

Transportation Planning Policy Board

December 16, 2020 9:30 a.m.

Agenda



Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Planning Policy Board (TPPB) Wednesday, December 16, 2020

Electronic Meeting: 9:30 A.M.

Please join meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone. https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/179319149

> You can also dial in using your phone. United States: <u>+1 (872) 240-3412</u> Access Code: 179-319-149

AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order.
- 2. Opportunity for Public Comment.
- 3. Staff Update (pgs. 5-8):
 - a) KTMPO Meetings;
 - b) 2045 MTP Reprioritization;
 - c) FY21-24 STIP Schedule;
 - d) Air Quality.
- 4. Action Item: Regarding approval of minutes from November 18, 2020 meeting (pgs. 10-12).
- 5. **Discussion and Action Item:** Regarding approval of public involvement process for Reprioritization of Congestion Management Process (CMP) Network Segments (pgs. 14-26).
- Discussion and Action Item: Regarding approval of public involvement process for amendment to FY21-24 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) for project B45-03, 13th Avenue Sidewalk & Shared Use Path (pgs. 28-32).
- 7. **Discussion and Action Item**: Regarding approval of the following resolutions to support the State's targets as the MPO performance targets for the region (pgs. 34-91):
 - a) Resolution 2021-01 for Pavement and Bridge Condition (PM2);
 - b) Resolution 2021-02 for System Performance (PM3).

BELTON, TX 76513

- 8. **Discussion and Action Item**: Regarding approval of Resolution 2021-03 to support Hill Country Transit District's (HCTD) Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) targets as the MPO performance targets for the region (pgs. 93-135).
- 9. Discussion Item: Regarding public input received through November 2020 (pgs. 137-138).
- 10. Member comments.
- 11. Adjourn.

P.O. BOX 729

The Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization is committed to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Reasonable accommodations and equal opportunity for effective communications will be provided upon request. Please contact the KTMPO office at 254-770-2200 24 hours in advance if accommodation is needed. Citizens who desire to address the Board on any matter may sign up to do so prior to this meeting. Public comments will be received during this portion of the meeting. Comments are limited to 3 minutes maximum. No discussion or final action will be taken by the Board.

FAX 254-770-2360

W W W . K T M P O . O R G

. 3

Item 3: Staff Update



Agenda Item #3

Staff Update

a.) Listed below are the upcoming KTMPO meetings:

- January 13, 2021- Joint Technical Advisory Committee and Transportation Planning Policy Board meeting; Project Overview (electronic)
- February 3, 2021 Technical Advisory Committee (electronic)
- February 17, 2021 Transportation Planning Policy Board (electronic)

All meetings are scheduled for 9:30am at the Central Texas Council of Governments offices in Belton, Texas, unless otherwise noted (ie – electronic meeting).

b.) 2045 MTP Reprioritization

- Call for Projects closed on November 13th.
- 59 roadway, 24 livability and 1 transit projects were received; 84 total.
- An updated schedule is included on the following pages.

c.) FY21-24 STIP Schedule

• An updated schedule is included on the following pages.



2045 MTP Reprioritization Schedule

May 2019-May 2020 Evaluation and Development of MTP project scoring criteria.

July 2020 Development of task order and solicitation and selection of Consultant for Reprioritization of CMP Network Segments.

September 2020 Present updated Project Application Scoring Packet; Recommendation and approval of Project Application Scoring Packet; Recommendation and approval of MTP Reprioritization Schedule.

September 2020 Development of task order and solicitation and selection of Consultant for objective scoring of MTP projects.

October 1, 2020 Call for Projects opens.

October 30, 2020 Submission deadline for questions pertaining to the Call for Projects.

November 5-6, 2020 TxDOT review of on-system projects.

November 13, 2020 Call for Projects closes.

November 20, 2020 Project applications submitted to Consultant.

December 2020 Reprioritization of CMP Network Segments completed by Consultant; Initiate and conduct public involvement for reprioritized CMP segments

- January 13, 2021 Approval of Reprioritized CMP Network Segments; Project Bus Tour; TAC conducts subjective scoring on their own.
- January 31, 2021 Objective scores completed by Consultant.
- February 3, 2021 TAC subjective scores due to KTMPO.
- February 9, 2021 BPAC discussion of priority livability projects.

February 10, 2021 Objective scores sent to TAC/PB; Request questions for March meetings.

March 2021 Presentation of scoring results; Discussion of prioritization.

April 2021 Recommendation and approval of allocation of funds for Categories 2, 7, and 9 projects; Recommendation, approval and conducting of public involvement process for TIP and MTP Reprioritization amendments.

May 2021 Recommendation and approval of TIP and MTP Reprioritization amendments.

2021 – 2024 STIP TIMETABLE (UPDATED November 2020)

2021-2024 "Project Movements Spreadsheet" due November 30, 2020; per TPPs ema update and confirm changes to your specific area and send back to TPP_STIP@txdot.gov; cc Peggy Thruin and I	ail 11/14/2020 Mildred Litchfield
TPP will re-analyze changes made and run back thru STIP fiscal constraint summary to verify if fiscal constraint was achieved If achieved; TPP will notify the masses to begin their public involvement processes	December 1-4, 2020
TPP STIP Team will update eSTIP with all changes	Once fiscal constraint is achieved via required changes. Starts December 5, 2020
District and MPO public Involvement should be completed by If additional time is needed please contact STIP Team	January 22, 2021
Districts and MPOs will verify all changes in the eSTIP	Each area will be contacted once update has been completed
TPP Post 21-24 STIP, begins public comment period	February 19, 2021
Public Hearing Held	Week of March 14, 2021
STIP public comment period ends	March 22, 2021
2021-2024 STIP goes to the Commission for approval	March 25, 2021
First Day FHWA / FTA can approve the 2021-2024 STIP *Or, once FHWA / FTA receives TxDOT letter of approval	* March 26, 2021 7



d.) Air Quality



nce with El th Highest /	P A Ozone S Annual Valu	tandard: ie	3-year average (Calculated on
2018	2019	2020	Oct. 1 2020)
69	63	64	65
72	67	63	67
	nce with El th Highest / 2018 69 72	nce with EPA Ozone S th Highest Annual Valu 2018 2019 69 63 72 67	nce with EPA Ozone Standard:th Highest Annual Value201820192020696364726763

Action Needed: No action needed; for discussion only.

Item 4: Meeting Minutes



KILLEEN-TEMPLE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (KTMPO) TRANSPORTATION PLANNING POLICY BOARD (TPPB)

Wednesday, November 18, 2020 9:30 AM

Electronic Meeting

Central Texas Council of Governments (CTCOG) 2180 North Main Street Belton, TX 76513

Policy Board Voting Members Present

Chair Mayor Jose Segarra – City of Killeen	M
Vice-Chair Mayor Bradi Diaz – City of Copperas Cove	С
Mayor Tim Davis – City of Temple	
Councilmember Susan Long – City of Temple	Ju
Sam Listi for Councilmember David Leigh – City of	Vi
Belton	
Danielle Singh for Councilmember Jim Kilpatrick –	El
City of Killeen	Da

Mayor Spencer Smith – City of Harker Heights Commissioner Bobby Whitson for Judge David Blackburn – Bell County Judge Roger Miller – Coryell County Victor Goebel for Stan Swiatek – TxDOT Waco District Elias Rmeili – TxDOT Brownwood District Darrell Burtner — Hill Country Transit District

Policy Board Non-Voting Members Present

Brian Dosa – Fort Hood

Others Present

Jason Deckman – City of Temple Brenton Lane – TxDOT Waco District Christi Bonham – TxDOT Waco District Allen Duncan – TxDOT Waco District Austin Valentine – TxDOT Waco District Erika Kunkel – TxDOT Waco District Ryan Haverlah – City of Copperas Cove Bobby Lewis – City of Copperas Cove Keith Sledd – HOTDA Uryan Nelson – KTMPO Kendra Coufal – KTMPO James McGill – KTMPO

In observance of State and Local directives regarding social distancing and travel; members participated via the live stream where possible.

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order: Mayor Jose Segarra called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

- 2. Opportunity for Public Comment: No comments were made by the public.
- **3. Staff Update:** Advisory Committees; 2045 MTP Reprioritization Call for Projects; Air Quality.

Uryan Nelson informed the Board about upcoming KTMPO meetings through January. Mr. Nelson stated that the January meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 13th as a joint Policy Board-TAC meeting. Mr. Nelson informed the Board that the 2045 MTP Call for Projects closed November 13th and that in all 59 roadway projects and 22 livability projects (1 transit) were received. Mr. Nelson stated that Air Quality readings for the month of October were 61 ppb in Temple and 60 ppb in Killeen.

4. Action Item: Approve minutes from October 21, 2020 meeting.

Mayor Tim Davis made a motion to approve the October 21, 2020 meeting minutes, seconded by Mayor Bradi Diaz; the motion passed unanimously.

5. Discussion and Action Item: Regarding approval of the KTMPO Public Participation Plan (PPP) and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plan.

Kendra Coufal informed the Board that the 45-day public comment period for these plans had been completed with no comments received. Ms. Coufal also stated that TAC had recommended approval of both plans at their November meeting.

Darrell Burtner made a motion to approve the KTMPO Public Participation Plan (PPP) and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plan, seconded by Councilmember Susan Long; the motion passed unanimously.

6. Discussion Item: Regarding approval of amendments to the FY21-24 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) for project W35-01, US 190 Bypass and project W35-07, NW Loop 363.

Kendra Coufal informed the Board that the 15-day public comment period for projects W35-01 and W35-07 had been completed with no comments received. Ms. Coufal stated that KTMPO had received guidance from TxDOT to not take action to approve any amendments to the TIP due to TxDOT working on revisions to fiscally constrain the STIP. Therefore, this item will be tabled until authorization is received from TxDOT to proceed.

7. Discussion and Action Item: Regarding approval of amendments to the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) for project W30-23, US 190/Loop 363.

Kendra Coufal informed the Board that the 15-day public comment period for project W30-23 had been completed with no comments received. Ms. Coufal stated that since this amendment is only to the 2045 MTP, it can be approved by the Policy Board unlike the previous item.

Mayor Bradi Diaz made a motion to approve amendments to the 2045 MTP regarding project W30-23, seconded by Commissioner Bobby Whitson; the motion passed unanimously.

8. Discussion and Action Item: Regarding approval of Category 7 on-system project match requirements and Transit allocation.

Uryan Nelson informed the Board what the Category 7 match requirement for on-system projects meant and what the options considered had been. Mr. Nelson stated that the TAC recommended a 20% local match for on-system projects with an option for special exception by vote of the TAC and Policy Board. Mr. Nelson also informed the Board of the TAC's recommendation to allocate 10% of Category 7 funds for Transit projects and the historical background of that allocation.

Mayor Bradi Diaz made a motion to approve requiring 20% local match for Category 7 on-system projects, allowing by special vote on a project-by-project basis, to allow state funds to be utilized as 20% match, and to allocate 10% of Category 7 funding for Transit, seconded by Judge Roger Miller; the motion passed unanimously.

9. Discussion Item: Public input received through October 2020.

Public input received through October 2020 was presented to the TPPB. No input was received during the designated period.

10. Member Comments:

No member comments.

11. Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 9:42 a.m.

These meeting minutes were approved by the TPPB members at their meeting on ______.

Mayor Jose Segarra, Chair

Uryan Nelson, KTMPO Director

Item 5:

Congestion Management Process (CMP) Network Segments



Agenda Item #5

Reprioritization of Congestion Management Process (CMP) Network Segments

A Congestion Management Process (CMP) is a systematic approach for managing congestion that provides accurate, up-to-date information on transportation system performance and assesses alternative strategies for congestion management. This process follows an eight-step process which includes: develop regional objectives, define network, develop performance measures, collect data/monitor system performance, analyze congestion problems and needs, and identify and access strategies. KTMPO adopted the most recent full CMP in October 2016.

In 2018, KTMPO staff worked with Alliance Transportation Group to reprioritize CMP network segments. This process utilized updated data to refresh the CMP network, recalculate congestion performance for each CMP segment, and re-prioritize CMP segments. An amendment to the CMP was made in October 2018 to revise the Final Prioritized List of Congestion Hotspots for Highways and the Final Prioritized List of Congestion Hotspots for Arterials.

KTMPO has once again contracted with Alliance to update the CMP network as done in 2018. As part of this update, the CMP additions were based on public survey results from 2018. Year 2020 public surveys were not conducted due to travel patterns being outside of normal patterns, which could have biased the results. Year 2018 surveys were deemed more meaningful than a new survey would be.

The 2020 update to the CMP network was also based on assembling travel demand data, crash data and location-based data such as INRIX cell phone data and the National Performance Management Research Dataset. This data was utilized to analyze congestion levels on the respective CMP segments and calculate congestion scores and transportation system performance priority for each segment using performance measure criteria weights identified in the updated 2018 CMP which include Congestion Rank 25%, Congestion Rank Change 5%, Volume 20%, Safety Crashes 15%, Rear-End Crashes 10%, Transit 15%, School 5%, Public Input 5% = Total 100%.

Alliance will present an overview of the CMP segment analysis; the identification of any new segments that should be added to the CMP network; and the preliminary prioritization of CMP segments based on the updated data.

A 15-day public comment period and one public forum is needed for the proposed CMP amendment of revised Final Prioritized List of Congestion Hotspots for Highways and the Final Prioritized List of Congestion Hotspots for Arterials.



Agenda Item #5

Schedule:

- December 2, 2020—TAC recommends approval to initiate public involvement for proposed CMP amendment;
- December 16, 2020—TPPB approves initiation of public involvement for proposed CMP amendment;
- December 19, 2020- January 2, 2021—15-Day Public Comment Period;
 - Public Hearing: December 22, 2020 held at the Central Texas Council of Governments at 2180 N Main St. in Belton, TX 76513 at 12:00 pm
 - Virtual access: <u>https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/965292165</u>
 - Phone access: +1 (872) 240-3311, Access Code: 965-292-165
- January 13, 2021—TAC recommends approval of proposed CMP amendment.
- January 13, 2021—TPPB approves proposed CMP amendment.

Action Needed: Regarding approval of initiation of public involvement for proposed CMP amendment.

KTMPO 2020 CMP SEGMENT REPRIORITIZATION

TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING – DECEMBER 16, 2020





PRESENTATION OVERVIEW

- CMP Overview
- 2020 CMP Updates
- Updated Congestion Results
- 2020 CMP Segment Re-prioritization Results

WHAT IS CONGESTION MANAGEMENT

Congestion management is **the application of strategies to improve transportation system performance and reliability** by reducing the adverse impacts of congestion on the movement of people and goods.

A congestion management process (CMP) is a systematic approach for managing congestion that provides accurate, up-to-date information on transportation system performance and assesses alternative strategies for congestion management that meet state and local needs.

The CMP results in a **list of roadway segments which are prioritized based level of congestion** occurring along each segment, as well as strategies to address congestion in the region.

2020 CMP UPDATE

Why Reprioritize CMP Segments?

- Reflect real-world changes to the roadway network that impact congestion
- Take advantage of updated data sources
- Monitor the effectiveness of congestion management strategies and transportation system improvements

What is the Process?

