed through some of these initiatives.

Slide 16: Coffee Talk: Recent Developments

Participants were asked to provide input on the following “Coffee Talk” (interactive discussion) question:

What are you most excited about for the future of I-10?

Participants provided the following responses:

- Judge Branick (Jefferson County) said that he is not excited about getting caught in the construction and traffic. He is excited about the improvements, but not about the increase in trucks in the corridor. He is hopeful that the improvements will lead to a safer corridor. He mentions the last day without a death on Texas highways was in 1991.
- It was stated that improvements to alternative routes, such as US 90, are needed. There is a need for a near-term solution in Orange.
- There is excitement about using freight to improve the way assets are moved.
 - Encouraging off-peak times for the movement of goods is an option to help reduce congestion.

- There is excitement about new technology available and the new abilities to provide information, which is almost as important as infrastructure.
- Improvements to infrastructure in small towns and counties are needed. They are often overlooked, and the stakeholders are encouraged they are being involved in this process.
 - Frontage roads that go through the smaller towns need improvements.
- Improvements to truck parking are needed as there is no public truck parking in Houston and trucks are parking everywhere.
 - Brian noted federal rules require truckers to rest and get off the road for a certain number of hours every day.
 - Information distribution to truckers will provide improvements as well.
 - There is a location outside of La Grange near the fairgrounds where a lot of truckers are parking.
 - In Schulenburg, all of the truck stops are full.
 - Brian stated there is a current TxDOT study looking into truck parking improvements along I-10.
- It was asked if intercoastal and barge management is part of the program to take the pressure off I-10.
 - Brian noted that there are a lot of interconnections to ensure a smooth transition of freight among modes.

Guideline and Program Priorities

Slides 18: Applicable Guidelines and Programs for Infrastructure

Brian provided an overview of the applicable guidelines and programs related to infrastructure projects on the corridor. Where feasible, the guidelines include incorporating key design and operational improvements into major projects, incorporating context-sensitive design and environmentally sustainable materials and practices into I-10 improvements, and working with adjacent segments to ensure appropriate project sequencing to minimize the impacts on safety and mobility.

Some of the infrastructure programs discussed include design upgrades, access management, ramp improvements, bridge improvement strategies, frontage road upgrades, and drainage improvements. Brian also mentioned potential Power Projection Platform route upgrades, such as replacing substandard and low-clearance bridges to accommodate major freight and military needs.

- One stakeholder stated that there are a limited number of routes for heavy loads due to bridge heights, so it is encouraging that the study is looking at bridge improvements.

Slide 19: Applicable Guidelines and Programs for Technology and Communications

Brian reviewed the applicable technology and communications guidelines and programs. Where feasible, the applicable guidelines included incorporating the installation of broadband/fiber and smart technology equipment into major projects on the I-10 corridor, developing comprehensive statewide communication technologies to improve trip planning and incident management, and continuing to develop infrastructure to support vehicle technology (ADS/CDS).

Applicable technology and communications programs that were discussed include installing broadband/fiber backbone, ITS/DMS infrastructure improvements, advanced flooding warning systems, bridge clearance notifications, blocked rail crossing notification, Truck Parking Availability System and Weigh-in-Motion and Vehicle Classification expansion and upgrades, Smart Work Zones, signage improvements, and freight fuel alternatives. Brian noted the ConnectSmart program in Houston is a good example of using improvements to technology to get information out to drivers.

Slide 20: Applicable Guidelines and Programs for Multimodal Passenger Travel

Brian provided an overview of the applicable guidelines for multimodal passenger travel. The applicable guidelines include overcoming funding and legislative policy barriers, encouraging the incorporation of multimodal improvements into larger projects, and supporting the development of multimodal capacity and connectivity improvements. As people move further out of inner cities, multi-county and multi-agency funding for bus transit will become more important.

Brian outlined the applicable multimodal programs for passenger transit. These include intercity bus transit, commuter transit, autonomous rural transit, the bicycle tourism network, and intercity passenger rail service. He noted the Amtrak 2035 plan service recommendation for upgrades to provide more frequent service.

Slide 21: Applicable Guidelines and Programs for Multimodal Freight

Brian provided a summary of the applicable multimodal freight travel guidelines for implementation on the I-10 corridor. He said the guidelines should include standardizing and sharing freight data among states and partner agencies, identifying funding and legislative/policy opportunities to overcome freight transport barriers, and supporting last-mile freight connectivity options.

Brian outlined applicable multimodal programs to move freight on I-10, including freight data sharing (including TPAS, WIM/VC), border wait times, supporting private alternative freight delivery systems, freight transportation/land use connections, and freight mobility hubs. One example Brian highlighted was the Houston District REAL Plan which is looking at freight mobility hubs around the region that would incorporate truck parking. In meetings with the Strategic Planning Division and the Aviation Division, the study team found that TxDOT is looking at air mobility systems that provide options for moving freight. Private industry is also working on freight shuttle concepts. Stakeholders

have brought up the importance of addressing access improvements and the infrastructure to support these systems.

