

REPORT OF THE CORRIDOR GUIDELINES (CG) WORK GROUP
REVISING THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (TxDOT)
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (UTP)

7/17/02 mgwade tti fn=c:/UTP/CGWG Report 1c

BACKGROUND

The Texas Legislature requested that the Texas Transportation Commission (Commission) consider a simplified procedure for the planning, programming, and development of projects to contract letting. In addition, Governor Rick Perry requested that the Commission simplify the project planning process and deliver highway improvements in, “continuous and complete corridors”, thereby increasing efficiency and decreasing inconvenience to the Texas motorists.

TxDOT requested that the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) perform a survey of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), County officials, and TxDOT staff regarding perceived limitations of the current Project Selection and Funds Distribution Process, and suggest recommendations for improvement based on survey results. TTI’s report provided specific recommendations for improving highway project programming as well as the general understanding and acceptance of TxDOT procedures. The Commission proposed changing the project selection process based on these recommendations. The proposed simplification involves reducing the number of funding categories from 34 to 12, developing clear and understandable guidelines, and providing better education and training regarding the new process. The Commission also gave direction to improve the project development authorization of the proposed 12 categories by changing the nomenclature to layman’s terms.

THE UTP

TxDOT and the Commission use the Unified Transportation Program (UTP) as a ten-year plan for project development and construction. The Commission administers the UTP, it establishes the funds distribution procedures, and determines a project selection process. The Commission concurred to an action plan to implement proposed changes. Highlights of the action plan include:

- Reassign all un-let projects into the new categories.
- Develop allocation formulas for the new categories.
- Define the corridors and establish a corridor development priority process.

DEVELOPMENT OF A PROCESS

The Commission directed that all decisions regarding development of the revised planning, programming and scheduling process involve as much input and consensus as possible from subject matter experts. Such expertise came from both within TxDOT as well as from outside transportation planning partners. TxDOT Assistant Executive Director for Engineering

Operations, Amadeo Saenz (with assistance of the Texas Metropolitan Planning Organization [TEMPO], TTI, TxDOT Districts, and TxDOT Transportation Planning and Programming Division [TPP] staff), led recruitment efforts for persons to fill the work groups.

REDUCED NUMBER OF CATEGORIES IN STATEWIDE MOBILITY

To reduce the number of overall existing categories of work from 34 to a proposed 12, the Commission approved reshuffling 12 existing statewide mobility categories into three.

The 12 existing categories are

- Category 1 – High Priority Interstate Corridors
- Category 3A – National Highway System (NHS) Mobility
- Category 3B – Texas Trunk System
- Category 3D – NHS Traffic Management Systems
- Category 8B – Farm Road and Ranch Road System Expansion (New Locations)
- Category 13A – State Funded Mobility
- Category 13B – Hurricane Evacuation Routes
- Category 13C – Border Trade Transportation Projects (NAFTA Discretionary)
- Category 13D – Urban Street Program
- Category 15 – Congressional High Priority Projects
- Category 17 – State Principal Arterial Street System (PASS)
- Category 18 – Candidate Turnpike Projects (Toll)

The three proposed categories are

- Category 2 – Metropolitan Area Corridor Projects
Corridors located within TMA MPO boundaries that have both local and statewide interest.
- Category 3 – Urban Area Corridor Projects
Corridors located within non-TMA MPO boundaries that have both local and statewide interest.
- Category 4 – Statewide Connectivity Corridor Projects
Corridors located outside of MPO boundaries that have statewide significance.

CORRIDOR WORK GROUPS:

Four work groups were designated to implement a process for identifying and prioritizing corridor-segments for future development or improvement:

- Statewide Corridor Guidelines (CG) Work Group
- Category 2 – Metropolitan Area Corridor Prioritization (MACP) Work Group
- Category 3 – Urban Area Corridor Prioritization (UACP) Work Group
- Category 4 – Statewide Connectivity Corridor Prioritization (SCCP) Work Group

TxDOT intends to chart the future of mobility by using the work groups to make corridor value determinations. This will help define long-term mobility objectives and incorporate local interest into corridor priority determinations. Developing a statewide consensus on corridor

priorities will aid in identifying corridors for the Statewide Plan and also balance forecasted resources with the prioritized corridors. Use of the results will also be permitted to leverage additional resources needed.