- Collect up-to-date data
- Update CMP network to reflect changes to data and data availability
- Calculate congestion performance measures
- Revise evaluation criteria, if needed
- Rank/re-prioritize CMP segments

2020 CMP UPDATE

Data Resources

- Primary data sources
 - NPMRDS data
 - Additional INRIX data from TxDOT
 - 2045 Travel Demand Model
 - TxDOT CRIS Data
 - 2018 CMP Network

2020 Segment Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Weight	
Congestio	25%	
Congestio	on Rank Change	5%
Volume		20%
Safaty	Crashes	15%
Salety	Rear-End Crashes	10%
Transit		15%
School		5%
Public Inp	out	5%
Total		100%

AVERAGE DELAY PER MILE



2020 CMP SEGMENT REPRIORITIZATION RESULTS

TOP 10 PRIORITY HIGHWAYS

2020 Priority Rank	Description	Ranking Change	2018 Rank
I	IH 35 – US 190 TO S LOOP 363	-1	2
2	US 190 – FM 3470/STAN SCHLUETER LOOP TO BUSINESS 190	-2	4
3	US 190 – SH 9 TO FM 3470/STAN SCHLUETER LOOP	0	3
4	IH 35 – S LOOP 363 TO N LOOP 363	-3	7
5	US 190 – BUSINESS 190 TO IH 35	4	I
6	LOOP 363 – SPUR 290 TO IH 35 S	I	5
7	IH 35 – N LOOP 363 TO FALLS COUNTY LINE	I	6
8	IH 35 – US 190 TO WILLIAMSON COUNTY LINE	0	8
9	LOOP 363 – IH 35 S TO SH 36	-2	
10	US 190 - BUSINESS 190 W TO BUSINESS 190 E	-5	15

2020 CMP SEGMENT REPRIORITIZATION RESULTS

TOP 10 PRIORITY ARTERIALS

2020 Priority Rank	Description	Ranking Change	2018 Rank
I	FM 3470/STAN SCHLUETER LOOP - SH 201/CLEAR CREEK RD TO US 190	-4	5
2	SH 53/ADAMS AVE – FM 2271 TO 3RD ST	-6	8
3	FORT HOOD ST – FM 3470/STAN SCHLUETER LOOP TO RANCIER AVE	2	I
4	RANCIER AVE – FORT HOOD ST TO ROY REYNOLDS DR	-6	10
5	SH 317 – US 190 TO SH 36	3	2
6	FM 1741/S 31ST ST – FM 93 TO SH 53/ADAMS AVE	-1	7
7	FM 2410 – US 190 TO WARRIORS PATH	-4	11
8	WSYOUNG DR – BUSINESS 190 TO FM 3470/STAN SCHLUETER LOOP	5	3
9	BUSINESS 190 – US 190 BYPASS W TO US 190 BYPASS E	3	6
10	BUSINESS 190 – US 190 TO NOLA RUTH BLVD	I	9

Table 3 (H) CMP Segment Prioritization Highway Segments

Highways									
Segment ID	2020 Priority Rank	Description	Ranking Change	2018 Rank					
20B	I	IH 35 - US 190 TO S LOOP 363	-1	2					
4D	2	US 190 - FM 3470/STAN SCHLUETER LOOP TO BUSINESS 190	-2	4					
4C	3	US 190 - SH 9 TO FM 3470/STAN SCHLUETER LOOP	0	3					
20C	4	IH 35 - S LOOP 363 TO N LOOP 363	-3	7					
4E	5	US 190 - BUSINESS 190 TO IH 35	4	I					
26B	6	LOOP 363 - SPUR 290 TO IH 35 S	I.	5					
20D	7	IH 35 - N LOOP 363 TO FALLS COUNTY LINE	I	6					
20A	8	IH 35 - US 190 TO WILLIAMSON COUNTY LINE	0	8					
26C	9	LOOP 363 - IH 35 S TO SH 36	-2	11					
5	10	US 190 - BUSINESS 190 W TO BUSINESS 190 E	-5	15					
26E	11	LOOP 363 - IH 35 N TO SH 53	-3	14					
16	12	SH 195 - WILLIAMSON COUNTY LINE TO FM 3470/STAN SCHLUETER LOOP	3	9					
28	13	SH 36 - LOOP 363 TO SH 317	I.	12					
26A	14	LOOP 363 - US 190 TO SPUR 290	I	13					
26F	15	LOOP 363 - SH 53 TO US 190	-2	17					
26D	16	LOOP 363 - SH 36 TO IH 35 N	6	10					
3	17	SH 9 - US 190 to FM 116	-2	19					
32B	18	US 190 SE - PRITCHARD RD TO MILAM COUNTY LINE	2	16					
32A	19	US 190 SE - LOOP 363 TO PRITCHARD RD	-1	20					
4A	20	US 190 - FM 1715 TO US 190	2	18					
				-					

Table 3 (A) CMP Segment Prioritization Arterial Segments

		Arterials		
Segment ID	2020 Priority Rank	Description	Ranking Change	2018 Rank
9	I	FM 3470/STAN SCHLUETER LOOP - SH 201/CLEAR CREEK RD TO US 190	-4	5
29	2	SH 53/ADAMS AVE - FM 2271 TO 3RD ST	-6	8
10	3	FORT HOOD ST - FM 3470/STAN SCHLUETER LOOP TO RANCIER AVE	2	I
14	4	RANCIER AVE - FORT HOOD ST TO ROY REYNOLDS DR	-6	10
24	5	SH 317 - US 190 TO SH 36	3	2
25	6	FM 1741/S 31ST ST - FM 93 TO SH 53/ADAMS AVE	-1	7
8	7	FM 2410 - US 190 TO WARRIORS PATH	-4	11
13	8	WS YOUNG DR - BUSINESS 190 TO FM 3470/STAN SCHLUETER LOOP	5	3
4B	9	BUSINESS 190 - US 190 BYPASS W TO US 190 BYPASS E	3	6
7	10	BUSINESS 190 - US 190 TO NOLA RUTH BLVD	I.	9
17	11	TRIMMIER RD - FM 3470/STAN SCHLUETER LOOP TO HALLMARK AVE	7	4
23	12	LOOP 121 - IH 35 TO LAKE RD	-2	14
34	13	CLEAR CREEK RD - US 190 TO SH 195	0	13
31	14	SPUR 290/S IST ST - S LOOP 363 TO AVE E	-2	16
30	15	SPUR 290/3RD ST - AVE E TO IH 35	0	15
I	16	AVE D - N IST ST TO BUSINESS 190	4	12
12	17	N 2ND ST - HALLMARK AVE TO RANCIER AVE	-5	22
21A	18	FM 93/NOLAN VALLEY RD - WHEAT RD TO IH 35	-3	21
21B	19	FM 93 - IH 35 TO US 190	-8	27
18	20	WILLOW SPRINGS RD - US 190 TO WATERCREST RD	3	17
33	21	SH 53/ADAMS AVE - 3RD ST TO E LOOP 363	-4	25
22	22	LAKE RD - FM 2271 TO SH 317	2	20
6	23	38TH ST - BUSINESS 190 TO RANCIER AVE	4	19
27	24	INDUSTRIAL BLVD - OLD HOWARD RD TO IH 35	-2	26
2	25	FM I I 6 - AVE D TO ELIJAH RD	7	18
19	26	FM 2271 - LAKE RD TO FM 2305/W ADAMS AVE	2	24
- 11	27	HALLMARK AVE - FORT HOOD ST TO TRIMMIER RD	4	23
15	28	ROY REYNOLDS DR - BUSINESS 190 TO RANCIER AVE	0	28

QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION

Questions?

Item 6:

FY21-24 TIP and 2045 MTP Amendment for Project: B45-03 – Belton 13th Ave Sidewalks



Agenda Item #6

Amendment to the FY21-24 TIP and 2045 MTP

MTP Background

The MTP is the 25-year long range planning document for KTMPO. The MTP includes a short and long-range prioritized project listing incorporating projects expected to be funded within the document's 25-year planning horizon. The project listing is fiscally constrained based on the projected funding the MPO expects to receive in the 25 year planning period. The document also lists regionally significant unfunded projects. Projects must be included in the funded section of the MTP in order to receive state or federal funding.

TIP Background

The TIP is a 4-year transportation planning document that includes a detailed listing of projects reasonably expected to begin within a four-year period. The current TIP covers FY21 through FY24. Projects included in the TIP must be consistent with the MTP and are chosen based on regional priority and available funding. An amendment to a TIP is not completed until the change has also been included in the STIP—Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

Amendment to the FY21-24 TIP and 2045 MTP:

Amendments to the TIP and MTP are needed to:

Update the let date, cost estimate, work description, and project name for Belton's 13th Ave Sidewalks project, B45-03.

- > Belton provided KTMPO with an updated let date for project B45-03.
 - Original Let Date: 2022
 - Revised Let Date: 2023
- Belton provided KTMPO with an updated cost estimate for project B45-03. The federal cost share of the project will not change.
 - Original Cost Estimate: \$423,611
 - Revised Cost Estimate: \$539,233
- > Belton provided KTMPO with an updated work description for project B45-03.
 - Original Work Description: Construct 5 ft sidewalk on the north side of 13th Avenue from Main St to Woodall; Transition to 10 ft SUP from Woodall to Waco Rd.
 - **Revised Work Description:** Construct ADA compliant ramps, sidewalks, and crosswalks and add striping for a bike line on the south side of the roadway.
- > Revised description of work no longer includes plans for a shared use path.



Agenda Item #6

- Original Project Name: Belton 13th Ave Sidewalk & Shared Use Path Project
- **Revised Project Name:** Belton 13th Ave Sidewalk Improvements

Schedule:

- December 2, 2020—TAC recommends initiation of public involvement process for MTP and TIP amendments (not presented);
- December 16, 2020—TPPB approves initiation of public involvement process for MTP and TIP amendments;
- December 19, 2020 January 2, 2021—15 day public comment period;
 - Public Hearing: December 22, 2020 held at the Central Texas Council of Governments at 2180 N Main St. in Belton, TX 76513 at 12:00 pm
 - Virtual access: <u>https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/965292165</u>
 - Phone access: +1 (872) 240-3311, Access Code: 965-292-165
- January 13, 2021—TAC recommends approval of the proposed MTP and TIP amendment;
- January 13, 2021—TPPB approves the proposed MTP and TIP amendment.

Action Needed: Approve initiation of the public involvement process for an amendment to the FY21-24 TIP and 2045 MTP for project B45-03, 13th Avenue Sidewalks,

Original Description

DISTRICT	COUNTY	CSJ	HWY	LET DATE	PHASE	CITY		PROJECT SPONSOR	YOE COST
WACO	Bell	0909-36-139	CS	<mark>2022</mark>	С	Belton	Belton		\$423,611
LIMITS FROM:	Main Street (SH 317)								
LIMITS TO:	Waco Road (FM 817)					REVISION DATE:		Jul-20	
DESCRIPTION:	Construct 5 ft sidewalks	s on the north side o	of 13 th Avenue from M	ain St to Woodall; 1	Fransition to 10	MPO ID:		B45-03	
		ft SUP fror	m Woodall to Waco R	d.		FUNDING CATEGORY:		9TAP	
REMARKS:						PROJECT HISTORY:		MPO selected proj 2018 during repri MT	ect in December pritization of the P
TOTAL PROJECT COST	INFORMATION:		COST OF APPROVED PHASES:			AUTHORIZED FUNDIN	G BY CATEGOR	RY	
PRELIMINARY ENGINEE	RING:	\$22,592		CATEGORY:	FEDERAL:	STATE:	LOCAL:	LOCAL CONT:	TOTAL:
RIGHT OF WAY:		\$0		9TAP	\$338,889		\$84,722		<mark>\$423,611</mark>
CONSTRUCTION:		<mark>\$423,611</mark>	<mark>\$423,611</mark>						
CONSTRUCTION ENGIN	IEERING:	\$18,488		TOTAL	\$338,889	\$0	\$84,722	<mark>\$0</mark>	<mark>\$423,611</mark>
CONTINGENCIES:		\$6,547							
INDIRECTS:		\$0							
BOND FINANCING:		\$0							
TOTAL PROJECT COST (YOE):		\$471,238							

Revised Description

DISTRICT	COUNTY	CSJ	HWY	LET DATE	PHASE	CITY		PROJECT SPONSOR	YOE COST
WACO	Bell	0909-36-139	CS	<mark>2023</mark>	С	Belton		Belton	\$539,233
LIMITS FROM:	Main Street (SH 317)								
LIMITS TO:	Waco Road (FM 817)					REVISION DATE:		Jul-20	
DESCRIPTION:	Construct ADA complia	nt ramps, sidewalks, a	and crosswalks and	d add striping for a b	vike lane on the	MPO ID:		B45-03	
		south sid	le of the roadway.			FUNDING CATEGORY:		9TAP	
REMARKS:	Reconstruct 4' sidewa nursing home to Park	alks from Main St to F Ave (north side) and I bike la	Park Ave as needed Park Ave to Waco F Ine (south side)	l; construct new 4' s Rd (south side); add	idewalk from I striping for 6'	PROJECT HISTORY:		MPO selected pro 2018 during repri MT	ject in December oritization of the P
TOTAL PROJECT COST	INFORMATION:		COST OF APPROVED PHASES:			AUTHORIZED FUNDIN	IG BY CATEGOP	RY	
PRELIMINARY ENGINEE	RING:	\$58,227		CATEGORY:	FEDERAL:	STATE: LOCAL:		LOCAL CONT:	TOTAL:
RIGHT OF WAY:		\$0		9TAP	\$338,889	\$84,722		<mark>\$115,622</mark>	\$539,233
CONSTRUCTION:		<mark>\$539,233</mark>	<mark>\$539,233</mark>						
CONSTRUCTION ENGIN	IEERING:	\$47,649		TOTAL	\$338,889	\$0	\$84,722	<mark>\$115,622</mark>	\$539,233
CONTINGENCIES:		\$16,874							
INDIRECTS:		\$0							
BOND FINANCING:		\$0							
TOTAL PROJECT COST	(YOE):	\$661,983							



2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Project Listing

				MPO PROPOSITION 1/CATEGORY 2 PROJE	ECTS (METRO	OPOLITAN C	ORRIDOF	RS)				
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
C30-03b	0231-02-062	Business US 190 Phase I	FM 1113 (Avenue D) to Constitution Dr	Construction of a raised median and conversion of one travel lane in each direction to a sidewalk/bicycle lane	81.00	4	4	\$10,000,000	2021	Yes	EJ	
W40-04a (1)	2502-01-021	Loop 121 Phase 1a	Lake Rd (FM 439) to US 190	Widen from two lanes to four lanes with a raised median	56.45	14	5	\$28,000,000	2021	Yes	EJ, H, P	, ,
W35-07	0320-06-008	NW Loop 363	Industrial Blvd to Lucius McCelvey Dr	Construct interchange and expand two to four lanes with frontage roads	72.00	3	1	\$45,000,000	2025	Yes	Н	4-year UT
W35-01	0231-19-003	US 190 Bypass	Lampasas County Line to US 190 W of Clarke Rd	Widen from two lanes to four lanes divided and construct interchange	68.27	9	2	\$48,150,000	2025	Yes	L, H,	
				CATEGORY 4 PROJECTS (STATEW	IDE URBAN (CONNECTIVI	TY)					
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
W45-01	0231-03-152	IH 14 Advanced Traffic Management System	Coryell County Line to FM 3423 (Indian Trail)	Construction of fiber optics, traffic cameras and Dynamic Message Boards	73.33	2	11	\$6,200,000	2021	Yes	EJ, L, H	4-y W
			CATEGO	DRY 7 PROJECTS (SURFACE TRANSPORTAT	ION PROGR	RAM-METR	OPOLIT	AN MOBILI	TY)			
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
T40-15	0184-03-039 0232-01-053	Adams Ave/Central Ave. Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements	IH-35 to MLK Jr Blvd (Spur 290)	Installation of ADA compliant sidewalks traveling east on Central Avenue from 31st Street to 3rd Street and west on Adams Avenue from 3rd Street to 31st Street with tapered connections to existing sidewalks at bridges	92.00	2	2	\$1,913,044	2021	Yes	EJ, H	
T40-07a	0909-36-168	Temple Outer Loop West-Phase I	522 ft South of Jupiter Dr to 20 ft North of Riverside Trail	Widen from two to four lane divided roadway with a curb and gutter, Phase 1	64.67	17	4	\$10,298,198	2021	No	P, H	4-year UT
N40-04	0909-36-167	Nolanville City Park Connectivity	Park (North Mesquite) along Ave H to 10th St	Construct ADA compliant sidewalks, ramps, and crosswalks	72.34	6	3	\$1,558,802	2021	No	Р	
				MPO CATEGORY 9 PROJECTS (TRANSPOR	RTATION AL	TERNATIVI	E PROGF	RAM)				
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
B45-03	0909-36-169	13th Avenue Sidewalk & Shared Use Path	Main St (SH 317) to Waco Rd (FM 817)	Construct 5 ft sidewalks on the north side of 13th Ave from Main St to Woodall; Transition to 10 f SUP from Woodall to Waco Rd	t 72.16	7	4	\$423,611	2022	No	Р	4-year U
			STATEW	IDE CATEGORY 9 PROJECTS (TRANSPORT	ATION ALTE	ERNATIVE S	SET-ASIC	e progra	AM)			
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
B40-05	0909-36-163	Belton Hike and Bike Trail Extension South (South Belton Shared Use Path)	IH-35 from FM 436 to Confederate Park Dr	Construct 12 ft wide hike and bike trail. Project will extend along FM 436, IH-35 northbound frontage road and Confederate Park Drive.	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,790,571	2021	No	EJ, P	
				STATEWIDE CATEGORY 9 PROJECTS (SAF	E ROUTES			RAM)				
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
	0909-36-180	Troy - Mays Middle School SRTS	On Lee Mays Blvd and Luther Curtis Rd to Raymond Mays Middle School	Construct 0.2 miles of accessible sidewalks with crosswalks and ADA ramps.	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$277,571	2021	No	N/A	

Short Range Funded (2020-2030) Projects with Allocated Funding as of October 2020 and Listed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Original Description

Funding

Allocation: \$131,150,000 ITP Fiscal Constraint: \$68,585,914

Funding

Allocation: \$6,200,000 year UTP Fiscal Constraint: Vaco District: \$59,730,508 Brownwood District: \$0