Brian asked the group if they thought there were any guidelines or programs that were missing.

Participants provided the following responses:

- Stephen Gage (HOU) stated that retrofitting parts of the corridor that were built a long time ago is a heavy burden. He remarked that this should be a lesson learned and lead to a policy of thinking 20 to 30 years ahead and preserving more right-of-way. Planning for the future, even on the simple things, pays big dividends in the long run.
- Stephen also noted that the integration of technology and infrastructure helps to move people and goods from one place to another. There must be an easy transition from one form of transportation to the next.
 - A stakeholder remarked that as there are HOV lanes for passenger travel, designated routes for freight should be considered as part of this effort.

Slide 22: Break

Plans and Projects

Slide 24: Applicable Connectivity Plans

Brian presented a slide summarizing the six phases of the project development process. He described how plans and projects move through development phases from concept to construction. Brian explained that there are several multi-segment I-10 projects for which portions are already in the Unified Transportation Program (UTP), but there are also portions that have not yet been funded for construction. Others may currently be in the UTP as a planning or feasibility study, but specific project details (such as the number of lanes, route locations, etc.) have not been determined. Identifying these “gap” projects as being important for improving mobility, safety, or connectivity along I-10, will result in them being included in the I-10 Texas Corridor Implementation Plan for potential advancement to the next phase of project development. He asked members to consider these phases as the team discussed proposed plans and projects for the I-10 Corridor.

Slides 25 - 26: East Segment Connectivity Plans: Prioritization Exercise

Brian presented a map showing applicable East Segment connectivity plans. The maps also indicated the parallel and connecting corridors that were identified from a resiliency standpoint. He informed members that they would be broken up into smaller breakout groups to discuss the connecting and parallel routes along I-10. The groups were advised to consider the overarching desire to improve connectivity, mobility, and resiliency along the I-10 corridor. Brian explained that each member was provided three voting dots to correspond with their top three plans. After the group discussions, each member would vote by placing their dots in the “priority” column of the plan

to reflect those three priorities of mobility, connectivity, and resiliency. Space was provided for participants to add connecting and parallel routes not identified on the maps.

Slides 27 - 29: Project Prioritization Exercise

Brian presented slides describing the gap projects identified in the East Segment. Brian noted that each project had been provided to the members on a postcard. The postcards included details about each project's limits, the current status, the estimated cost, and several anticipated benefits. The breakout groups were to review the project-specific information, consider the prioritization of each project in the context of I-10 through the region, and select the preferred time frame for advancing each project. The time frame options were short-term (less than five years), mid-term (from five to ten years), and long-term (more than ten years).

Brian then asked that the breakout groups keep in mind the following as they discussed the projects:

- Estimated Cost
- Project Sequencing
- Other Ongoing or Planned Projects
- Previous Stakeholder Input
- Segment and Corridor-wide Needs and Impacts

Brian reminded members that during prior meetings, the top priorities were established as being:

- To reduce congestion
- To reduce crashes
- To increase maintenance

The members broke out into three groups to discuss and prioritize the plans and projects. Study team members engaged the members within the groups, facilitating the discussion and answering any questions that were asked about the plans or projects.

- Breakout group #1 reported that they focused on US 90 and the Yoakum District area. The group suggested that the US 90 study should ensure that US 90 is ultimately a four-lane divided facility. The group also suggested adding SH 105 through Orange County as a possible alternative route, at least for local traffic. They felt that the US 183 corridor from I-10 south to Gonzalez needed a study. Additionally, US 77 was a high priority for their group. They identified the intersection of I-10 and US 77 as an area where TxDOT should flip the stack.
- Breakout group #2 reported that they had a very good discussion. They pointed out that everyone tends to have regional biases, as everyone wants their area to thrive, but that it is important in this exercise to keep in mind what will benefit the entire corridor. They discussed and focused on several areas, the first was US 90. They highlighted the need for rail crossing improvements at US 90 and SH 71. They also focused on the Beaumont area and added a plan

to the list, Highway 62, which would make a good alternative route and should be completed from I-10 to US 96. They also discussed that consideration be given to raising the centerline elevation on each side of existing bridge structures. For example, during some flooding events, bridge structures may be fine, but the approaches are completely flooded and unusable.

- Breakout group #3 expressed the desire for a Freeport connection to I-10. They agreed that US 90 is key to having a parallel system. They were concerned that there were no projects in the Beaumont area between Grand Parkway and Winnie, TX. They feel as though there is a need there. I-10 PEL was also mentioned, and the group expressed a desire to see it expanded on the east side.
- With regards to the projects, Breakout group #2 recommended a grade separation be constructed at the intersection of FM 1135 and I-10.
- One comment was retrieved from the back of the project cards. It asked if E-13 (I-610 to I-45) includes “new connections between I-10 and I-45. Greatest congestion occurs b/c of traffic conflicts at I-10 and 45 near the Heights.”