Statewide Corridor Guidelines (CG) Work Group

Membership for the CG Work Group included a large-sized (Austin) and a medium-sized MPO staff person (Waco), representatives of large-sized MPOs (El Paso and San Antonio), medium-sized MPOs (Amarillo and Laredo), small-sized MPOs (Abilene, Brownsville, and Tyler), rural county judges (Concho and Polk Counties), a Regional Planning Commission, a Council of Governments, large-sized TxDOT Districts (Ft. Worth and Houston), medium-sized TxDOT Districts (Beaumont, Bryan, Lubbock and Odessa), small-sized TxDOT Districts (Atlanta, Paris and Yoakum), and TxDOT Division Staff representing the Design, Right of Way (ROW), Traffic Operations, Construction, Environmental, and Transportation Planning and Programming (TPP) Divisions (Programming and Scheduling as well as System Planning Sections). The TxDOT Legislative Affairs Office and the Public Information Office also attended for informational purpose. Appendix Table 1 is a list of individuals who served on the CG Work Group.

The “Charge” to the Statewide Corridor Guidelines Work Group was:

1. Review Existing and Currently Proposed Priority Corridors Documents
2. Review Historical TxDOT / USDOT Criteria for Corridor Selection
3. Develop Corridor Guidelines Task Force Definition of “Corridor”
4. Prepare “Charge” (recommended guidelines) for the individual Statewide Corridor Prioritization Work Groups. Guidelines should enable preparation of a recommended system of statewide and regional corridors and a plan for developing that network. It is anticipated that these charges will suggest a uniform format for:
 - Category 2 – Metropolitan Area Corridor Prioritization Work Group
 - Category 3 – Urban Area Corridor Prioritization Work Group
 - Category 4 – Statewide Connectivity Prioritization Work Group
5. Recommend “Criteria” or “Performance Measures” for consideration of Category 2, 3 and 4 Work Groups to establish a consensus on a statewide interconnected corridor network. The process needs to assure that individual corridors are determined to allow projects to be identified on the corridors.
6. Recommend “Criteria” or “Techniques” for consideration of Category 2, 3 and 4 to make investments count statewide by:
 - Selection of “corridor segments” (projects) to be included in the Statewide Plan
 - Prioritization of “corridor segments” for the Statewide Plan
7. Draft a Report of Recommendations to the Statewide Corridor Prioritization Task Forces

The CG Work Group reviewed previous efforts made by TxDOT and others to develop a logical corridor network for the state. CG reviewed the Statewide Plan, TxDOT Strategic Plan, Texas Trunk System, Trans Texas Corridors, USDOT Functional Classification System, and Western Transportation Trade Network. They also reviewed individual corridor studies such as IH 69, Ports-to-Plains, IH 10, Border Trade, Hurricane Evacuation, Green Carpet, and SH 21. A status report of the Texas Farm to Market Road System was also made. CG also reviewed historical TxDOT/USDOT criteria for corridor selection as well as current use of benefit/cost studies in

project selection. The group also prepared definitions of corridor related terms for consideration by other work groups.

CG further outlined the responsibilities and guidelines for the three Corridor Prioritization Work Groups by developing their “Charge” and recommending initial criteria for consideration in corridor-segment prioritization.

Statewide Corridor Prioritization Task Forces

Corridor prioritization responsibilities are divided into three work groups: Metropolitan, Urban, and Statewide Connectivity. The final results from these work groups will be three lists of prioritized corridors and corridor segments for Category 2 – Metropolitan Area (TMA) Corridor Projects, Category 3 – Urban Area (non-TMA Corridor Projects, and Category 4 – Statewide Connectivity Corridor Projects. After the work groups have reached consensus on prioritization of the metropolitan, urban, and statewide connectivity corridors and corridor segments, their reports of recommendation will be submitted to the Commission for consideration of approval.

Category 2 – Metropolitan Area Corridor Prioritization Work Group

Each Transportation Management Area (TMA) MPO was offered the opportunity to be represented by one person on this work group. They were offered the choice of recommending either a Policy Committee member, a Technical Committee member or a MPO staff person. MPOs which chose to send an elected official as representative could have an MPO staff person accompany the elected official to provide him/her support or representation during his/her absence.