Funding

Allocation: \$13,770,044 ITP Fiscal Constraint: \$23,549,569

Funding

Allocation: \$423,611 JTP Fiscal Constraint: \$1,576,040

Funding

Allocation: \$1,790,571 Fiscal Constraint: n/a

Funding

Allocation: \$277,571 Fiscal Constraint: n/a



2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Project Listing

				MPO PROPOSITION 1/CATEGORY 2 PROJE	CTS (METRC	POLITAN C	ORRIDOR	S)				
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
C30-03b	0231-02-062	Business US 190 Phase I	FM 1113 (Avenue D) to Constitution Dr	Construction of a raised median and conversion of one travel lane in each direction to a sidewalk/bicycle lane	81.00	4	4	\$10,000,000	2021	Yes	EJ	
W40-04a (1)	2502-01-021	Loop 121 Phase 1a	Lake Rd (FM 439) to US 190	Widen from two lanes to four lanes with a raised median	56.45	14	5	\$28,000,000	2021	Yes	EJ, H, P	
W35-07	0320-06-008	NW Loop 363	Industrial Blvd to Lucius McCelvey Dr	Construct interchange and expand two to four lanes with frontage roads	72.00	3	1	\$45,000,000	2025	Yes	Н	4-year U
W35-01	0231-19-003	US 190 Bypass	Lampasas County Line to US 190 W of Clarke Rd	Widen from two lanes to four lanes divided and construct interchange	68.27	9	2	\$48,150,000	2025	Yes	L, H,	
				CATEGORY 4 PROJECTS (STATEWII	DE URBAN C	ONNECTIVI	TY)					
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
W45-01	0231-03-152	IH 14 Advanced Traffic Management System	n Coryell County Line to FM 3423 (Indian Trail)	Construction of fiber optics, traffic cameras and Dynamic Message Boards	73.33	2	11	\$6,200,000	2021	Yes	EJ, L, H	4-' W
			CATEGO	RY 7 PROJECTS (SURFACE TRANSPORTATI	ON PROGR	AM-METR	OPOLITA	N MOBILI	TY)			
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
T40-15	0184-03-039 0232-01-053	Adams Ave/Central Ave. Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements	IH-35 to MLK Jr Blvd (Spur 290)	Installation of ADA compliant sidewalks traveling east on Central Avenue from 31st Street to 3rd Street and west on Adams Avenue from 3rd Street to 31st Street with tapered connections to existing sidewalks at bridges	92.00	2	2	\$1,913,044	2021	Yes	EJ, H	
T40-07a	0909-36-168	Temple Outer Loop West-Phase I	522 ft South of Jupiter Dr to 20 ft North of Riverside Trail	Widen from two to four lane divided roadway with a curb and gutter, Phase 1	64.67	17	4	\$10,298,198	2021	No	Р, Н	4-year U
N40-04	0909-36-167	Nolanville City Park Connectivity	Park (North Mesquite) along Ave H to 10th St	Construct ADA compliant sidewalks, ramps, and crosswalks	72.34	6	3	\$1,558,802	2021	No	Р	
				MPO CATEGORY 9 PROJECTS (TRANSPOR	TATION AL	TERNATIVI	E PROGR	AM)				
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
B45-03	0909-36-169	13th Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	Main St (SH 317) to Waco Rd (FM 817)	Construct ADA compliant ramps, sidewalks, and crosswalks and add striping for a bike line on the south side of the roadway.	72.16	7	4	\$539,233	2023	No	Р	4-year L
			STATEW	IDE CATEGORY 9 PROJECTS (TRANSPORTA	TION ALTE	RNATIVE S	ET-ASID	E PROGRA	M)			
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
B40-05	0909-36-163	Belton Hike and Bike Trail Extension South (South Belton Shared Use Path)	IH-35 from FM 436 to Confederate Park Dr	Construct 12 ft wide hike and bike trail. Project will extend along FM 436, IH-35 northbound frontage road and Confederate Park Drive.	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,790,571	2021	No	EJ, P	
				STATEWIDE CATEGORY 9 PROJECTS (SAFE	E ROUTES T	O SCHOOL	PROGR	AM)				
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
	0909-36-180	Troy - Mays Middle School SRTS	On Lee Mays Blvd and Luther Curtis Rd to Raymond Mays Middle School	Construct 0.2 miles of accessible sidewalks with crosswalks and ADA ramps.	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$277,571	2021	No	N/A	

Short Range Funded (2020-2030) Projects with Allocated Funding as of October 2020 and Listed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Revised Description

Funding

Allocation: \$131,150,000 UTP Fiscal Constraint: \$68,585,914

Funding

Allocation: \$6,200,000 -year UTP Fiscal Constraint: Waco District: \$59,730,508 Brownwood District: \$0

Funding

Allocation: \$13,770,044 UTP Fiscal Constraint: \$23,549,569

Funding

Allocation: \$539,233 UTP Fiscal Constraint: \$1,576,040

Funding

Allocation: \$1,790,571 Fiscal Constraint: n/a

Funding

Allocation: \$277,571 Fiscal Constraint: n/a

Item 7:

- **Resolution 2021-01 for**
 - **Pavement and Bridge**
 - Condition (PM2);
- **Resolution 2021-02 for**
- **System Performance (PM3)**



Agenda Item #7

Pavement and Bridge (PM2) and System Performance (PM3) Measures

The Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act requires the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to demonstrate a performance-based decision process that ties back to regional performance targets so that resources are invested in projects that collectively will make progress towards the achievement of national goals.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) require the following national performance measures to be adopted by State Departments of Transportation (DOT) and by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs):

- Safety
- Pavement and Bridge Condition
- System Performance and Freight
- CMAQ (Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality) Improvement Program
- Transit Asset Management (State of Good Repair)
- Transit Agency Safety Plan

State DOTs and MPOs are to support the Federal measures by establishing regional performance standards and meeting subsequent reporting requirements. These standards can be to support those adopted by the State DOT.

The Pavement and Bridge Condition Rule establishes performance requirements to assess pavement and bridge conditions on the National Highway System (NHS). It also outlines the process for State DOTs and MPOs to establish and report their pavement and bridge condition targets, and the process that FHWA will use to assess whether State DOTs and/or MPOs have met or made significant progress toward meeting their pavement and bridge condition targets.

The System Performance Rule established performance measures for State DOTs and MPOs to use to report on the performance of the Interstate and non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) to carry out the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP); freight movement on the Interstate system; and traffic congestion and on-road mobile source emissions for the purpose of carrying out the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program.

TXDOT adopted 2018 Pavement and Bridge Condition (PM2) and System Performance (PM3) targets for Texas on June 21, 2018. KTMPO followed suit by adopting the State targets as the targets for the region.

Since then, TXDOT conducted a mid-performance period review and published a progress report in November 2020 adjusting the PM2 and PM3 four-year targets for the



Agenda Item #7

State. KTMPO is now required to either continue supporting the State targets or set other targets for the region.

In 2018, the general consensus of MPOs across the state was to adopt the State targets for these measures due to limited experience in evaluating datasets that vary and can be difficult to interpret.

It is KTMPO's recommendation for 2020 to continue to support the State targets for the remainder of the four-year planning cycle and then utilize the assistance of a consultant in 2022 to pull the various data sets required to compile the measures and analyze our regional performance.

The 2018 and 2020 TXDOT targets as well as fact sheets on the Pavement and Bridge (PM2) and System Performance (PM3) Measures are included in the meeting packet.

Draft Resolutions, 2021-01 and 2021-02, supporting the adoption of these targets are included in the meeting packet for review.

Schedule:

- December 2, 2020 -TAC recommends approval of Resolution 2021-01 regarding Pavement and Bridge Condition (PM2) targets and Resolution 2021-02 regarding System Performance (PM3) targets.
- December 16, 2020 TPPB approves Resolution 2021-01 regarding Pavement and Bridge Condition (PM2) targets and Resolution 2021-02 regarding System Performance (PM3) targets.

Action needed: Regarding approval of:

- a.) Resolution 2021-01 regarding TXDOT Pavement and Bridge Condition (PM2) targets; and
- b.) Resolution 2021-02 regarding TXDOT System Performance (PM3) targets as the MPO performance targets for the region.



RESOLUTION NO. 2021-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE KILLEEN-TEMPLE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (KTMPO) IN SUPPORT OF THE ADOPTION OF TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (TXDOT) TARGETS FOR PAVEMENT AND BRIDGE (PM2) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.

- WHEREAS; TXDOT established targets for PM2 in 2018 as pursuant to Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 45.206 (c).
- WHEREAS; TXDOT set targets regarding percent of "good" condition and "poor" condition for pavement on the Interstate Highways (IH) and non-IH National Highway System (NHS) and percent of "good" condition and "poor" condition for NHS Bridge Deck Condition; and
- WHEREAS; in November 2020, TXDOT conducted a mid-performance period review and published a progress report adjusting the PM2 four-year target for the State; and
- WHEREAS; the KTMPO, which serves as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Area, has the responsibility under the provisions of Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act for developing and carrying out a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Metropolitan Area; and
- **WHEREAS**; pursuant to KTMPO's responsibilities as the MPO for the region must agree to support and accept the State performance targets or set other targets for the Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Area.
- NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the KTMPO Transportation Planning Policy Board agrees to support and adopt the TXDOT performance targets as the MPO performance targets for the region and reflect these targets in the Transportation Improvement Program and Metropolitan Transportation Plan.
- **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the KTMPO Policy Board will plan and program projects that contribute to the accomplishment of said targets.
- **PASSED AND ADOPTED** on this 16th day of December 2020, at a regular meeting of the KTMPO Policy Board meeting which was held in compliance with the Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code, 511.001, *et seq.*, at which meeting a quorum was present and voting.

ATTEST:


RESOLUTION NO. 2021-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE KILLEEN-TEMPLE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (KTMPO) IN SUPPORT OF THE ADOPTION OF TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (TXDOT) TARGETS FOR SYSTEM PERFORMANCE (PM3) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.

- WHEREAS; TXDOT established targets for PM3 in 2018 as pursuant to Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 45.206 (c).
- WHEREAS; TXDOT set targets regarding travel time reliability for both Interstate Highway (IH) and Non-IH National Highway System (NHS) and truck travel time reliability; and
- WHEREAS; in November 2020, TXDOT conducted a mid-performance period review and published a progress report adjusting the PM3 four-year target for the State; and
- WHEREAS; the KTMPO, which serves as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Area, has the responsibility under the provisions of Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act for developing and carrying out a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Metropolitan Area; and
- WHEREAS; pursuant to KTMPO's responsibilities as the MPO for the region must agree to support and accept the State performance targets or set other targets for the Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Area.
- NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the KTMP Transportation Planning Policy Board agrees to support and adopt the TXDOT performance targets as the MPO performance targets for the region and reflect these targets in the Transportation Improvement Program and Metropolitan Transportation Plan.
- **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the KTMPO Policy Board will plan and program projects that contribute to the accomplishment of said targets.
- **PASSED AND ADOPTED** on this 16th day of December 2020, at a regular meeting of the KTMPO Policy Board meeting which was held in compliance with the Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code, 511.001, *et seq.*, at which meeting a quorum was present and voting.

ATTEST:



125 EAST 11TH STREET, AUSTIN. TEXAS 78701-2483 | 512.463.8588 | WWW.TXDOT.GOV

June 21, 2018

Mr. Al Alonzi Division Administrator Federal Highway Administration 300 East Eighth Street, Suite 826 Austin, Texas 78701

Attention: Michael Leary

Dear Mr. Alonzi:

Pursuant to Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 450.206 (c), the state must select and establish performance targets in coordination with the MPOs. These measures are established under 23 CFR 490.

Over the past year, the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) has been working with the MPOs through the Association of Texas Metropolitan Planning Organization's on the establishment of targets. Safety targets were established in August, 2018 and reported to the Federal Highway Administration in the State Highway Safety Plan. The remaining targets have now been set and are provided for your information.

These targets are also being provided to the MPOs and will begin the 180 day time-clock for the MPOs to set their own or to support TxDOT's targets.

If you have any questions or need further assistance, please contact Peggy Thurin at (512) 486-5024.

Sincerely,

JANUES MA BARS

James M. Bass Executive Director

Enclosure

 Peter Smith, P.E., Director, Transportation Planning and Programming Division, TxDOT Michael A. Chacon, P.E., Director, Traffic Operations Division, TxDOT Gregg A. Freeby, P.E., Bridge Division Director, TxDOT Dan Stacks, P.E., Maintenance Division Director, TxDOT Eric L. Gleason, Director, Public Transportation Division, TxDOT Peggy Thurin. P.E., Systems Planning Section Director, TxDOT Lori Morel, Transportation Planning and Programming Division, TxDOT Tonia Norman, Government Affairs Division, TxDOT

OUR VALUES: People • Accountability • Trust • Honesty

Performance Measure	Baseline	2020 Target	2022 Target
Pavement on IH			
% in "good" condition			66.4%
% in "poor" condition			0.3%
Pavement on non-IH NHS			
% in "good" condition	54.4%	52.0%	52.3%
% in "poor" condition	13.8%	14.3%	14.3%

2

Performance Measure	Baseline	2020 Target	2022 Target
NHS Bridge Deck Condition			
% in "poor" condition	0.88%	0.80%	0.80%
% in "good" condition	50.63%	50.58%	50.42%

Performance Measure	Baseline	2020 Target	2022 Target
Transit Asset Management			<15%
% revenue vehicles at or exceeding useful life benchmark			<15%
% service vehicles (non- revenue) at or exceeding useful life benchmark			<15%
% facilities rated below 3 on condition scale (TERM)			<15%
% track segments with performance restrictions			NA

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.

Mr. Al Alonzi

June 21, 2018

3

Performance Measure	Baseline	2020 Target	2022 Target
NHS Travel Time Reliability			
iH Level of Travel Time Reliability	79.6%	61.2%	56.6%
Non-IH Level of Travel Time Reliability			55.4%
Truck Travel Time Reliability	1.50	1.70	1.79
Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay per capita			
Dallas Fort Worth			15
Houston-Galveston			16
% Non-SOV Travel			
Dailas Fort Worth	19.60%	19.21%	19.01%
Houston-Galveston	20.10%	19.70%	19.50%
Total Emission Reduction			
NOTOOG NOX	2,410.80	2,892.96	6,509.16
VOC	499.72	599.67	1,399.23
HGAO NOX	403.22	806.44	1,612.87
VOIO	267.86	535.72	1,071.44
El Paso 00	580.24		891.11
PM 10	0.97		13.71
Statewide NOX	2814.02	3699.4	8122.03
Statewide VOC	767.58	1135.39	2470.67
Statewide CO	580.24		891.11
Statewide PM 10	0.97		13.71

4

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.

Transportation Performance Management

State Biennial Performance Report for Performance Period 2018-2021

2020

MID PERFORMANCE PERIOD (MPP) PROGRESS REPORT

Texas

Report Due: 10/1/2020 Report Status: Recommend Acceptance Report Updated On: Report Exported on 11/18/2020

This document is exported from the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) web-based Performance Management Form (PMF) of the Policy Information Data Portal (PIDP).

The web-based PMF is the State's official report to FHWA.

State Contact:

Name	: Peggy Thurin
Phone number	: 5122943427
Email	: peggy.thurin@txdot.gov

Summary of Performance Measures and Targets

Performance Measures	Baseline	2-Year Condition/ Performance	2-Year Target	4-Year Target	4-Year Adjustment	KTMPO 2018
Percentage of Pavements of the		66.6%		66.4%	66.5%	89.96%
Interstate System in Good Condition					/	
Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Poor Condition		0.1%		0.3%	0.2%	00.15%
Percentage of Pavements of the Non- Interstate NHS in Good Condition	54.5%	55.2%	52.0%	52.3%	54.1%	90.42%
Percentage of Pavements of the Non- Interstate NHS in Good Condition (Full Distress + IRI)						N/A
Percentage of Pavements of the Non- Interstate NHS in Poor Condition	14.0%	13.5%	14.3%	14.3%	14.2%	01.93%
Percentage of Pavements of the Non- Interstate NHS in Poor Condition (Full Distress + IRI)						N/A
Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Good Condition	50.7%	50.7%	50.6%	50.4%		51.40%
Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Poor Condition	0.9%	1.3%	0.8%	0.8%	1.5%	00.90%
Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable	79.5%	81.2%	61.2%	56.6%	70.0%	100.00%
Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS That Are Reliable		83.0%		55.0%	70.0%	98.90%
Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index	1.40	1.44	1.70	1.79	1.76	01.46
Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita: Urbanized Area 1		12.2%		15.0%		N/A
Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita: Urbanized Area 2		13.4%		16.0%	14.0%	N/A
Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel: Urbanized Area 1	19.5%	19.5%	19.9%	20.2%		N/A
Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel: Urbanized Area 2	20.1%	19.6%	19.7%	19.5%	20.0%	N/A
Total Emission Reductions: PM2.5						N/A
Total Emission Reductions: NOx	2864.540	6882.338	4312.39 0	6945.980	8833.027	N/A
Total Emission Reductions: VOC	566.574	1514.190	768.970	1280.210	2048.624	N/A
Total Emission Reductions: PM10	0.969	11.369	4.733		21.963	N/A
Total Emission Reductions: CO	580.239	490.753	434.931	891.111	841.615	N/A

Overview

OVERVIEW SECTION 1

Question No	Description	Field Type
01	Please provide a discussion on the effectiveness of the investment strategies developed and documented in the State asset management plan for the National Highway System (NHS) required under [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(C)].	Bridges In pursuit of a steady-state level of performance, TxDOT has begun to focus more bridge funding on improving structures in fair condition. Based on the lifecycle planning analysis outlined in the TAMP, this portion of NHS bridges is the key to long-term health of the system. Pavement In the investment strategies, TxDOT requires each district to produce a Four-Year Pavement Management Plan each year that includes all aspects of pavement-related work. These are project-specific and financially- constrained plans which map out the pavement work needed, along with expected changes in pavement condition. This has been proved to provide districts the immediate benefit of planning the pavement Management Plan also provides investment strategies on an annual basis. The planned number of lane miles treated for each work type/treatment level is reported in each of the four planning years. The practice shows that preventive maintenance is the predominant work type used to preserve the network's performance in a cost-effective manner. In the meantime, the rehabilitation work is used to maintain or reduce the lane miles in the poor condition. These strategies have been proved to be effective in a way that it has been shown that they contributed to the SOGR of TxDOT pavement network, including the NHS.
02	Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of your submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current condition/performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. This text may be shared verbatim online. (Optional)	See attached 2019 TxDOT Asset Management Plan.