Slides 30 - 32: Prioritization Exercise Results

Brian reviewed the results of the plan and project prioritization exercises, showing how stakeholders prioritized plans and projects in the East Segment.

Plan Prioritization Results

Plan	Breakout Group #1	Breakout Group #2	Breakout Group #3	Total Votes
US 90 Corridor Study (Statewide)	4	5	2	11
US 90A Corridor Study (West of San Antonio to Houston)	4		6	10
Completion of Grand Parkway	5			5
US 69 I-10 to Future I-69	1	4		5
Highway 62 to 96*		5		5
I-10 East PEL Study I-69 to SH 99	4			4
SH 71 Corridor Study (Austin to I-10)	1		3	4
US 77 Improvement Study			4	4
I-10 Inner-Katy Bus Rapid Transit I-10 Lanes	2			2

Plan	Breakout Group #1	Breakout Group #2	Breakout Group #3	Total Votes
Real Plan 2.0 Implementation (Houston Region)	2			2
Highway 36A (US 59 S/I-69 S to US 290/ SH 6)	1			1
I-14 Corridor-wide (I-10 in Pecos County to Texas/Louisiana State line)		1		1
SH 73 I-10 to Port Arthur		1		1
SH 146 US 90 to Future I-69		1		1
US 290 Corridor Study (I-10 south of Junction to I-10 in Houston)				
Bolivar Bridge Connects Galveston Island to Port Bolivar Peninsula (Feasibility)				
FM 365 US 90 to Port Neches				
SH 87 Port Arthur to Port Orange and points north within the Beaumont District				
US 183 Gonzales to I-10*				

* Indicates plan added by the stakeholders

Project Prioritization Results

Facility	Project Score
E-1: Study, US 183/80 to US 90 (East of Waelder)	Mid Term
E-2: Study, US 90 (East of Waelder) to FM 2672	Mid Term
E-3: Widening, FM 2672 to Fayette/Colorado C/L	Mid Term
E-4: Widening, Fayette/Colorado C/L to FM 155	Mid Term
E-5: Widening, FM 155 to FM 2434	Mid Term
E-6: Widening FM 2434 to Colorado Bridge	Mid Term

Facility	Project Score
E-7: Widening Colorado Bridge to US 90 (Alleyton Rd)	Short Term
E-8: Frontage Rds FM 359 to W. of Snake Creek	Mid Term
E-8b: Frontage Rds Waller/Ft. Bend CL to west of Snake Creek	Mid Term
E-9: FM 359 to Waller/Ft. Bend C/L	Mid Term
E-10: Waller/Ft. Bend C/L to W. of Snake Creek	Mid Term
E-11: W. of Snake Creek to Ft. Bend/Harris C/L	Mid Term
E-12: Ft. Bend/Harris C/L to Mason Rd.	Mid Term
E-13: I-610 to I-45	Mid Term

Brian asked the members if any results surprised them.

Stakeholder Input/Discussion

- Stakeholders indicated there were no surprises and there was consensus among the groups.

Slides 33 - 35: Overview of Proposed Plan Contents

Brian reviewed the proposed I-10 Corridor Plan contents. He noted that the plan will include the following:

- Emphasis on the local, statewide, and national importance of I-10
- Description of stakeholder engagement and planning process
- Overview of existing and forecasted socio-economic, traffic, and infrastructure conditions
- Description of identified needs and gaps
- List of prioritized guidelines, programs, plans, and projects

Brian asked the members if there were any key topics that they would like to highlight in the I-10 Texas Corridor Study Report for the East Segment.

Stakeholder Input/Discussion

- It was noted that not enough consideration has been given to the need for early acquisition of rights-of-way. The areas of the state that have been most successful in addressing their transportation needs have had the foresight to acquire right-of-way early. This has proved very difficult on I-10 as the cost of right-of-way through metropolitan Houston has become almost

cost-prohibitive. This fact leads to the need for the integration of land use planning with transportation planning.

Next Steps

Slides 36 - 37: Next Steps

Brian provided an overview of the next steps and the upcoming schedule. He said following the Working Group meetings, the study team would incorporate the stakeholders' input into the plan. Later in the spring, the team will meet with the Steering Committee to review the stakeholder input and the draft plan. The study team will finalize and present the implementation plan in the early summer of 2023.

Questions & Closing Remarks

Slides 38 - 39: Questions & Closing Remarks

Judge Branick (Jefferson County) thanked the working group members for their attendance. He stated that today's session provided a lot of good information on the corridor. Cary said the information provided was extremely valuable and thanked the attendees for taking the time to participate. Lorena also thanked the stakeholders for their attendance and their involvement throughout the study.