Membership for this group include representatives of the Capital Area (Austin), Corpus Christi, El Paso, Hidalgo County (McAllen), Houston/Galveston Area Council of Governments (Houston), Lubbock, North Central Texas Council of Governments (Dallas/Fort Worth), and San Antonio MPOs, and TxDOT Austin, Corpus Christi, El Paso, Pharr, Houston, Lubbock, Dallas, Ft. Worth, and San Antonio Districts. It also includes TxDOT Design Division, TxDOT ROW Division (in staff support role only), TxDOT Construction Division (in staff support role only), TxDOT TPP (Programming and Scheduling Section) Division, TxDOT TPP (Systems Planning Section) Division, TxDOT Legislative Affairs Office (information purposes only), and TxDOT Public Information Office (information purposes only).

Category 3 – Urban Area Corridor Prioritization (UACP) Work Group

Each non-TMA MPO had the opportunity to be represented by one person on the UACP Work Group. They were offered the choice of recommending either a Policy Committee member, a Technical Committee member or a MPO staff person. MPOs which chose to send an elected official as representative could have an MPO staff person accompany the elected official to provide him/her support or representation during his/her absence.

Membership for this group includes representatives of the Abilene, Amarillo, Beaumont, Brownsville, Bryan-College Station, Harlingen-San Benito, Killeen-Temple, Laredo, Longview,

Midland-Odessa, San Angelo, Sherman-Denison, Texarkana, Tyler, Victoria, Waco, and Wichita Falls MPOs, and TxDOT Abilene, Amarillo, Atlanta, Beaumont, Bryan, Laredo, Odessa, Paris, Pharr, San Angelo, Tyler, Waco, Wichita Falls and Yoakum Districts. It also includes TxDOT Design Division, TxDOT ROW Division (in staff support role only), TxDOT Construction Division (in staff support role only), TxDOT TPP (Programming and Scheduling Section) Division, TxDOT TPP (Systems Planning Section) Division, TxDOT Legislative Affairs Office (information purposes only), and the TxDOT Public Information Office (information purposes only).

Category 4 – Statewide Connectivity Corridor Prioritization Work Group

Membership for this group include rural county judges from Clay and Duval Counties, a Regional Planning Commission, a Council of Governments, and the Dallas/Ft. Worth, McAllen, Killeen/Temple, Lubbock, Sherman/Denison, and Victoria MPOs. It also includes El Paso, San Antonio, Tyler, Brownwood, Lufkin, and Childress TxDOT Districts, TxDOT Design Division, TxDOT ROW Division (in staff support role only), TxDOT Construction Division (in staff support role only), TxDOT TPP (Programming and Scheduling Section) Division, TxDOT TPP (Systems Planning Section) Division, TxDOT Legislative Affairs Office (information purposes only), and the TxDOT Public Information Office (information purposes only).

DEFINITIONS

The definitions developed by the Corridor Guidelines Work Group are for workgroups purposes only and do not supercede these similar definitions recognized by the Commission and the Texas Legislature.

General Definitions:

Corridor: A broad geographical band that follows a general directional flow connecting major sources and destinations of trips that may contain multi-modal alignments.

Corridor Segment:

A portion of a corridor with logical termini for the user. A corridor segment may be a group of projects on multiple highways that are leading to a single purpose.

Selection and Prioritization Criteria Definitions:

Traffic Engineering Definitions

Traffic: Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)– The National Research Council defines AADT as total volume of traffic passing a point or segment of a highway facility in both directions for one year divided by the number of days in the year. TxDOT computes the AADT by taking a series of 24-hour axle counts for a segment of roadway and applying seasonal factors and axle correction factors to develop an estimated AADT. Types of AADT include:

- Historic AADT – A record of AADT for previous years, used to develop growth factors for estimating current and/or future AADT
- Current AADT – The most recent AADT estimate for a roadway segment
- Forecasted AADT – Usually a 20 year projection of AADT developed using linear regression and 10 years of historic AADT
- Modeled AADT – The AADT projected by the travel demand models in use by TxDOT and MPOs. Modeled AADT may be for the base year or for a forecast year.

Vehicle Miles of Travel: Vehicle miles of travel (VMT) is a measure of travel which is developed by multiplying a roadway section length in centerline miles by the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT).

Travel Time: The average time spent by vehicles traversing a highway segment, including control delay, in seconds per vehicle or minutes per vehicle.

Delay: The additional travel time experienced by a driver, passenger or pedestrian.

Level of Service (LOS): A qualitative measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, based on service measures such as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort and convenience. LOS is a measure of traffic flow and congestion.

Capacity: Capacity is the number of vehicles that can traverse a point or section of a lane or roadway during a set time period under given roadway, geometric, traffic, environmental and control conditions. It is usually expressed in vehicles per hour.