OVERVIEW SECTION 2

Question No	Description	Field Type
03	Who should FHWA contact with questions?	Peggy Thurin
04	What is the phone number for this contact? Please provide 10-digit number (area code and phone number) without formatting. (e.g., 1234567890)	5122943427
05	What is the email address for this contact?	peggy.thurin@txdot.gov

Pavement

Pavement Performance Overview

Question No	Description	Field Type
P1	Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of this part of the submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current condition, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. This text may be shared verbatim online. (Optional)	When the initial targets were set, TxDOT had recently switched from visual pavement surveys to semi- automated pavement data collection. Three years later, more consistent semi-auto/automated pavement data can be used to develop the new targets. In addition, TxDOT continues to improve pavement management, maintenance, and rehabilitation techniques. These efforts, such as 4-year pavement management planning and peer reviews, allow TxDOT to treat additional lane miles, keeping the overall pavement network in good condition. Instead of using the hybrid of visual, semi-automated and automated data, the 2022 pavement targets were adjusted using only semi-auto/automated HPMS pavement data from the last three years. The 3-year moving average approach was used to set the 2022 targets for both IH and non-IH NHS systems.

Statewide Performance Target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Good Condition

Question No	Description	Field Type
Ρ2	The 2-year statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Good condition. This value is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] For the 2018-2021 Performance Period, this 2-year condition value will be used as the baseline value for this measure per the phase-in of new requirements for this measure. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(7)(iii)]	66.6
Ρ3	The 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Good condition for the 2018- 2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	66.4
Ρ4	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Good condition? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Yes
P4a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Good condition. The adjusted target should reflect expected	66.5

	condition by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] The adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.313(f)(2)]	
P4b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Good condition and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	As described in P1, the adjusted 4- year target is based on the last three years of semi- auto/automated data. They were adjusted using the 3-year moving average method. This has resulted in a slight improvement in the statewide performance target for IH NHS in good condition. The adjusted target is consistent with the state's longer-range plans such as the 10-year transportation asset management plan which aims to improve the State Of Good Repair (SOGR).

Statewide Performance Target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Poor Condition

Question No	Description	Field Type
Ρ5	The 2-year statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Poor condition. This value is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] For the 2018-2021 Performance Period, this 2-year condition value will be used as the baseline value for this measure per the phase-in of new requirements for this measure. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(7)(iii)]	0.1
Ρ6	The 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Poor condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	0.3
P7	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Poor condition? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Yes
P7a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Poor condition. The adjusted target should reflect expected condition by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5 [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.313(f)(3)]	0.2
Р7b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Poor condition and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the	As described in P1, the adjusted 4- year target is based on the last three years of semi- auto/automated data. They were adjusted using the 3-year moving

long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	average method. This has resulted in a slight improvement in the statewide performance target for IH NHS in poor condition. Reducing the percentage of pavements in poor condition increases the percentage in good and fair condition accordingly. This will contribute to the longer-range plans aiming to improve the SOGR.
---	---

Statewide Performance Target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition.

Question No	Description	Field Type
P8	The baseline statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition. This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report, and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] For the first performance period, FHWA calculated this value using IRI only (or PSR values for road sections where speed is less than 40 mph). [23 CFR 490.313(e)]	54.5
P9	The 2-year statewide percentage of pavements on the Non- Interstate NHS in Good condition. This value is the actual 2- year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] For the first performance period, FHWA calculated this value using IRI only (or PSR values for road sections where speed is less than 40 mph). [23 CFR 490.313(e)]	55.2
P10	If the State DOT reported its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition based on "Full Distress + IRI" data in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report, FHWA has calculated an actual condition level using "Full Distress + IRI" data. [23 CFR 490.313 (c) and (d)] When a State DOT reported the 2-year target based on "Full Distress + IRI" data, FHWA will use this value to determine whether the actual condition level is equal to or better than the established 2-year target as part of the 2-year significant progress determination. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(2)(ii)]	
P11	The 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition for the 2018- 2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	52.0
P12	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition. At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year condition with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)	In this category, the achieved 2- year percentage of pavements in good condition has exceeded the target. TxDOT has continued to improve pavement management, maintenance, and rehabilitation techniques in the last 2 years. These efforts (such as the 4-year pavement management plan and

	For State DOTs that established a 2-year target using IRI only, the baseline value (P8), actual condition calculated with IRI only (P9), and the 2-year target (P11) all use the same metrics and can be compared to each other. State DOTs that established a 2-year target using "Full Distress + IRI" will see an actual condition value in both P9 and P10. These values must be used correctly in order to provide a meaningful discussion of progress. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)] -The actual condition calculated with IRI only (P9) is ONLY comparable to the baseline value calculated with IRI only (P8). -The actual condition calculated with "Full Distress + IRI" (P10) is ONLY comparable to the State DOT's 2-year target established based on "Full distress + IRI" (P11)	District peer reviews) have allowed TxDOT to treat additional lane miles and reach the statewide 2- year target for Non-Interstate NHS pavements in Good condition. In particular, the preservation treatment strategy of "keeping good roads good" has contributed to a higher percentage of pavements in Good condition than the 2-year target.
P13	The 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition for the 2018- 2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	52.3
P14	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Yes
P14a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition. The adjusted target should reflect expected condition by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.313(f)(4)]	54.1
P14b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non- Interstate NHS in Good condition and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	As described in P1, the adjusted 4- year target is based on the last three years of semi- automated/automated data. They are adjusted using the 3-year moving average method. This has resulted in an improvement in the statewide performance target for Non-IH NHS in good condition. The adjusted target is consistent with the state longer-range plans such as the 10-year transportation asset management plan, which aims to improve the State Of Good Repair (SOGR).
P15	Please provide a summary of prior accomplishments and planned activities that will be conducted during the remainder of the performance period to make significant progress toward achievement of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(F)]	TxDOT is committed to achieving the 4-year target. TxDOT has continued to improve pavement management, maintenance, and rehabilitation techniques through core programs such as the 4-year pavement management plan, and

		peer reviews. TxDOT will continue these efforts to achieve the 4-year target for Non-IH NHS in good condition.
P16	Are there any extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	No
P16a	Please select the extenuating circumstance(s) that apply. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
P16b	Please explain the extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Good condition and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	

Statewide Performance Target for the Percentage of Pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition.

Question No	Description	Field Type
P17	The baseline statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition. This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report, and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)] For the first performance period, FHWA calculated this value using IRI only (or PSR values for road sections where speed is less than 40 mph). [23 CFR 490.313(e)]	14.0
P18	The 2-year statewide percentage of pavements on the Non- Interstate NHS in Poor condition. This value is the actual 2- year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] For the first performance period, FHWA calculated this value using IRI only (or PSR values for road sections where speed is less than 40 mph). [23 CFR 490.313(e)]	13.5
P19	If the State DOT reported its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition based on "Full Distress + IRI" data in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report, FHWA has calculated an actual condition level using "Full Distress + IRI" data. [23 CFR 490.313 (c) and (d)] When a State DOT reported the 2-year target based on "Full Distress + IRI" data, FHWA will use this value to determine whether the actual condition level is equal to or better than the established 2-year target as part of the 2-year significant progress determination. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(2)(ii)]	
P20	The 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition for the 2018- 2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018	14.3

	Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	
P21	 Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition. At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year condition with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)] For State DOTs that established a 2-year target using IRI only, the baseline value (P8), actual condition calculated with IRI only (P9), and the 2-year target (P11) all use the same metrics and can be compared to each other. State DOTs that established a 2-year target using "Full Distress + IRI" will see an actual condition value in both P9 and P10. These values must be used correctly in order to provide a meaningful discussion of progress. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)] The actual condition calculated with IRI only (P9) is ONLY comparable to the baseline value calculated with IRI only (P8). The actual condition calculated with "Full Distress + IRI" (P10) is ONLY comparable to the baseline value calculated with IRI only (P8). 	The actual 2-year percentage of pavements in Poor condition was lower than the 2-year target. TxDOT has continued to improve pavement management, maintenance, and rehabilitation techniques. These efforts (such as the 4-year pavement management plan and District peer reviews) have enabled TxDOT to treat additional lane miles and keep the percentage of Non-Interstate NHS pavements in Poor condition below the limit defined in the 2-year targets. In particular, the pavement rehabilitation strategy has lowered the percentage of pavements in Poor condition to a level below that outlined in the 2-year goal.
P22	The 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition for the 2018- 2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	14.3
P23	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Yes
P23a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition. The adjusted target should reflect expected condition by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5 [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.313(f)(5)]	14.2
P23b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non- Interstate NHS in Poor condition and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	As described in P1, the adjusted 4- year target is based on the last three years of semi- auto/automated data and adjusted using the 3-year moving average method. This has resulted in an improvement in the statewide performance target for Non-IH NHS in poor condition. Reducing

		the percentage of poor pavements increases the percentage of good and fair pavements accordingly. This will contribute to the longer- range plans aiming to improve the SOGR.
P24	Please provide a summary of prior accomplishments and planned activities that will be conducted during the remainder of the performance period to make significant progress toward achievement of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(F)]	TxDOT is committed to achieving the 4-year target. TxDOT has continued to improve pavement management, maintenance, and rehabilitation techniques through core programs such as 4-year pavement management plan and peer reviews. TxDOT will continue these efforts to achieve the 4-year target for Non-IH NHS in poor condition.
P25	Are there any extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	No
P25a	Please select the extenuating circumstance(s) that apply. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
P25b	Please explain the extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of pavements on the Non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	

Bridge

Bridge Performance Overview

Question No	Description	Field Type
B1	Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of this part of the submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current condition, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. This text may be shared verbatim online. (Optional)	For many years, Texas has simultaneously boasted the nation's largest inventory of highway bridges and lowest percent of bridges in poor condition. TxDOT prides itself on these two facts, but they pose unique challenges as our inventory continues to age. TxDOT is proactively improving the state's asset management practices and intends on sustaining a high level of performance over the years to come.

Statewide Performance Target for Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Good Condition

Question No	Description	Field Type
B2	The baseline statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition. This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report, and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	50.7
B3	The 2-year statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition. This value is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)]	50.7
B4	The 2-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	50.6
B5	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition. <i>At a minimum, this discussion should address overall</i> <i>progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and</i> <i>shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year condition</i> <i>achieved (based on data contained within the National</i> <i>Bridge Inventory as of June 15, 2020, and made available by</i> <i>FHWA) with the 2-year target and any reasons for</i> <i>differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR</i> <i>490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]</i>	As of Texas' 2020 NBI submittal, the percent of NHS bridge deck area in good condition is 50.7—the same as the baseline year of 2018. TxDOT projected a slight decrease from the baseline in the percentage of bridge deck in good condition from 50.7 to 50.6% for it's 2020 target. The actual reported value for 2020 exceeded this target. TxDOT and other facility owners are consistently improving our inventory of vehicular bridges and doing what we can to keep bridges in good condition. Since 2016, we have experienced an average increase in good deck area of roughly 2.25 million square

		feet per year.
B6	The 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	50.4
B7	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	No
B7a B7b	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition. The adjusted target should reflect expected condition by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5 [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.409(c)(1)] Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target	
	NHS classified as in Good condition and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	
B8	Please provide a summary of prior accomplishments and planned activities that will be conducted during the remainder of the performance period to make significant progress toward achievement of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(F)]	TxDOT is participating in a number of efforts to keep bridges in good condition. In recent years, much of TxDOT's focus has been on improving the infrastructure and lines of communication which link inspections with maintenance activities. This includes new forms, workflows, and roles within TxDOT's bridge inspection system which help capture and make accessible any maintenance recommendations from routine bridge inspections. Several districts are in the pilot testing phase of these solutions, and we anticipate statewide deployment before the end of this performance period. Additionally, TxDOT has been improving its internal data infrastructure while developing bridge performance dashboards so that districts can more easily identify structures which have remained in poor condition for long periods of time.
в9	Are there any extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State	INO

	DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	
B9a	Please select the extenuating circumstance(s) that apply. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
B9b	Please explain the extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Good condition and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	

Statewide Performance Target for Bridges on the NHS Classified as in Poor Condition

Question No	Description	Field Type
B10	The baseline statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition. This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report, and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	0.9
B11	The 2-year statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition. This value is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)]	1.3
B12	The 2-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	0.8
B13	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition. <i>At a minimum, this discussion should address overall</i> <i>progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and</i> <i>shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year condition</i> <i>achieved (based on data contained within the National</i> <i>Bridge Inventory as of June 15, 2020, and made available by</i> <i>FHWA) with the 2-year target and any reasons for</i> <i>differences in the actual and target values.</i> [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]	Texas bridges are growing older. While TxDOT has excelled at minimizing the number of bridges in poor condition, the reality of an aging inventory is that we are seeing an increased frequency of bridges transitioning from fair to poor. Between the 2019 and 2020 NBI submittals, this occurred on several very large bridges, resulting in an unanticipated increase in the percentage of deck area rated poor. Those bridges have been rehabilitated and are no longer rated poor, but the rehab work occurred after the NBI submittal. A consequence of having such a low percentage of poor condition deck area is that a

		small number of large bridges can significantly alter the overall percentage. That was the case for the most recent submittal and resulted in an increase in percent poor from 0.9% in 2018 to 1.3% in 2020. TxDOT had projected a slight improvement in the percentage of bridge deck in poor condition from the baseline from 0.9 to 0.8% for its 2020 target. The actual reported value for 2020 did not meet this target.
B14	The 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	0.8
B15	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Yes
B15a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition. The adjusted target should reflect expected condition by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5 [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.409(c)(2)]	1.5
B15b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	For many years, Texas' bridge inventory has been at essentially the lowest practical limit for bridges in poor condition. TxDOT intends on sustaining this level of performance and will continue to minimize the number of bridges in poor condition. However, we are adjusting this target in the interest of risk-based planning. Accounting for the volume of bridges in fair condition, we anticipate some will transition into poor over the next two years. Increasing our target from 0.8% to 1.5% acknowledges the uncertain risks that can cause this measure to vary from year-to- year, including the possibility that a small number of very large bridges could fall into the poor condition category. With such a small percentage of bridge deck area in poor condition, a single large bridge being rated poor can have a significant impact on the overall

		percentage.
B16	Please provide a summary of prior accomplishments and planned activities that will be conducted during the remainder of the performance period to make significant progress toward achievement of the 4-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(F)]	Similar to TxDOT's strategies with improving the percent of bridges in good condition, we are focusing on improving the link between inventory data, improvement projects, and maintenance activities. Over the next two years, TxDOT will be taking a more proactive role in ensuring that performance improvements projects are reflected in Texas' bridge inventory data. TxDOT will ensure its bridge condition data more accurately reflect the actions TxDOT is taking to maintain bridges in a state of good repair by capturing maintenance recommendations within our bridge inspection system, and through following-up with districts as improvement projects are completed.
B17	Are there any extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition for the 2018-2021 Performance Period? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	No
B17a	Please select the extenuating circumstance(s) that apply. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
B17b	Please explain the extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percentage of deck area of bridges on the NHS classified as in Poor condition and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	

Reliability

Travel Time Reliability Performance Overview

Question No	Description	Field Type
R1	Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of this part of the submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. This text may be shared verbatim online. (Optional)	

Statewide Performance Target for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable

Question No	Description	Field Type
R2	The baseline statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable. This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report, and is the condition derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	79.5
R3	The 2-year statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable. This value is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)]	81.2
R4	The 2-year target for the statewide percent of the person- miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable for the 2018- 2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	61.2
R5	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable. At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]	The anticipated actual Travel Time Reliability (2020 values) for both IH and non-IH NHS systems appear to be improving greatly. The initial 2020 targets were 61.2% and 61.8% respectively. While TxDOT has added 71.52-lane miles of IH and 1015.28-lane miles of non-IH NHS that have added capacity to the system, there are also data issues at play that are likely more impactful on the "improvements" indicated. First, we are now just beginning to get enough timeseries data to adequately project from. There are also changes that have occurred in the INRIX data dealing with fleet mix and network segmentation that have a significant impact on the targets. And finally, at the state level, our volume data is also changing

		yearly, sometimes significantly. Because of all the variables in play, while we are improving our target for FY 2022, it is not necessarily a result of the significant construction of additional lanes being done at the state level.
R6	The 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person- miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable for the 2018- 2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	56.6
R7	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Yes
R7a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable. The adjusted target should reflect expected condition by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5 [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.513(b)]	70.0
R7b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	In addition to the data issues at play, there will also be changes associated with the impacts of Covid-19, i.e. a reduction in the amount of commuter travel. This significant drop in travel may linger for some time. Also, based on the findings of the "Texas Transportation Plan 2050", technology may greatly impact the actual capacity per lane-mile we presume today. As such, we feel that the updated target will be more representative to what the data will show for 2022.
R8	Please provide a summary of prior accomplishments and planned activities that will be conducted during the remainder of the performance period to make significant progress toward achievement of the 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(F)]	Again, TxDOT has added 71.52- lane miles of IH and 1015.28-lane miles of non-IH NHS that have added capacity to the system, there are also data issues at play that are likely more impactful on the "improvements" indicated. First, we are now just beginning to get enough time-series data to adequately project from. There are also changes that have occurred in the INRIX data dealing with fleet mix and network segmentation that have a significant impact on the targets. And finally, at the state level, our volume data is also

		changing yearly, sometimes significantly. Because of all the variables in play, while we are improving our target for FY 2022, it is not necessarily a result of the significant construction of additional lane-miles being done at the state level.
R9	Are there any extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable for the 2018-2021 Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	No
R9a	Please select the extenuating circumstance(s) that apply. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
R9b	Please explain the extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	

Statewide Performance Target for the Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS That Are Reliable

Question No	Description	Field Type
R10	The 2-year statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable. This value is the actual 2-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] For the 2018-2021 Performance Period, this 2-year performance value will be used as the baseline value for this measure per the phase-in of new requirements for this measure. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(7)(iii)]	83.0
R11	The 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person- miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	55.0
R12	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the non- Interstate NHS that are reliable? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Yes
R12a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable.	70.0
	The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by	

	the end of the Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5 [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.513(c)]	
R12b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide percent of the person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	Again, in addition to the data issues at play, there will also be changes associated with the impacts of Covid-19, i.e. a reduction in the amount of commuter travel. This significant drop in travel may linger for some time. Also, based on the findings of the "Texas Transportation Plan 2050", technology may greatly impact the actual capacity per lane- mile we presume today. As such, we feel that the updated target will be more representative to what the data will show for 2022.

Freight

Freight Reliability (Movement) Performance Overview

Question No	Description	Field Type
F1	Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of this part of the submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. This text may be shared verbatim online. (Optional)	Texas's Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) continues to be below the targets set in this four- year report. The four-year target was adjusted to 1.76 from 1.79 as Texas has invested in both significant freight planning and performance analytics that have helped to strategically invest in projects and Transportation System Management and Operations activities that make freight movement more efficient. TxDOT's target of 1.76 is much higher than the TTTR results have been, and it is important to note that this target was chosen after considerable analysis of truck travel time performance and looking at urban versus rural areas, truck volumes, and freight fluctuations. Texas moves a significant amount of the nation's freight and at any given time, regional results that drive the statewide result may fluctuate. TxDOT tracks this information, especially in relation to emerging freight markets such as the Permian Basin and cross-border goods movement. Despite these fluctuations, TxDOT's planning and project efforts for freight are helping to realize freight efficiencies across the network, which are reflected in the state's TTTR performance, as well as the other freight measures TxDOT tracks. More in-depth information about Texas' activities for freight are attached.
F2	Please discuss progress of the State DOT's efforts in addressing congestion at truck freight bottlenecks within the State (described in § 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(E)) through comprehensive freight improvement efforts of State Freight Plan or MPO freight plans; the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program and Transportation Improvement Program; regional or corridor level efforts; other related planning efforts; and operational and capital activities targeted to improve freight movement on the Interstate System. <i>If the State has prepared a State Freight Plan under 49</i> <i>U.S.C. 70202, within the previous 2 years, then it may serve</i> <i>as the basis for addressing congestion at truck freight</i> <i>bottlenecks. If the State Freight Plan has not been updated</i>	Texas uses several important resources to identify and address bottlenecks in the State and those in the National Freight Strategic Plan. First, Texas published the Texas Freight Mobility Plan (TFMP) in 2018. While this plan is approximately two years old, the bottlenecks identified in the plan are still relevant. TxDOT monitors bottlenecks using its Texas' 100 Most Congested Roadways analysis results that rank bottlenecks by delay per mile. These bottlenecks are addressed

since the previous State Biennial Performance Report, then an updated analysis of congestion at truck freight bottlenecks must be completed. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(D)] Please upload related document(s) in the "Attachment" tab.	by using a number of strategies including planning and project development and operational strategies. The TFMP includes 515 projects that are fully-funded at a cost of \$7.5 billion. 508 are highway projects. The TFMP plan
	is attached via weblink.

Statewide Performance Target for the Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index

Question No	Description	Field Type
F3	The baseline statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index. This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	1.40
F4	The 2-year statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index. This value is the actual 2-year condition derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)]	1.44
F5	The 2-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	1.70
F6	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index. At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]	Texas' two-year target was 1.70, and this was achieved as the TruckTravel Time Reliability Index (TTTR) was 1.44 for the 2-year period. As stated earlier in this report, TxDOT has embarked on a number of freight planning, project development and operational strategies, all influenced by robust freight performance measurement. The Texas' 100 Most Congested Roadways information shows freight performance across the state and helps to identify where the state needs to focus resources to improve freight movement. TxDOT also works to use innovative practices to understand the multimodal trips goods make, (i.e., freight fluidity) to work with freight stakeholders on implementation. The TFMP was an important update to TxDOT's continued freight planning efforts in that it was comprehensive of all modes and recognized the important connection of freight trips and transportation's role in supply chains. The TFMP identified a number of strategies for different stakeholders. TxDOT has been implementing the recommendations and planned

		projects since its publication in 2018. These include focusing on truck parking, regional freight planning, technology and operations, border plans and more. These efforts are helping TxDOT to continue to meet its targets for freight.
F7	The 4-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	1.79
F8	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Yes
F8a	 Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index. The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest hundredth. For example, enter 2.54. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.613(b)] 	1.76
F8b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	The state does wish to adjust the TTTR target to 1.76. TxDOT routinely works with the Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) to evaluate the data and to assess performance and targets. Growth rates and performance are monitored to determine the targets, as well as regional differences. Trends are calculated and determinations are made for the targets. TxDOT originally set a conservative target because Texas' rural and urban areas have fluctuating freight volume and seasonal changes, as well as rapidly emerging freight activity that can drastically change results. Some of Texas' regions have higher TTTRs that exceed the statewide target, while other areas are much lower. Depending on the type of freight movement at the time of year or changes in supply chains, especially as Texas freight is so significant and influences the national economy, the TTTR can change quickly. While a conservative target was originally set at 1.79, it has been reduced to 1.76 based on evaluating regional

		performance since 2014 and considering the volumes of trucks observed throughout the state, which fluctuates. This change aligns with expectations documented in TxDOT's plans, particularly the TFMP and following plans for freight since then, as well as TxDOT's continued monitoring of freight performance year to year. The data support this change, and TxDOT's prioritization on bottlenecks in its planning, project development, and operations will help to drive the state to meet this target as it has continued to do.
F9	Please provide a summary of prior accomplishments and planned activities that will be conducted during the remainder of the performance period to make significant progress toward achievement of the 4-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(F)]	See attachment F9.
F10	Are there any extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index for the 2018-2021 Performance Period? [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	No
F10a	Please select the extenuating circumstance(s) that apply. [23 CFR 490.109(e)(5)]	
F10b	Please explain the extenuating circumstance(s) beyond the State DOT's control that prevented it from making significant progress toward achieving its 2-year target for the statewide Truck Travel Time Reliability Index and quantify the impacts that resulted from these circumstances. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(G)]	

Peak Hour Excess Delay (PHED)

Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) Per Capita Performance Overview

Question No	Description	Field Type
D1	Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of this part of the submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. This text may be shared verbatim online. (Optional)	The The Houston urbanized area MPO acted on PHED targets after October 1, 2018 and these numbers were not captured in the Transportation Performance Management (TPM) dashboard and the Performance Management Form. Their adopted 4 year target is 14.0.
D2	The total number of applicable UZA(s) required to establish targets and report progress for the Traffic Congestion Measures in your State are:	2

Urbanized Area Target #1 - Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita

Question No	Description	Field Type
D3	Urbanized Area:	DallasFort WorthArlington, TX
D4	The 2-year annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita in this UZA. This value is the actual 2-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] For the 2018-2021 Performance Period, this 2-year performance value will be used as the baseline value for this measure for this UZA per the phase-in of new requirements. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(8)(vi)(C) and 23 CFR 490.105(f)(5)(vi)(B)]	12.2
D5	The 4-year target for the annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita in this UZA for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] and [23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(A)]	15.0
D6	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita in this UZA? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	No
D6a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita in this UZA. Any adjustments made to 4-year targets established for this measure must be agreed upon and made collectively by all relevant State DOTs and MPOs. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)] The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E) and 23 CFR 490.105(f)(8)] This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth.	

	For example, enter 7.1. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.713(b)]	
D6b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita in this UZA and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long- range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	

Urbanized Area Target #2 - Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita

Question No	Description	Field Type
D7	Urbanized Area:	Houston, TX
D8	The 2-year annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita in this UZA. This value is the actual 2-year performance derived from the latest data collected through the midpoint of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A)] For the 2018-2021 Performance Period, this 2-year performance value will be used as the baseline value for this measure for this UZA per the phase-in of new requirements. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(8)(vi)(C) and 23 CFR 490.105(f)(5)(vi)(B)]	13.4
D9	The 4-year target for the annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita in this UZA for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)] and [23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(A)]	16.0
D10	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita in this UZA? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Yes
D10a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita in this UZA. Any adjustments made to 4-year targets established for this measure must be agreed upon and made collectively by all relevant State DOTs and MPOs. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)] The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E) and 23 CFR 490.105(f)(8)] This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth. For example, enter 7.1. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.713(b)]	14.0
D10b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita in this UZA and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long- range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR	This adjustment is being made to correct the PHED of 16 annual hours that was incorrectly reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Report. The correct 4-year target approved by the Houston

490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	urbanized area MPO for PHED is 14.0.
-----------------------	--------------------------------------

Percent of Non-SOV Travel

Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel Performance Overview

Question No	Description	Field Type
Τ1	Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of this part of the submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. This text may be shared verbatim online. (Optional)	The Houston urbanized area MPO acted on Non-SOV targets after October 1, 2018 and these numbers were not captured in the Transportation Performance Management (TPM) dashboard and the Performance Management Form. Their adopted 2-year target is 21.1 and their 4-year target was 22.1.
T2	The total number of applicable UZA(s) required to establish targets and report progress for the Traffic Congestion Measures in your State are:	2

Urbanized Area Target #1 - Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel

Question No	Description	Field Type
Т3	Urbanized Area:	DallasFort WorthArlington, TX
Τ4	The baseline percent of Non-SOV travel. This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	19.5
Τ5	The 2-year percent of Non-SOV travel. This value is the actual 2-year performance. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A) and [23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(iii)(A)] Since the baseline performance submitted in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report was based on Method A, the 2-year performance value is based on Method A – American Community Survey (ACS). [23 CFR 490.709 (f)(2) and (3)]	19.5
Τ6	The 2-year target for the percent of Non-SOV travel for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	19.9
Τ7	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for the percent of Non-SOV travel. At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]	NCTCOG has incorporated this measure into its MTP, TIP, and other planning documents, and is recommending and programming many policies, programs, and projects related to transit, bicycle- pedestrian, and other modes that will increase the mode share diversity of travel in North Central Texas. While the two year target (19.9%) was not met, this measure has held steady over the past three

		years that data is available, and staff anticipates that both short- term and long-term changes in travel patterns related to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic will strongly impact this measure.
Τ8	The 4-year target for the percent of Non-SOV travel established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	20.2
Т9	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the percent of Non-SOV travel? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Νο
T9a	 Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the percent of Non-SOV travel. Any adjustments made to 4-year targets established for this measure must be agreed upon and made collectively by all relevant State DOTs and MPOs. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)] The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(f)(8) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5. [23 CFR 490.713(d)] 	
T9b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the percent of Non-SOV travel and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	

Urbanized Area Target #2 - Percent of Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel

Question No	Description	Field Type
Т10	Urbanized Area:	Houston, TX
T11	The baseline percent of Non-SOV travel. This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the beginning date of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	20.1
T12	The 2-year percent of Non-SOV travel. This value is the actual 2-year performance. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A) and [23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(iii)(A)] Since the baseline performance submitted in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report was based on Method A, the 2-year performance value is based on Method A – American Community Survey (ACS). [23 CFR 490.709 (f)(2)	19.6

	and (3)]	
T13	The 2-year target for the percent of Non-SOV travel for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	19.7
T14	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for the percent of Non-SOV travel. At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]	While the Non-SOV 2-year target was not met, it was missed by only 0.1 percentage point. The Commute Solutions Program implemented in the Houston MPO region has contributed to the Non- SOV travel measures. Programming and construction of transportation projects that include pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure have also contributed to the progress made toward the 2- year target for Non-SOV.
T15	The 4-year target for the percent of Non-SOV travel established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A)]	19.5
T16	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for the percent of Non-SOV travel? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Yes
T16a	 Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for the percent of Non-SOV travel. Any adjustments made to 4-year targets established for this measure must be agreed upon and made collectively by all relevant State DOTs and MPOs. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)] The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Calendar Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the Mid Performance Period Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(f)(8) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] This adjusted target must be reported to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, enter 86.5% as 86.5. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.713(d)] 	20.0
T16b	Please provide the basis for adjustment of the 4-year target for the percent of Non-SOV travel and describe how the adjusted target supports expectations documented in longer range plans, such as the State asset management plan and the long-range statewide transportation plan. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	The adjustment of the 4-year target is based on existing conditions and on the impacts of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. The adjusted 4-year target supports expectations documented in the Houston urbanized area MPO's regional transportation plan, as it was developed with a performance based planning approach. Goals in the long-range plan have an emphasis on projects that support an increase in multioccupant vehicle use.
Emissions

Emissions Reduction Performance Overview

Question No	Description	Field Type
E1	Please use this space to provide any general comments that may assist FHWA in its review of this part of the submission. You can use this space to provide greater context for your targets and current performance, provide additional background detail or clarification, note any assumptions, or discuss complications. This text may be shared verbatim online. (Optional)	
E2	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for PM2.5? Note: Based on the response to E2, the State is not required to establish a statewide target for annual emissions reductions for PM2.5.	No
E3	If the State includes any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for PM2.5, are NOx and/or VOC a significant contributor to PM2.5 emissions anywhere in the State? A significant contributor is defined as a precursor pollutant that the State or EPA has made a finding that the precursor has a significant impact on particulate matter (PM) air quality problem in a given area; or, the State Implementation Plan establishes approved or adequate motor vehicle emissions budgets for that precursor. [40 CFR 93.102(b) and 40 CFR 93.119(f)]	
Ε4	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for PM10? Note: Based on the response to E4, the State is required to provide a statewide target for annual emissions reductions for PM10.	Yes
E5	If the State includes any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for PM10, are NOx and/or VOC a significant contributor to PM10 emissions anywhere in the State?	No significant contributors
E6	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for CO? Note: Based on the response to E6, the State is required to provide a statewide target for annual emissions reductions for CO.	Yes
E7	Does the State include any areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for ozone? Note: Based on the response to E7, the State is required to provide statewide targets for annual emissions reductions for NOx and VOC.	Yes
E8	The number of MPOs within your State that are required to submit a CMAQ Performance Plan to the State DOT are:[23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(G)]	2

Page 32 of 41

E9.1	MPO required to submit a CMAQ Performance Plan to the State DOT:	Houston-Galveston Area Council
E10.1	Did you upload the plan to the PMF on the "attachment" tab?	Yes
E10.1a	Please explain why the plan was not uploaded to the PMF.	
E9.2	MPO required to submit a CMAQ Performance Plan to the State DOT:	North Central Texas COG
E10.2	Did you upload the plan to the PMF on the "attachment" tab?	Yes
E10.2a	Please explain why the plan was not uploaded to the PMF.	

Statewide Total Emission Reductions PM2.5 Target #1

E11 The baseline emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5.
This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the cumulative statewide estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal Fiscal Years before the start of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]
Performance Period Report.
E12 Please provide the current estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(iii)(B)] The current data for the performance period must include the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) over the Federal Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019. The data needed to calculate the measure shall come from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR 490.809(a) and 23 CFR 490(b)(2). The data must be reported to the nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.811(b)] FHWA provided the prepopulated data from the CMAQ Public Access System. If the DOT feels that a different value is appropriate due to an error, please contact the FHWA Division Office in your State
E13 The 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction

Page **33** of **41**

	(total daily kilograms) of PM2.5 for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	
E14	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5. <i>At a minimum, this discussion should address overall</i> <i>progress as of the midpoint of the performance period,</i> <i>and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year</i> <i>performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for</i> <i>differences in the actual and target values.</i> [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]	
E15	The 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5 established for the 2018- 2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	
E16	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	
E16a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5. The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Federal Fiscal Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] This adjusted target must be reported to nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)]	
E16b	Please provide the basis for adjustments of the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM2.5 established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	

Statewide Total Emission Reductions NOx Target #2

Question No	Description	Field Type
E17	The baseline emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of NOx.	2864.540
	This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the cumulative statewide estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal Fiscal Years before the start of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	
E18	Please provide the current estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of NOx. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(iii)(B)]	6882.338

Page 34 of 41

	The current data for the performance period must include the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) over the Federal Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019. The data needed to calculate the measure shall come from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR 490.809(a) and 23 CFR 490(b)(2). The data must be reported to the nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)] FHWA provided the prepopulated data from the CMAQ Public Access System. If the DOT feels that a different value is appropriate due to an error, please contact the FHWA Division Office in your State.	
E19	The 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of NOx for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	4312.390
E20	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of NOx. At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year performance with the 2- year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]	Texas met the 2-year target established in 2018 for NOx. The Houston urbanized area made significantly less progress on the initial 2-year target than was anticipated due to several factors that reduced the anticipated emissions reductions. These factors can be attributed to several things including unexpected variance in project letting date, changes in funding categories, project delays, and project cancellations. The Dallas urbanized area, however, was able to exceed their individual target enough to exceed the State's 2- year target.
E21	The 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of NOx established for the 2018- 2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	6945.980
E22	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of NOx? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Yes
E22a	Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of NOx. The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Federal Fiscal Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)]	8833.027

Page **35** of **41**

	This adjusted target must be reported to nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)]	
E22b	Please provide the basis for adjustments of the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of NOx established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)].	Texas is adjusting the 4-year target established in 2018 for NOx. The target was 6945.974 and the new 4-year target is 8833.027. The Dallas MPO incorporated observed 2018 and 2019 reported emissions data. Based on this, the 4-year original target was met and exceeded so the adjustment is being made. The Houston MPO (due to lower than expected progress towards meeting the 2- year target) is revising their 4-year target downwards to better represent future conditions.