Access Management: A systematic process of controlling the rights of entry and exit from property that abuts upon a street or highway. Access is a private right as distinguished from rights of the public and is a purchased property interest. TxDOT may acquire property for control of access or impose access control for safety and design considerations. Access management is designed to alleviate or prevent congestion and enhance mobility.

Safety: A measure of the relative degree of security, protection or well being while traveling a highway corridor segment.

Percent Trucks: A truck is defined as a heavy vehicle engaged primarily in the transport of goods and materials or in the delivery of services including public transportation. Percent trucks is the ratio of number of trucks passing a given point in a day to the total number of vehicles (AADT) passing that point in the same day. Percent Trucks = number of trucks divided by AADT multiplied by 100.

Financial Definitions

Economic Development: Projects that stimulate, maintain, or promote trade, development, and industry.

Leveraging: Use of a range of financing or resource techniques to produce a maximum contract letting volume. The term is also used in association with “buy down” in which local funds are used to offset State and Federal finance to improve the benefit / cost relationship of a project.

Tolls: A toll lane is a lane for use of which a toll, or fare, is collected from users. A toll lane may also be used in connection with high-occupancy freeway lanes (HOV) during peak traffic periods. A toll road is a highway open to traffic only upon payment of a direct fee.

Benefit/Cost (B/C): A systematic method used to compare the benefits versus the cost of proposed alternatives. For highway projects, benefits may include reduced fuel consumption, travel time, and reduced air pollution. The costs of alternatives are measured by their estimated monetary expenditures. Cost may include construction, rights of way, maintenance, environmental mitigation, and other variables. Various forms of B/C are used to rank, and prioritize highway mobility projects.

Special Significance Definitions

International Traffic: Any traffic, vehicles, persons or goods, which enter or exit the borders of the United States. Reference “Port of Entry” for additional information.

Ports of Entry: Any installation (complex, terminal, or inspection station) with U.S. Customs and/or Immigration services where passengers and freight enter and/or exit the United States, including pedestrian, rail, or highway border crossings, seaports, and airports.

Military or National Security Installations: These installations are special generators of traffic and cargo. They also involve unique challenges to security, mobility, and disaster preparedness for the nation.

Serving Tourism and / or Recreational Areas: Projects that provide service to and improvement of the quality and scope of travel and tourism, both recreational and otherwise.

Major Freight Routes: A corridor along which a significant percentage of the State’s cargo and goods are passing in trade and industry.

Air Quality Conformity: A regulation issued jointly by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) that requires transportation plans and programs in nonattainment areas to demonstrate conformity to

the air quality State Implementation Plan. Failure to demonstrate conformity will lead to withholding of transportation funding. An area is designated nonattainment by the EPA when a number of years of ambient air monitors indicate that the area does not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for a criteria pollutant.

Connectivity Definitions

Closing System Gaps: A roadway gap may be either an undeveloped space between two roadway segments of a route or a section of roadway with significant differential capacity or safety within logical termini.

Connecting With Principle Roadways from Adjacent States: The process of assuring that the adjacent state/nation has an approved comparable transportation facility (including a funded project) that has a logical terminus.

Intermodal Connectivity: This term refers to the provision of connections between different modes, such as highways to ports or rail. A highway facility providing access to intermodal facilities would be considered an intermodal connection.

Fit with other TxDOT Development: The degree to which the proposed corridor segment (project) contributes to other TxDOT, MPO, local, or regional plans, special initiatives, and previous commitments for development.

Maximize the use of existing transportation systems: Deployment of strategies and operational techniques to allow maximum utilization of the existing system, without adding capacity and mobility projects, that will improve the level of service to the existing system.

Other Critical Factors Definitions

Regional Funds Distribution: This factor is an input to decision-making to assure that programming and scheduling has met the goal of funding projects across the entire state as much as practical.

Highway System Distribution: This factor is an input to decision-making to assure that programming and scheduling has met the goal of funding projects across the entire State highway system (Trunk, Primary, Collector, etc.) as much as practical.

CHARGES TO WORK GROUPS

Category 2 – Metropolitan Area Corridor Prioritization Work Group

The Statewide CG Work Group has proposed criteria for prioritizing corridor projects in the metropolitan areas across the state. This process assumes that already prioritized projects will not be affected by the application of these criteria. Projects in the FY 2002 Unified

Transportation Program (UTP) will not be affected by this process. In keeping with the Commission's desire to simplify TxDOT's procedures, we have categorized the criteria for the corridors while attempting to keep the criteria condensed, universal and to the point. Weighting of each element in the criteria is being left to your discretion. Your group shall consider all of the criteria proposed.