Statewide Total Emission Reductions VOC Target #3

Question No	Description	Field Type
E23	The baseline emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of VOC.	566.574
	This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the cumulative statewide	
	estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal Fiscal Years before the start of the performance period [23 CER 490 107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	
E24	Please provide the current estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of VOC. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(iii)(B)]	1514.190
	The current data for the performance period must include the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) over the Federal Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.	
	The data needed to calculate the measure shall come from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR 490.809(a) and 23 CFR 490(b)(2).	
	The data must be reported to the nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)]	
	FHWA provided the prepopulated data from the CMAQ Public Access System. If the DOT feels that a different value is appropriate due to an error, please contact the FHWA Division Office in your State.	
E25	The 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of VOC for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	768.970
E26	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of VOC.	Texas met the 2-year target established in 2018 for VOC. The Houston urbanized area made significantly less progress on the

Page **36** of **41**

	At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]	initial 2-year target than was anticipated due to several factors that reduced the anticipated emissions reductions. These factors can be attributed to several factors including unexpected variance in project letting date, changes in funding categories, project delays, and project cancellations. The Dallas urbanized area was able to exceed their individual target enough to exceed the State's 2-year target.
E27	The 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of VOC established for the 2018- 2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	1280.210
E28	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of VOC? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Yes
E28a	 Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of VOC. The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Federal Fiscal Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] This adjusted target must be reported to nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)] 	2048.624
E28b	Please provide the basis for adjustments of the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of VOC established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E) and [23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)].	Texas is adjusting the 4-year target established in 2018 for VOC. The target was 1280.209 and the new 4-year target is 2048.624. The Dallas MPO incorporated observed 2018 and 2019 reported emissions data. Based on this, the 4-year original target was met and exceeded so the adjustment is being made. The Houston MPO increased the 4-year VOC target based on predicted outcomes.

Statewide Total Emission Reductions PM10 Target #4

Question No	Description	Field Type
E29	The baseline emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM10. This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the cumulative statewide estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal Fiscal Years before the start of the performance period [23 CEP 400.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	0.969
	performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	

E30	 Please provide the current estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of PM10. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(iii)(B)] The current data for the performance period must include the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) over the Federal Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019. The data needed to calculate the measure shall come from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR 490.809(a) and 23 CFR 490(b)(2). The data must be reported to the nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)] FHWA provided the prepopulated data from the CMAQ Public Access System. If the DOT feels that a different value is appropriate due to an error, please contact the FHWA Division Office in your State. 	11.369
E31	The 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM10 for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	4.733
E32	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM10. <i>At a minimum, this discussion should address overall</i> <i>progress as of the midpoint of the performance period,</i> <i>and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year</i> <i>performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for</i> <i>differences in the actual and target values.</i> [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]	Texas met the 2-year target established in 2018 for PM10. Due to more reliable UPACS/PAS data in 2018 and 2019 for PM-10 for comparison to the original 2-year target that was based on historical data one can see that there was an under estimation of the original 2- year PM-10 target.
E33	The 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM10 established for the 2018- 2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	13.707
E34	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM10?[23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Yes
E34a	 Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of PM10. The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Federal Fiscal Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] This adjusted target must be reported to nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)] 	21.963
E34b	Please provide the basis for adjustments of the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily	Texas is adjusting the 4-year target established in 2018 for PM10. The

Page 38 of 41

kilograms) of PM10 established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)].	target was 13.710 and the new 4- year target is 21.963. Due to more reliable UPACS/PAS data in 2018 and 2019 for PM-10 comparison to the original 4-year target that was based on historical data the EI Paso MPO was able to develop an adjustment factor to update the 4- year PM-10 target.
---	--

Statewide Total Emission Reductions CO Target #5

Question No	Description	Field Type
E35	The baseline emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of CO. This value is from the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report and is the performance derived from the latest data collected through the cumulative statewide estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) for the previous 4 Federal Fiscal Years before the start of the performance period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(B)]	580.239
E36	 Please provide the current estimated emissions reductions (total daily kilograms) of CO. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(iii)(B)] The current data for the performance period must include the cumulative reductions in emissions (total daily kilograms) over the Federal Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019. The data needed to calculate the measure shall come from the CMAQ Public Access System. [23 CFR 490.809(a) and 23 CFR 490(b)(2). The data must be reported to the nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)] FHWA provided the prepopulated data from the CMAQ Public Access System. If the DOT feels that a different value is appropriate due to an error, please contact the FHWA Division Office in your State. 	490.753
E37	The 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of CO for the 2018-2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018 Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	434.931
E38	Please provide a discussion of the progress made toward achieving the 2-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of CO. At a minimum, this discussion should address overall progress as of the midpoint of the performance period, and shall include a comparison of the actual 2-year performance with the 2-year target and any reasons for differences in the actual and target values. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(B)]	Texas met the 2-year target established in 2018 for CO. Due to more reliable UPACS/PAS data in 2018 and 2019 for CO for comparison to the original 2-year target that was based on historical data one can see that there was an under estimation of the original 2- year CO target.
E39	The 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of CO established for the 2018- 2021 Performance Period that was reported in the 2018	891.111

Page **39** of **41**

	Baseline Performance Period Report. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(1)(ii)(A) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)]	
E40	Does the State DOT wish to adjust the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of CO? [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6)]	Yes
E40a	 Please provide the adjusted 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of CO. The adjusted target should reflect expected performance by the end of Federal Fiscal Year 2021. This adjustment is only permitted in the MPP Progress Report. [23 CFR 490.105(e)(6) and 23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E)] This adjusted target must be reported to nearest one thousandths. For example, enter 86.512. [23 CFR 490.101 (Target definition) and 23 CFR 490.811(b)] 	841.615
E40b	Please provide the basis for adjustments of the 4-year target for cumulative emissions reduction (total daily kilograms) of CO established for the 2018-2021 Performance Period. [23 CFR 490.107(b)(2)(ii)(E) and 23 CFR 490.107(c)(3)(ii)(B)].	Texas is adjusting the 4-year target established in 2018 for CO. The target was 891.110 and the new 4- year target is 841.615. Due to more reliable UPACS/PAS data in 2018 and 2019 for CO for comparison to the original 4-year target that was based on historical data the EI Paso MPO was able to develop an adjustment factor to update the 4-year CO target.

Attachments

S.No	Section	Attachment Detail
1	Freight	Filename: 2020_TX_Freight_Attachment F1.docx Notes: Attachment for F1 Attachment UrI:
2	Freight	Filename: 2020_TX_Freight_Mid_Perform_F9_Freight.docx Notes: Answer for F9 Attachment UrI:
3	Freight	Filename: 2020_TX_Freight_Attachment F2.docx Notes: Attachment for F2 Attachment Url: https://www.dot.state.tx.us/move-texas- freight/studies/freight-plan.htm
4	Overview	Filename: 2020_TX_Overview_AttachmentO2TxDOTAMP.pdf Notes: TxDOT 2019 Asset Management Plan Attachment Url:
5	Emissions	Filename: 2020_TX_Emissions_CMAQ-Performance-Plan-Report-2018.pdf Notes: Houston-Galveston CMAQ Performance Plan Attachment UrI:
6	Emissions	Filename: 2020_TX_Emissions_NCTCOG-FInal-CMAQ-Performance- Plan.pdf Notes: North Central Texas Council of Governments CMAQ Performance Plan Attachment Url:
7	Emissions	Filename: 2020_TX_Emissions_NCTCOG Mid-Performance Report_NCTCOG.pdf Notes: CMAQ Performance Plan - Mid Cycle Dallas Attachment UrI:
8	Emissions	Filename: 2020_TX_Emissions_2020_TX_Emissions_FINAL 2020 CMAQ Perf Plan MidReport-Sept 2020.pdf Notes: CMAQ Performance Plan - Mid Cycle Houston Attachment Url:

PAVEMENT Performance Measures



Final Rulemaking

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) published in the *Federal Register* (82 FR 5886) a <u>final rule</u> establishing performance measures for State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) to use in managing pavement and bridge performance on the National Highway System (NHS). The National Performance Management Measures; Assessing Pavement Condition for the National Highway Performance Program and Bridge Condition for the National Highway Performance Program Final Rule addresses requirements established by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and reflects passage of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. The rule is effective **May 20, 2017**.

Performance Measures

- ✓ % of Interstate pavements in Good condition
- ✓ % of Interstate pavements in Poor condition
- ✓ % of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Good condition
- ✓ % of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Poor condition

About Condition

- **Good condition:** Suggests no major investment is needed.
- **Poor condition:** Suggests major reconstruction investment is needed.

Penalty Provisions

If FHWA determines the State DOT's Interstate pavement condition falls below the minimum level for the most recent year, the State DOT must obligate a portion of National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) and transfer a portion of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds to address Interstate pavement condition.

Target Setting State DOTs:

- Must establish targets, regardless of ownership, for the full extent of the Interstate and non-Interstate NHS.
- Must establish statewide 2- and 4-year targets for the non-Interstate NHS and 4-year targets for the Interstate by May 20, 2018, and report by October 1, 2018.
- May adjust targets at the Mid Performance Period Progress Report (October 1, 2020).

Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs):

 Support the relevant State DOT(s) 4year target or establish their own by 180 days after the State DOT(s) target is established.

PAVEMENT Performance Measures



Key Dates		
May 20, 2017	Final rule effective date.	
January 1, 2018	1st 4-year performance period begins.	
May 20, 2018	State DOT targets must be established.	
January 1, 2018	State DOTs collect data for Interstate pavements that conform to the final rule (IRI, Rutting, Cracking %, Faulting, and Inventory).	
Within 180 days of relevant State DOT(s) target establishment	MPOs must commit to support state target or establish separate quantifiable target.	
October 1, 2018	Baseline Performance Period Report for 1 st Performance Period due. State DOTs report 4-year targets for Interstate and 2-year and 4-year targets for non-Interstate NHS; etc.	
April 15, 2019, and each April 15 thereafter	State DOTs submit first Interstate data that conform to the final rule.	
January 1, 2020	State DOTs collect data for non-Interstate NHS pavements that conform to the final rule s .	
October 1, 2020	Mid Performance Period Progress Report for the 1st Performance Period due. State DOTs report 2-year condition/performance; progress toward achieving 2-year targets; etc.	
June 15, 2021, and each June 15 thereafter	State DOTs submit non-Interstate NHS data that conform to the final rule.	
December 31, 2021	1st 4-year performance period ends.	
October 1, 2022	Full Performance Period Progress Report for 1 st Performance Period due. State DOTs reports 4-year condition/performance; progress toward achieving 4-year targets, etc. Baseline Performance Period Report for 2 nd Performance Period due. State DOTs report 2-year and 4-year targets for Interstate and non-Interstate NHS; baseline condition; etc.	

Visit <u>www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/</u> to learn about training, guidance, and other implementation-related info⁸⁴mation.

BRIDGE **PERFORMANCE MEASURES**



Final Rulemaking

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) published in the Federal Register (82 FR5886) a final rule establishing performance measures for State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) to use in managing pavement and bridge performance on the National Highway System (NHS). The National Performance Management Measures; Assessing Pavement Condition for the National Highway Performance Program and Bridge Condition for the National Highway Performance Program Final Rule addresses requirements established by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and reflects passage of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. The rule is effective May 20, 2017.

Performance Measures

- % of NHS bridges by deck area classified as in Good condition \checkmark
- % of NHS bridges by deck area classified as in Poor condition \checkmark

Condition-Based Performance Measures

- Measures are based on deck area.
- The classification is based on National Bridge Inventory (NBI) condition ratings for item 58 - Deck, 59 - Superstructure, 60 - Substructure, and 62 - Culvert.
- Condition is determined by the lowest rating of deck, superstructure, substructure, or culvert. If the lowest rating is greater than or equal to 7, the bridge is classified as good; if is less than or equal to 4, the classification is poor. (Bridges rated below 7 but above 4 will be classified as fair; there is no related performance measure.)
- Deck area is computed using NBI item 49 - Structure Length, and 52 - Deck Width or 32 - Approach Roadway Width (for some culverts).

Target Setting State DOTs:

- Must establish targets for all bridges carrying the NHS, which includes on- and off-ramps connected to the NHS within a State, and bridges carrying the NHS that cross a State border, regardless of ownership.
- Must establish statewide 2- and 4year targets by May 20, 2018, and report targets by October 1, 2018, in the Baseline Performance Period Report.
- May adjust 4-year targets at the Mid Performance Period Progress Report (October 1, 2020).

Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs):

Support the relevant State DOT(s) 4-year target or establish their own by 180 days after the State DOT(s) target is established. 85

BRIDGE Performance Measures



Key Dates		
May 20, 2017	Final rule effective date.	
January 1, 2018	1st 4- year performance period begins.	
May 20, 2018	Initial 2- and 4-year targets established.	
October 1, 2018	Baseline Performance Period Report for the 1 st Performance Period due. State DOTs report 2-year and 4-year targets; etc.	
Within 180 days of relevant State DOT(s) target establishment	MPOs must commit to support State target or establish separate quantifiable target.	
October 1, 2020	Mid Performance Period Progress Report for the 1 st Performance Period due. State DOTs report 2-year condition/performance; progress toward achieving 2-year targets; etc.	
December 31, 2021	1st 4-year performance period ends.	
October 1, 2022	Full Performance Period Progress Report for 1 st performance period due. State DOTs report 4-year condition/ performance; progress toward achieving 4-year targets; etc. Baseline report due for 2 nd performance period due. State DOTs report 2- and 4-year targets; baseline condition, etc.	

Other Specifics

- State DOT targets should be determined from asset management analyses and procedures and reflect investment strategies that work toward achieving a state of good repair over the life cycle of assets at minimum practicable cost. State DOTs may establish additional measures and targets that reflect asset management objectives.
- The rule applies to bridges carrying the NHS, including bridges on on- and off-ramps connected to the NHS.
- If for 3 consecutive years more than 10.0% of a State DOT's NHS bridges' total deck area is classified as Structurally Deficient, the State DOT must obligate and set aside National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) funds for eligible projects on bridges on the NHS.
- Deck area of all border bridges counts toward both States DOTs' totals.

Visit <u>www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/</u> to learn about training, guidance, and other implementation-related info⁸⁶mation.



FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS: PAVEMENT AND BRIDGE CONDITION PERFORMANCE MEASURES FINAL RULE

On May 20, 2017, one of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)'s final rules establishing performance measures for State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) took effect. The rule, published in the *Federal Register* on January 18, 2017 (82 Fed. Reg. 5886), establishes measures to assess the condition of pavements and bridges on the National Highway System (NHS) to carry out the National Highway performance program (NHPP). This rule addresses requirements established by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and reflects passage of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act.

General

Q. What is the rule's effective date?

A. The effective date is **May 20, 2017.** While the rule was final on January 18, 2017, in accordance with the memorandum of January 20, 2017, from the Assistant to the President and Chief of Staff, entitled "Regulatory Freeze Pending Review," the Department delayed the effective date of rule to May 20, 2017. See 82 Fed. Reg. 10441 and 82 Fed. Reg. 14438.

Q. What are the dates of the first four-year performance period?

A. The first performance period begins January 1, 2018, and ends on December 31, 2021.

Q. When is this period's State DOT baseline performance period report due?

A. The baseline report for the first performance period is due **October 1, 2018,** for all measures under this final rule.

Q. How can I learn more about the final rule?

A. We encourage you to read the rule at

https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/01/18/2017-00550/national-performancemanagement-measures-assessing-pavement-condition-for-the-national-highway and to visit www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/ to learn about training, guidance, and other implementation-related information.

Bridge

Q. What are the bridge condition performance measures?

A. The measures are:

- Percentage of NHS bridges by deck area in Good condition
- Percentage of NHS bridges by deck area in Poor condition

Q. What changed from the proposed rule to the final rule regarding bridge requirements?

A. Two National Bridge Inventory (NBI) items—Structural Evaluation and Waterway Adequacy will no longer be used to classify bridges as structurally deficient after **January 1, 2018**, when a new definition will go into effect. The definition for structurally deficient will be a bridge with any component (Deck, Superstructure, Substructure, or Culverts) in Poor condition, and deck areas of (bridge-length) culverts and border bridges will be included in the computation for percent deck area classified as structurally deficient.

Q. To what bridges does the rule apply?

A. The final rule applies to all bridges carrying the NHS, including bridge on- and off-ramps connected to the NHS.

Q. How are Good and Poor conditions calculated?

A. The measure is the percent of deck area classified as good and poor, using National Bridge Inventory (NBI) condition ratings for Deck, Superstructure, Substructure, and Culvert. Condition is determined by the lowest rating of these items. If the lowest rating is greater than or equal to 7, the bridge is classified as good; if it is less than or equal to 4, the bridge is classified as poor. Deck area is computed using NBI Structure Length and Deck Width or Approach Roadway Width (for some culverts). (Bridges rated below 7 but above 4 will be classified as fair; there is no related performance measure.)

Q. How are border bridges counted?

A. The deck area of all border bridges counts toward both State DOTs' totals.

Q. When do State DOTs establish bridge targets?

A. Two- and four-year statewide targets for the first Performance Period must be established by **May 20, 2018.** The State DOTs will report these targets in the Baseline Performance Period Report to FHWA by October 1, 2018. The State DOTs have the option to adjust four-year targets in their Mid Performance Period Progress Report, due **October 1, 2020**.

Q. Can additional targets be established?

A. Yes, State DOTs may establish additional targets for urbanized/non-urbanized areas. However, these optional (or additional) targets do not replace the statewide targets.

Q. How should State DOTs establish bridge targets?

A. State DOT targets should be determined from asset management analyses and procedures and reflect investment strategies that work toward achieving a state of good repair over the life cycle of assets at minimum practicable cost.

Q. When do State DOTs have to report bridge targets?

A. The first reporting of 2-year and 4-year targets is due to FHWA by **October 1, 2018,** when the Baseline Performance Period Report is due.

Q. When are the first MPO targets due?

A. Within 180 days after the State DOT(s) target is established, MPOs can decide to support the relevant State DOT(s) 4-year target or establish their own, quantifiable targets.

Q. What happens if more than 10 percent of the total deck area of a State DOT's NHS bridges is classified as structurally deficient for three consecutive years?

A. The State DOT must obligate and set aside NHPP funds for eligible projects on the NHS.

Pavement

Q. What are the pavement condition performance measures?

A. The measures are:

- Percentage of Interstate pavements in Good condition
- Percentage of Interstate pavements in Poor condition
- Percentage of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Good condition
- Percentage of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Poor condition

Q. What changed from the proposed rule to the final rule regarding pavement requirements?

A. The Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act required two changes to pavementrelated provisions. First, State DOTs must take action when FHWA determines they have not made significant progress for each biennial determination rather than two consecutive biennial determinations. Second, the penalty for Interstate pavement condition below the minimum level is now triggered if FHWA makes such a determination for the most recent year instead of two consecutive years.

In addition, pavement data requirements changed from the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) to the final rule. International Roughness Index, Cracking Percent, Rutting, and Faulting on the Interstate will be required for only one direction (the NPRM had proposed both directions). Further, missing, invalid, and unresolved data shall not comprise more than 5% of data on the Interstate System and the non-Interstate NHS (the NPRM had proposed data with such issues be considered "Poor").

We made some adjustments in condition thresholds for International Roughness Index (IRI), cracking, and faulting, and added the use of Present Serviceability Rating (PSR) to determine overall Interstate and non-Interstate NHS pavement conditions where the posted speed limit is less than 40 mph.

In addition, the NPRM set a minimum condition requirement of no more than 5 percent Poor for Interstate system pavement. While the final rule retained that requirement in general, it was modified to 10 percent for Alaska.

For additional significant changes regarding pavement requirements, please see 82 Fed. Reg. 5888.

Q. When are State DOTs required to begin collecting pavement data that meets the new data collection requirements (a full-extent IRI, Rutting, Cracking %, Faulting, and Inventory data conforming to the updated HPMS Field Manual)?

A. The dates are:

- January 1, 2018: State DOTs are required to collect data for Interstate pavements.
- January 1, 2020: State DOTs are required to collect data for the non-Interstate NHS pavements.

Q. What are the required data submittal dates for pavement conditions that meets the new data collection requirements?

A. The dates are:

- April 15, 2019, and each April 15 thereafter: State DOTs submit the first Interstate data that conform to the final rule.
- June 15, 2021, and each June 15 thereafter: State DOTs submit the non-Interstate NHS pavement data that conform to the final rule.

Q. For how much of the NHS must a State DOT establish targets?

A. State DOTs must establish targets, regardless of ownership, for the full extent of the Interstate and non-Interstate NHS.

Q. When must State DOTs establish pavement targets?

A. Targets must be established by **May 20, 2018**. The State DOTs have the option to adjust 4year targets in their Mid Performance Period Progress Report, due **October 1, 2020**.

Q. When must State DOTs report pavement targets?

A. The first reporting of targets (4-year statewide Interstate targets and 2- and 4-year statewide non-Interstate NHS targets) is due to FHWA by **October 1, 2018,** when the Baseline Performance Period Report is due.

Q. When are the initial MPO targets due?

A. Within 180 days after the State DOT(s) target is established, MPOs can decide to support the relevant State DOT(s) 4-year target or establish their own, quantifiable targets.

Q. How will significant progress toward pavement condition targets be determined for the first Performance Period?

A. The FHWA will not make a determination of significant progress toward 2-year Interstate System targets with the Mid Performance Progress Report for the 1st Performance Period (due October 1, 2020). The actual 2-year condition will become the baseline condition for the first performance period. For non-Interstate NHS pavement IRI-based targets, FHWA will make a determination of significant progress at the midpoint and end of the first performance period.

Q. What happens if FHWA determines a State's Interstate pavement condition falls below the minimum level for any given year?

A. The State DOT must obligate a portion of the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) and transfer a portion of its Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds to address Interstate pavement conditions. The required obligation and transfer are in legislation and repeated in the published rule.

Item 8: Resolution 2021-03 for Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP)



Agenda Item #8

Public Transit Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) Measures

Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) granted the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) the authority to establish and enforce a comprehensive framework to oversee the safety of public transportation throughout the United States. MAP-21 expanded the regulatory authority of FTA to oversee safety, providing an opportunity to assist transit agencies in moving towards a more holistic, performance-based approach to Safety Management Systems (SMS). This authority was continued through the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act).

In compliance with MAP-21 and the FAST Act, FTA promulgated a Public Transportation Safety Program on August 11, 2016 that adopted SMS as the foundation for developing and implementing a Safety Program. FTA is committed to developing, implementing, and consistently improving strategies and processes to ensure that transit achieves the highest practicable level of safety. SMS helps organizations improve upon their safety performance by supporting the institutionalization of beliefs, practices, and procedures for identifying, mitigating, and monitoring safety risks.

All FTA Section 5307 recipients were required to set targets in their Public Transportation Agency Safety Program (PTASP) by July 20, 2020 as stated in 49 C.F.R. Part 673 (Part 673). The PTASP also incorporates the minimum required System Safety Program Plan elements delineated in Section 14-90.004(1).

Common elements of PTASPs include:

- 1) Transit Agency Information
- 2) Plan Development, Approval, and Updates
- 3) Definitions and acronyms
- 4) Safety Performance Targets
- 5) Safety Management Policy
- 6) Safety Risk Management
- 7) Safety Assurance
- 8) Safety Promotion
- 9) Additional Information

Metropolitan Planning Organizations were required to adopt the targets by January 20, 2021 (or no more than 180 days after receipt of the Agency Safety Plan from public transportation providers) for the Metropolitan Area.



Agenda Item #8

Hill Country Transit District (HCTD) Board of Directors approved their PTASP on June 25, 2020 and submitted to TxDOT which certified this plan on July 15, 2020.

A draft Resolution, 2021-03, supporting the adoption of these targets is included in the meeting packet for review.

Schedule:

- December 2, 2020 TAC recommends approval of Resolution 2021-03 regarding Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) targets.
- December 16, 2020 TPPB approves Resolution 2021-03 regarding Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) targets.

Action Needed: Regarding approval of Resolution 2021-03 regarding HCTD's Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) and associated performance targets as the MPO performance targets for the region.



RESOLUTION NO. 2021-03

A RESOLUTION OF THE KILLEEN-TEMPLE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (KTMPO) IN SUPPORT OF THE ADOPTION OF HILL COUNTRY TRANSIT DISTRICT'S PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AGENCY SAFETY PLAN (PTASP) AND RESPECTIVE PERFORMANCE TARGETS.

- WHEREAS; United States Code, Title 49. Transportation, Subtitle III General and Intermodal Programs, Chapter 53 Public Transportation, Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Grants provides that public transportation agencies prepare and maintain an agency safety plan. On July 19, 2018, Federal Transit Administration (FTA) published the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) Final Rule, which requires certain operators of public transportation systems that receive federal funds under FTA's Urbanized Area Formula Grants to develop safety plans that include the processes and procedures to implement Safety Management Systems (SMS); and
- WHEREAS; Hill Country Transit District (HCTD) serves as the transit operator and designated recipient for federal transit funding within the urban service area and has published a PTASP as required by FTA; and
- WHEREAS; the KTMPO, which serves as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Area, has the responsibility under the provisions of Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act for developing and carrying out a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Metropolitan Area; and
- WHEREAS; pursuant to KTMPO's responsibilities as the MPO for the region must agree with such PTASP, concur in the performance targets, and accept such targets as being applicable to the Hill County Transit District in the Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Area.
- **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization (KTMPO) Transportation Planning Policy Board agrees to support and adopt the Hill Country Transit District PTASP and associated performance targets as the MPO performance targets for the region and reflect these targets in the Transportation Improvement Program and Metropolitan Transportation Plan.
- **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the KTMPO Policy Board will plan and program projects that contribute to the accomplishment of said targets.
- **PASSED AND ADOPTED** on this 16th day of December 2020, at a regular meeting of the KTMPO Policy Board meeting which was held in compliance with the



Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code, 511.001, *et seq.*, at which meeting a quorum was present and voting.

ATTEST:

Mayor Jose Segarra, KTMPO TPPB Chair

Uryan Nelson, KTMPO Director

Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan Final Rule

Fact Sheet





Overview

The Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) final rule (49 C.F.R. Part 673) requires certain operators of public transportation systems that are recipients or subrecipients of FTA grant funds to develop safety plans that include the processes and procedures necessary for implementing Safety Management Systems (SMS).

Effective Date

The final rule becomes effective on July 19, 2019. Each transit operator is required to certify that it has a safety plan meeting the requirements of the rule by July 20, 2020.

To Whom Does the PTASP Rule Apply?

The rule **applies** to:

- Recipients or sub-recipients of financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. § 5307 that operate a public transportation system.
- Operators of rail systems subject to FTA's State Safety Oversight Program.

The rule **does not apply** to:

- Commuter rail service that is regulated by the Federal Railroad Administration.
- Passenger ferry service that is regulated by the U.S. Coast Guard.
- An operator of a public transportation system that only receives financial assistance under the Formula Grants for Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program (49 U.S.C. § 5310) and/or Formula Grants for Rural Areas Program (49 U.S.C. § 5311).

General Requirements for PTASPs

Each safety plan must include, at a minimum:

- An approval by the agency's Accountable Executive and Board of Directors (or an equivalent authority);
- The designation of a Chief Safety Officer;
- The documented processes of the agency's SMS, including the agency's Safety Management Policy and processes for Safety Risk Management, Safety Assurance, and Safety Promotion;
- An employee reporting program;
- Performance targets based on the safety performance measures established in FTA's National Public Transportation Safety Plan (NSP);
- Criteria to address all applicable requirements and standards set forth in FTA's Public Transportation Safety Program and the NSP; and
- A process and timeline for conducting an annual review and update of the safety plan.

A rail transit agency's safety plan also must include or incorporate by reference an emergency preparedness and response plan or procedures.

Who Develops and Implements a Safety Plan?

- Rail transit agencies to whom the PTASP rule applies must develop and implement their own safety plans.
- Small public transportation providers* that do not operate rail transit systems and to whom the PTASP rule applies may have their states draft safety plans on their behalf, or they may opt to draft their own safety plans. In either case, the small bus operator must implement the safety plan.
- Large bus operators (operating more than 100 vehicles in peak revenue service) to whom the PTASP rule applies must draft and implement their own safety plans.

*A small public transportation provider operates 100 or fewer vehicles in peak revenue service across all non-rail fixed route modes, or in any one non-fixed route mode.

PTASP Fact Sheet (Continued)

U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration

Who Approves a Safety Plan?

- Each safety plan must be signed by an operator's Accountable Executive.
- Each safety plan must be approved by its Board of Directors or an equivalent authority (such as a mayor, county executive, or grant manager).
- State Safety Oversight Agencies (SSOAs) must approve the safety plans of the rail transit agencies they oversee.

Certification of Compliance

- Each transit agency must annually certify via FTA's <u>Certifications and Assurances</u> process that its safety plan meets the requirements of the final rule.
- States must certify safety plans on behalf of small public transportation providers that operate 100 or fewer vehicles in peak revenue service within their states, unless providers opt to certify their own safety plans upon notification to the state.

Documentation and Recordkeeping

- A transit agency must maintain documents that set forth its safety plan, including those related to SMS implementation.
- These documents must be made available upon request by FTA and other agencies with safety jurisdiction, such as the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) and SSOAs.
- A transit agency must maintain these documents for a minimum of three years after they are created.

PTASP and the National Public Transportation Safety Plan (NSP)

Under the PTASP rule, an operator is required to set safety performance targets based on the safety performance measures in the <u>NSP</u>.

The NSP safety performance measures are:

- Fatalities
- Injuries
- Safety Events
- System Reliability (State of Good Repair)

SMS Components of a Safety Plan

Safety Management Policy

- Safety objectives
- Confidential employee reporting program
- Organizational accountabilities and safety responsibilities
- Designation of a Chief Safety Officer

Safety Risk Management

- Processes for hazard identification
- Risk assessment
- Mitigation development

Safety Assurance

All operators develop processes for:

• Safety performance monitoring and measurement

Rail and large bus operators develop processes for:

- Management of change
- Continuous improvement

Safety Promotion

- Comprehensive safety training program
- Safety communication

Relationship to <u>Transit Asset</u> <u>Management</u>

- A transit agency should consider the results of its asset condition assessments while performing safety risk management and safety assurance activities.
- The results of the condition assessments and subsequent SMS analysis should inform an operator's investment priorities.

Contact

For more information, please email <u>PTASP_QA@dot.gov</u>.

Hill Country Transit District (dba The Hop)

Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan

Version 1

Adopted June 25, 2020 In compliance with 49 CFR Part 673

Developed in conjunction with the Texas Department of Transportation





TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	E	xecutive Summary4	
Α		Plan Adoption – 673.11(a)(1)5	
В	•	Certification of Compliance – 673.13(a)(b)5	
2.	Tı	ransit Agency Information – 673.23(d)6	
Α	•	Authorities & Responsibilities – 673.23(d)9	
3.	Sa	afety Policies and Procedures10	
Α	•	Policy Statement – 673.23(a)10	
	١.	Employee Safety Reporting Program – 673.23(b)10	
	II.	. Communicating the Policy Throughout the Agency – 673.23(c)11	
В		PTASP Development and Coordination with TxDOT – 673.11(d)12	
C		PTASP Annual Review – 673.11(a)(5)12	
D	•	PTASP Maintenance – 673.11(a)(2)(c)13	
E.		PTASP Documentation and Recordkeeping – 673.3114	
F.		Safety Performance Measures – 673.11(a)(3)14	
G		Safety Performance Target Coordination – 673.15(a)(b)16	
4.	Sa	afety Management Systems – 673 subpart C17	
Α		Safety Risk Management – 673.2518	
	١.	Safety Hazard Identification – 673.25(b)19	
	II.	. Safety Risk Assessment – 673.25(c)21	
	III	l. Safety Risk Mitigation – 673.25(d)23	
В		Safety Assurance – 673.27 (a)24	
	١.	Safety Performance Monitoring and Measuring – 673.27 (b)	
	II.	. Safety Event Investigation – 673.27(B)(3)25	
C		Safety Promotion – 673.2927	
	١.	Safety Competencies and Training – 673.29(a)27	
	II.	. Safety Communication – 673.29(b)28	
5.	A	ppendix A29	
Α		Glossary of Terms	
В		Additional Acronyms Used35	
6.	5. Appendix B		
А		Board Minutes or Resolution	





LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: HCTD Organizational Chart	8
Figure 2: Safety Management Systems	17
Figure 3: Safety Risk Management Process	18
Figure 4: Draft Risk Register	19
Figure 5: Safety Risk Assessment Steps in Populating the Risk Register	22
Figure 6: Safety Risk Assessment Matrix	22
Figure 7: Risk Register Mitigation Component	23

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Agency Information	7
Table 2: ASP Annual Update Timeline	13
Table 3: ASP Record of Changes	13
Table 4: NSP Safety Performance Measures	14
Table 5: Baseline 2019 Safety Performance Measures	15
Table 6: Fixed Route (Bus) Safety Performance Targets	15
Table 7: Demand Response Safety Performance Targets	15
Table 8: PTASP Supporting Documents	29





1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) granted the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) the authority to establish and enforce a comprehensive framework to oversee the safety of public transportation throughout the United States. MAP-21 expanded the regulatory authority of FTA to oversee safety, providing an opportunity to assist transit agencies in moving towards a more holistic, performance-based approach to Safety Management Systems (SMS). This authority was continued through the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act).