Corridors in the Metropolitan Areas serve both local metropolitan and statewide transportation. Therefore there are access, operations, and connectivity issues.

1. Identify and review existing and currently proposed priority corridors within metropolitan areas.
2. Apply weighting factors to the corridor selection criteria as developed by the Statewide Corridor Guidelines Task Force. It is recognized that improvements that address current economic development are significantly more important than those which stimulate future economic growth and this understanding should be addressed in criteria rating.
3. Document the rationale for the weights of all criteria.
4. Review projects referred by TxDOT and MPOs in the Metropolitan area category to determine which corridor projects are eligible for consideration for prioritization.
5. Score each eligible priority corridor project by using the weighted criteria.
6. Rank prioritized eligible projects in Metropolitan areas based upon scores developed in 5 above.
7. Prioritize eligible mobility projects that fit the Statewide Connectivity Corridor.
8. Review regional funds distribution and highway system distribution to assure that goals of funding projects across the entire state and the entire highway system have been met as much as practical. Equitable consideration should also be given to mobility on the Texas Farm to Market Road system as well as Hurricane Evacuation Routes.
9. Prepare report of recommendations for review and final approval by the Texas Transportation Commission.

Category 3 -Urban Area Corridor Prioritization Work Group

The Statewide CG Work Group has proposed criteria for prioritizing corridor projects in the urban areas across the state. This process assumes that already prioritized projects will not be affected by the application of these criteria. Projects in the FY 2002 Unified Transportation Program (UTP) will not be affected by this process. In keeping with the Commission's desire to simplify TxDOT's procedures, we have categorized the criteria for the corridors while attempting to keep the criteria condensed, universal and to the point. Weighting of each element

in the criteria is being left to your discretion. Your group shall consider all of the criteria proposed.

Corridors in the Urban Areas serve both local urban and statewide transportation. Therefore there are access, operations, and connectivity issues.

1. Identify and review existing and currently proposed priority corridors within urban areas.
2. Apply weighting factors to the corridor selection criteria as developed by the Statewide Corridor Guidelines Task Force. . It is recognized that improvements which address current economic development are significantly more important than those which stimulate future economic growth and this understanding should be addressed in criteria rating.
3. Document the rationale for the weights of all criteria.
4. Review projects referred by TxDOT and MPOs in the urban area category to determine which corridor projects are eligible for consideration for prioritization.
5. Score each eligible priority corridor project by using the weighted criteria.
6. Rank prioritized eligible projects in urban areas based upon scores developed in 5 above.
7. Prioritize eligible mobility projects that fit the Statewide Connectivity Corridor.
8. Review regional funds distribution and highway system distribution to assure that goals of funding projects across the entire state and the entire highway system have been met as much as practical. Equitable consideration should also be given to mobility on the Texas Farm to Market Road system as well as Hurricane Evacuation Routes.
9. Prepare draft report of recommendations for review and final approval by the Texas Transportation Commission.

Charge to Category 4 - Statewide Connectivity Corridor Prioritization Work Group

The Statewide CG Work Group has proposed criteria for prioritizing corridor projects in the urban areas across the state. This process assumes that projects already prioritized will not be affected by the application of these criteria. Projects in the FY 2002 Unified Transportation Program (UTP) will not be affected by this process. In keeping with the Commission's desire to simplify TxDOT's procedures, we have categorized the criteria for the corridors while attempting to keep the criteria condensed, universal and to the point. Weighting of each element in the criteria is being left to your discretion. Your group shall consider all of the criteria proposed.

Statewide connectivity corridors provide highway connections between cities, facilities, and other roadways that are vital to the statewide transportation system. Therefore there are access, operations, and connectivity issues.

1. Review existing and currently proposed priority corridors documents.
 - Texas Trunk System
 - Statewide Transportation Plan
 - Trans-Texas Corridors
2. Review the inclusion of the State’s Farm to Market System in the Statewide Corridor Guidelines.
3. Use the definitions developed by the Statewide Corridor Guidelines Task Force to assign weighting factors to the corridor selection criteria. It is recognized that improvements which address current economic development are significantly more important than those which stimulate future economic growth and this understanding should be addressed in criteria rating.
4. Review mobility projects referred by TxDOT and other impacted parties that fit the definition of a Statewide Connectivity Corridor.
5. Prioritize eligible mobility projects that fit the Statewide Connectivity Corridor.
6. Review regional funds distribution and highway system distribution to assure that goals of funding projects across the entire state and the entire highway system have been met as much as practical. Equitable consideration should also be given to mobility on the Texas Farm to Market Road system as well as Hurricane Evacuation Routes.
7. Prepare draft report of recommendations for review and final approval by the Texas Transportation Commission.

WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATION OF CRITERIA FOR CORRIDOR PROJECT SELECTION AND PRIORITIZATION

The Corridor Guidelines Work Group spent considerable time reviewing possible criteria by which corridors, corridor-segments, and priorities could be identified and prioritized. Recommended criteria are shown in the following table.

Statewide Corridor Guidelines Work Group -

Recommended Criteria

mgwade tti fn= c:/utp/preliminary
criteria 3

Formula Criteria	Cat 2 – Metro	Cat 3 – Urban	Cat 4 – St.Wide
Traffic Engineering			
Traffic	X	X	X
Vehicle Miles of Travel	X	X	X
Travel Time / Delay	X	X	X
Level of Service / Capacity / Access Management	X	X	X
Safety	X	X	X
Percent of Trucks	X	X	X
Financial			
Economic Development	X	X	X
Leveraging and/or Tolls	X	X	X
Benefit - Cost	X	X	X
Special Significance			
International Traffic / Ports of Entry	X	X	X
Military or National Security Installations	X	X	X
Serving Tourism and/or Recreational Areas	X	X	X
Major Freight Routes	X	X	X
air quality / conformity	X	X	X
Connectivity			
Closing System Gaps	X	X	X
Connect with Princ. Rdwys from Adjacent States	X	X	X
Intermodal Connectivity	X	X	X
Fit with other TxDOT Development	X	X	X
Maximize the Use of Existing Transp. System	X	X	X

Other

- Factors**
- Regional Funds Distribution
 - Highway Systems Distribution

REFLECTIONS

The CG Work Group wishes to acknowledge the tremendous challenge that has been offered to the Category 2 – Metro, Category 3 – Urban, and Category 4 – Statewide Connectivity Work Groups. Identification of corridors, corridor-segments, and prioritization will be a significant task. Weighting of each element in the criteria is being left to those work groups' discretion. It is the desire of the CG Work Group that these groups consider all of the proposed criteria. Of particular concern for the CG Work Group is that final priorities consider the need for regional distribution and highway system distribution of funds across the State as much as practical. The requirement that recommendation reports from Categories 2, 3, and 4 be delivered to the Texas Transportation Commission prior to November 1 is acknowledged to be a significant task.

Appendix Table 1

Corridor Guidelines Work Group Designated Representatives

C:\Corridor Guidelines Work Group Representatives.xls

Organization	Contact	Phone/Fax	Address
Nortex Regional Plang Commis	Dennis Wilde MPO Director	940-322-5281 940-322-6743	P. O. Box 5144 Wichita Falls, Tx 76307-5144 dwilde@texasconnection.org
Coastal Bend COG	Richard Bullock	361-883-5743 361-883-5749	P. O. Box 9909 Corpus Christi 78469 richard@cbcog98.org
Abilene MPO	Robert Allen MPO Director	915-676-6243 915-676-6242	P. O. Box 60 Abilene 79604 allen@abilenex.com
Amarillo MPO	Harold McDaniel MPO Director	806-378-4219 803-378-9388	P. O. Box 1971 Amarillo 79186-0001 harold.mcdaniel@ci.amarillo.tx.us
Austin MPO	Michael Aulick MPO Director	512-974-6441 512-974-6385	CAMPO P. O. Box 1088 Austin 78767 michael.aulick@ci.austin.tx.us
Brownsville MPO	Mark Lund MPO Director	956-548-6154 956-548-6144	City of Brownsville P. O. Box 911 Brownsville 78520 BMPO@ci.brownsville.tx.us
El Paso MPO	Joe Pickett MPO Policy Board Chair	915-590-4349 915-592-4646	1790 Lee Travino Drive, Suite 307 El Paso 79936 joe.pickett@house.state.tx.us
	Alternate Roy Gilyard MPO Director	915-591-9735x13 915-591-7296	10767 Gateway Blvd West Suite 605 El Paso 79935 Rgilyard@elpasompo.org
Laredo MPO	John C. Galo City Councilman	956-723-6046 fax 956-728-8730 optional fax 956-728-0556	P. O. Box 579 Laredo 78042-0579 jgalo@stx.rr.com

San Antonio MPO	Al Notzon MPO Policy Board	210-362-5201 210-824-4576	8700 Tesoro, Suite 700 San Antonio 78217 anotzon@aacog.com
Tyler MPO	Jeff Austin III	903-876-2212 903-876-3399	P. O. Box 277 Frankston 75763-0277 jeff3@fsbfrankston.com
Waco MPO	Hugh McNeely MPO Director	254-750-5655 254-750-1605	City of Waco P. O. Box 2570 Waco 76702-2570 hughm@ci.waco.tx.us
Atlanta District	Robert Ratcliff TxDOT District Engineer	903-799-1220 903-799-1229	701 East Main Street Atlanta 75551 bratcli@dot.state.tx.us
Beaumont District	Scott Rollins TxDOT TP&D	409-892-5740 409-896-0265	8350 Eastex Freeway Beaumont 777806 srollin@dot.state.tx.us
Bryan District	Lonny Traweek TxDOT District Engineer	979-778-9714 979-778-9709	1300 N. Texas Avenue Bryan 77803 ltrawee@dot.state.tx.us
Ft. Worth District	Maribel Chavez TxDOT District Engineer	817-370-6511 817-370-6787	P. O. Box 6787 Ft. Worth 76115-0868 mchavez@dot.state.tx.us
Houston District	Delvin Dennis TxDOT Deputy Dist Engr	713-802-5011 713-802-5400	P. O. Box 1386 Houston 77251-1386 ddennis@dot.state.tx.us
Lubbock District	Carl Utley TxDOT District Engineer	806-748-4420 806-748-4380	P. O. Box 771 Lubbock 79408-0771 cutley@dot.state.tx.us
Odessa District	Lauren Garduno TxDOT District Engineer	915-498-4711 915-498-4656	3901 US Hwy 80 East Odessa 79761 LGARDUN@dot.state.tx.us
Paris District	Steve Ekstrom TxDOT TP&P	903-737-9285 903-737-9305	1365 N. Main St Paris 75460-2697 sekstro@dot.state.tx.us
Yoakum District	Lonnie Gregorcyk TxDOT TP&D	361-293-4347 361-293-4372	Trns Plng & Prog Director P. O. Box 757

Yoakum 77995
lgregor@dot.state.tx.us

County Judge, Polk County Lufkin DE Dennis Cooley	John P. Thompson	(936) 327-6813 936-327-6891	County Judge, Polk County Polk County Courthouse - 3rd Floor Livingston, Texas 77351 polkcountyjudge@hotmail.com
County Judge, Concho County San Angelo DE Walter McCullough	Allen Amos	(915) 732-4321 (915) 732-4307	County Judge, Concho County P.O. Box 158 Paint Rock, Tx 76866 conchojudge@yahoo.com
Traffic Operations Division	James Kratz	512-416-3225 512-416-3299	125 E. 11th Street (TRF-TE) Austin 78701-2483 jkratz@dot.state.tx.us
Legislative Affairs Office <i>Note: Informational Purposes Only</i>	Jefferson Grimes fax Alternate Jessica Pantano	512-475-3097 512-463-8665 512-475-3097	125 E. 11th Street (TRF-TE) Austin 78701-2483 jgrimes@dot.state.tx.us jpantan@dot.state.tx.us
Design Division	Maria Burke Alternate Doug Woodall Alternate Linda Olson	512-416-2703 512-416-2716 512-416-2673 512-416-2686 512-416-2591 512-416-2593	125 E. Eleventh St Austin 78701 mburke@dot.state.tx.us fwoodall@dot.state.tx.us lolson@dot.state.tx.us
Public Information Office <i>Note: Informational Purposes Only</i>	Gabriela Garcia	512-475-2134 512-463-9896	125 E. 11th Street (PIO) Autin 78701-2483 GGARCIA1@dot.state.tx.us
TP&P Programming and Scheduling	Max Proctor	512-486-5041	125 E. Eleventh St Austin 78701 mproctor@dot.state.tx.us
TP&P System Planning	Fred Marquez	512-486-5132 512-486-5040	125 E. Eleventh St. (TPP) Austin 78701 amarquez@dot.state.tx.us
Environmental Division	To be Announced		