In compliance with MAP-21 and the FAST Act, FTA promulgated a Public Transportation Safety Program on August 11, 2016 that adopted SMS as the foundation for developing and implementing a Safety Program. FTA is committed to developing, implementing, and consistently improving strategies and processes to ensure that transit achieves the highest practicable level of safety. SMS helps organizations improve upon their safety performance by supporting the institutionalization of beliefs, practices, and procedures for identifying, mitigating, and monitoring safety risks.

There are several components of the national safety program, including the National Public Transportation Safety Plan (NSP), that FTA published to provide guidance on managing safety risks and safety hazards. One element of the NSP is the Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan. Public transportation agencies implemented TAM plans across the industry in 2018. The subject of this document is the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) rule, 49 CFR Part 673, and guidance provided by FTA.

Safety is a core business function of all public transportation providers and should be systematically applied to every aspect of service delivery. At HCTD, all levels of management, administration and operations are responsible for the safety of their clientele and themselves. To improve public transportation safety to the highest practicable level in the State of Texas and comply with FTA requirements, the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) has developed this Agency Safety Plan (ASP) in collaboration with the Hill Country Transit District (HCTD).

To ensure that the necessary processes are in place to accomplish both enhanced safety at the local level and the goals of the NSP, HCTD adopts this ASP and the tenets of SMS including a Safety Management Policy (SMP) and the processes for Safety Risk Management (SRM), Safety Assurance (SA), and Safety Promotion (SP), per 49 U.S.C. 5329(d)(1)(A).¹ While safety has always been a primary function at HCTD, this document lays out a process to fully implement an SMS over the next several years that complies with the PTASP final rule.

¹ Federal Register, Vol. 81, No. 24





A. Plan Adoption - 673.11(a)(1)

This Public Transit Agency Safety Plan is hereby adopted, certified as compliant, and signed by:

Carole Warlick, General Manager

ACCOUNTABLE EXECUTIVE SIGNATURE

6-25-2021

DATE

The main governing body of HCTD (dba The HOP) is the Board of Directors. Approval of this plan by the HCTD Board of Directors occurred on June 25, 2020 and is documented in a Board Resolution (Appendix B of this document) from the Board Meeting.

B. Certification of Compliance - 673.13(a)(b)

TxDOT certifies on July 15, 2020, that this Agency Safety Plan is in full compliance with 49 CFR Part 673 and has been adopted and will be implemented by HCTD as evidenced by the plan adoption signature and necessary Board of Directors approvals under Section 1.A of this plan.





2. TRANSIT AGENCY INFORMATION - 673.23(D)

HCTD is the public transportation provider for the 9-county area in central Texas, including:

- Bell County
- Coryell County
- Hamilton County
- Lampasas County
- Llano County
- Mason County
- Milam County
- Mills County
- San Saba County

The HCTD administration office is located at 906 So. High (PO Box 217), San Saba, TX 76877. HCTD coordinates many kinds of trips, including both fixed route and demand response. Service is provided to passengers with disabilities via the Special Transit Service (STS) which often connects with the Fixed Route Service (FRS). HCTD partners with several area social service agencies to provide transportation to their clients. HCTD is governed by a Board of Directors that includes representation of each county served, and of each major city in the Urban service area. HCTD encourages social service agencies and the general public to use the public transit system. To the maximum extent possible, HCTD, serving as the region's existing transportation provider, works to meet transportation requirements through the use of the public transit system in several ways:

- HCTD encourages users and agencies to use fixed route service whenever possible.
- HCTD provides an easy means for agencies to purchase tokens, multi-ride tickets, and month passes for their clients for use on fixed route service.
- HCTD provides travel training for agencies and groups.
- Agencies and members of the general public can rely on HCTD as the existing transportation provider to continue to serve the area, merging rural and urban service.

Through cooperation and financial support of cities, businesses, TxDOT, and the FTA, HCTD has more than 170 passenger shelters throughout the cities of Copperas Cove, Killeen, Harker Heights, Belton, and Temple. This means well over 30% of all fixed route bus stops have passenger shelters installed for attractiveness, ease of identifying bus stops, protection from the weather, and passenger comfort. No additional transit service is provided by HCTD on behalf of another transit agency or entity at the time of the development of this plan.

Table 1 contains agency information, while an organizational chart for HCTD is provided in Figure 1.





TABLE 1: AGENCY INFORMATION		
Information Type	Information	
Full Transit Agency Name	Hill Country Transit District	
Transit Agency Address	PO Box 217 (906 S High), San Saba, TX 76877	
Name and Title of Accountable Executive 673.23(d)(1)	Carole Warlick, General Manager	
Name of Chief Safety Officer or SMS Executive	Darrell Burtner, Director of Urban	
673.23(d)(2)	Operations/CSO	
Temporary Project Manager	Darrell Burtner	
	Derek Czapnik, Transportation	
Key Staff	Superintendent;	
	Tony Austin, Director of Rural Operations	
Mode(c) of Service Covered by This Plan 672 11(b)	Fixed Route Service (FRS) & Special Transit	
	Service (STS)	
List All FTA Funding Types (e.g., 5307, 5310, 5311)	5307, 5310, 5311, 5339	
Mode(s) of Service Provided by the Transit Agency	Fixed Route Service (FRS) & Special Transit	
(Directly operated or contracted service)	Service (STS)	
Number of Vehicles Operated	130	





FIGURE 1: HCTD ORGANIZATIONAL CHART







A. Authorities & Responsibilities - 673.23(d)

As stated in 49 CFR Part 673.23(d), HCTD is establishing the necessary authority, accountabilities, and responsibilities for the management of safety amongst the key individuals within the organization, as those individuals relate to the development and management of our SMS. In general, the following defines the authority and responsibilities associated with our organization.

The **Accountable Executive** has ultimate responsibility for carrying out the SMS of our public transportation agency, and control or direction over the human and capital resources needed to develop and maintain both the ASP (in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5329(d)), and the agency's TAM Plan, in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5326. The Accountable Executive has authority and responsibility to address substandard performance in the HCTD SMS, per 673.23(d)(1).

Agency leadership and executive management include members of our agency leadership or executive management, other than the Accountable Executive, Chief Safety Officer (CSO)/SMS Executive, who have authority or responsibility for day-to-day implementation and operation of our agency's SMS.

The **CSO** is an adequately trained individual who has the authority and responsibility as designated by the Accountable Executive for the day-to-day implementation and operation of the HCTD SMS. As such, the CSO is able to report directly to our transit agency's Accountable Executive.

Key staff are staff, groups of staff, or committees to support the Accountable Executive, CSO, or SMS Executive in developing, implementing, and operating our agency's SMS.

Front line employees perform the daily tasks and activities where hazards can be readily identified so the identified hazards can be addressed before the hazards become adverse events. These employees are critical to SMS success through each employee's respective role in reporting safety hazards, which is where an effective SMS and a positive safety culture begins.

Further detail on this authority and these responsibilities are described at length in the *Safety Management System* document (Appendix A, Table 8 shows the document name, file name, and date of adoption). In addition, over the next year, HCTD will be reviewing and modifying, if necessary, our current job descriptions to ensure the job descriptions comply with 49 CFR Part 673.





3. SAFETY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

A. Policy Statement - 673.23(a)

Safety is Hill Country Transit District's first priority. HCTD is committed to implementing, developing, and improving strategies, management systems, and processes to ensure that all actives uphold the highest level of safety performance and meet required safety standards.

HCTD will develop and embed a safety culture in all activities that recognizes the importance and value of effective safety management and acknowledges at all times that safety is paramount.

We will clearly explain to all staff their accountabilities and responsibilities for the development and operation of the Safety Management System.

For passengers and employees, HCTD will minimize the safety risk associated with transit service to as low as reasonably practicable and will work to comply with and, wherever possible, exceed legislative and regulatory requirements and standards. We also will work to ensure that all employees are provided with adequate and appropriate safety information and training, are competent in safety matters, and are only allocated tasks commensurate with their skills.

HCTD has established safety performance targets (SPT) to help measure the overall effectiveness of our processes and to ensure that safety objectives are met. Quarterly reports will be provided to the entire organization documenting how well we met out safety performance targets and describing the safety risk mitigations that were implemented to reduce safety risk.

I. Employee Safety Reporting Program – 673.23(b)

Frontline employees are a significant source of safety data. These employees are typically the first to spot unsafe conditions that arise from unplanned conditions either on the vehicles, in the maintenance shop, or in the field during operations. For this reason, the Employee Safety Reporting Program (ESRP) is a major tenet of the PTASP Rule. Under this rule, agencies must establish and implement a process that allows employees to report safety conditions directly to senior management; provides protections for employees who report safety conditions to senior management; and includes a description of employee behaviors that may result in disciplinary action.

HCTD has a policy in place found in *Section VIII Safety and Security* of the *Employee Handbook* (Appendix A, Table 8 shows the document name, file name, and date of adoption), which is applicable to the reporting of accidents and injuries. The procedure requires accidents and injuries to be submitted to the supervisor immediately after the occurrence and employees to report any unsafe acts and conditions. Employees are also required to comply with HCTD's accident and injury documentation procedures. Over the next year, HCTD will review and modify, if necessary, our *Employee Handbook* procedures to develop them into a full ESRP to ensure that the procedures comply with 49 CFR Part 673.




As contained in HCTD's *Employee Handbook*, HCTD has a Suggestion Program that allows for both anonymous and identified communication of suggestions for improvement. This process requires the employee to first approach their immediate supervisor. If the matter cannot be resolved with the immediate supervisor, the General Manager has final authority. HCTD employees are protected from retaliation for using the Suggestion Program in good faith and HCTD maintains the confidentiality of the employee making the complaint.

For specific safety reports, *Section 2 Defect Identification* of HCTD's *Maintenance Plan and Transit Asset Management Plan (TAMP)* (Appendix A), includes a form called, "Defect Card". This form allows drivers to report any safety related defects and hazards identified following Pre- and Post-Trip Inspections.

HCTD has two procedures for customer complaints and comments. The First is relevant to complaints that are made on-site to drivers. As per the *Urban Site Operating Procedures* (Appendix A), drivers are to direct customers who wish to make a complaint while on-site to administrative staff. All other comments and complaints are covered under the *Customer Comments and Complaints* section of HCTD's *Urban Process/Procedure* document (Appendix A). Customers can submit comments and complaints in writing by mail, email or by phone. This process can allow for customers to remain anonymous. These complaints are also logged and compiled for monthly and quarterly reports.

In general, the HCTD's ESRP will ensure that all employees are encouraged to report safety conditions directly to senior management or their direct supervisor for elevation to senior management. The policy will include any contract employees. The policy will also spell out what protections are afforded employees who report safety related conditions and will describe employee behaviors that are not covered by those protections. The policy will also elaborate on how safety conditions that are reported will be reported back to the initiator(s) – either to the individual or groups of individuals or organization, dependent on the nature of the safety condition.

To bolster the information received from frontline employees, HCTD will also review our current policy for how our agency receives information and safety related data from employees and customers and. If necessary, HCTD will develop additional means for receiving, investigating and reporting the results from investigations back to the initiator (s) – either to the person, groups of persons, or distributed agency-wide to ensure that future reporting is encouraged.

II. Communicating the Policy Throughout the Agency – 673.23(c)

HCTD is committed to ensuring the safety of our clientele, personnel and operations. Part of that commitment is developing an SMS and agencywide safety culture that reduces agency risk to the lowest level possible. The first step in developing a full SMS and agencywide safety culture is communicating our SMP throughout our agency.

The SMP and safety objectives are at the forefront of all communications. This communication strategy will include posting the policy on the Bulletin Board, located in a prominent work location for existing employees and adding the policy statement to the on-boarding material for all new employees. In



addition, the policy statement will become part of our agency's regular safety meetings and other safety communications efforts. The policy will be signed by the Accountable Executive so that all employees know that the policy is supported by management.

B. PTASP Development and Coordination with TxDOT – 673.11(d)

This PTASP has been developed by TxDOT on behalf of the Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), also known as KTMPO, and HCTD in accordance with all requirements stated in 49 CFR Part 673 applicable to a small public transportation provider. TxDOT mailed a formal call for participation in a State sponsored PTASP development process to all Texas Section 5307 small bus transit agencies on January 15, 2019 and followed that call with a series of phone calls and additional correspondence. HCTD provided a letter to TxDOT opting into participation on March 15, 2019 and has been an active participant in the development of this plan through sharing existing documentation and participating in communication and coordination throughout the development of this plan. The HCTD documentation used in the development of this plan is presented in Table 8, in Appendix A.

In support of tracking performance on our SA and SP processes, HCTD conducts a yearly safety culture survey. The survey is intended to help HCTD assess how well we communicate safety and safety performance information throughout our organization by gauging how safety is perceived and embraced by HCTD's administrators, supervisors, staff and contractors. The survey is designed to help us assess how well we are conveying information on hazards and safety risks relevant to employees' roles and responsibilities and informing employees of safety actions taken in response to reports submitted through our ESRP. Results from our most recent survey were analyzed and incorporated into the implementation strategies contained in this ASP.

Once the documents were reviewed, an on-site interview was conducted with HCTD to gain a better understanding of the agency. This understanding was necessary to ensure that the ASP was developed to fit HCTD's size, operational characteristics, and capabilities.

The draft ASP was delivered to HCTD in March 2020 for review and comment. Once review was completed and any adjustments were made, the final was delivered to HCTD for review and adoption.

C. PTASP Annual Review - 673.11(a)(5)

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5329(d)(1)(D), this plan includes provisions for annual updates of the SMS. As part of HCTD's ongoing commitment to fully implementing SMS and engaging our agency employees in developing a robust safety culture, HCTD will review the ASP and all supporting documentation annually. The review will be conducted as a precursor to certifying to FTA that the ASP is fully compliant with 49 CFR Part 673 and accurately reflects the agency's current implementation status. Certification will be accomplished through HCTD's annual Certifications and Assurances reporting to FTA.

The annual review will include the ASP and supporting documents (Standard Operating Procedures [SOP], Policies, Manuals, etc.) that are used to fully implement all the processes used to manage safety



at HCTD. All changes will be noted (as discussed below) and the Accountable Executive will sign and date the title page of this document and provide documentation of approval by the HCTD Board of Directors whether by signature or by reference to resolution.

The annual ASP review will follow the update activities and schedule provided below in Table 2. As processes are changed to fully implement SMS or new processes are developed, HCTD will track those changes for use in the annual review.

TABLE 2: ASP ANNUAL UPDATE TIMELINE

Task	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept
Review Agency Operations								
Review SMS Documentation								
• Safety Policy;								
Risk Management;								
Safety Assurance; and								
Safety Promotion.								
Review Previous Targets and Set or Continue Targets								
Report Targets to National Transit Database (NTD),					1			
TxDOT, KTMPO								
Make Any Necessary Adjustments to PTASP								
Update Version No., Adopt & Certify Plan								-
Compliance								

The following table, Table 3, will be used to record final changes made to the ASP during the annual update. This table will be a permanent record of the changes to the ASP over time.

TABLE 3: ASP RECORD OF CHANGES

Document Version	Section/Pages Changed	Reason for Change	Reviewer Name	Date of Change
Header	Text	Text	Text	Text
Header	Text	Text	Text	Text
Header	Text	Text	Text	Text

The implementation of SMS is an ongoing and iterative process, and as such this PTASP is a working document. Therefore, a clear record of changes and adjustments is kept in the PTASP for the benefit of safety plan performance management and to comply with Federal statutes.

D. PTASP Maintenance - 673.11(a)(2)(c)

HCTD will follow the annual review process outlined above and adjust this ASP as necessary to accurately reflect current implementation status. This plan will document the processes and activities related to SMS implementation as required under 49 CFR Part 673 Subpart C and will make necessary updates to this ASP as HCTD continues to develop and refine our SMS implementation.





E. PTASP Documentation and Recordkeeping – 673.31

At all times, HCTD will maintain documents that set forth our ASP, including those documents related to the implementation of HCTD's SMS and those documents related to the results from SMS processes and activities. HCTD will also maintain documents that are included in whole, or by reference, that describe the programs, policies, and procedures that our agency uses to carry out our ASP and all iterations of those documents. These documents will be made available upon request to the FTA, other Federal entity, or TxDOT. HCTD will maintain these documents for a minimum of three years after the documents are created. These additional supporting documents are cataloged in Appendix A and the list will be kept current as part of the annual ASP review and update.

F. Safety Performance Measures – 673.11(a)(3)

The PTASP Final Rule, 49 CFR Part 673.11(a)(3), requires that all public transportation providers must develop an ASP to include SPTs based on the safety performance measures established under the NSP. The safety performance measures outlined in the NSP were developed to ensure that the measures can be applied to all modes of public transportation and are based on data currently being submitted to the NTD. The safety performance measures included in the NSP are fatalities, injuries, safety events, and system reliability (State of Good Repair as developed and tracked in the TAM Plan).

There are seven (7) SPTs that must be included in each ASP that are based on the four (4) performance measures in the NSP. These SPTs are presented in terms of total numbers reported and rate per Vehicle Revenue Mile (VRM). Each of the seven (7) is required to be reported by mode as presented in Table 4.

Safety Performance Measure	SPT	SPT			
Fatalities	Total Number Reported	Rate Per Total VRM			
Injuries	Total Number Reported	Rate Per Total VRM			
Safety Events	Total Number Reported	Rate Per Total VRM			
System Reliability	Mean distance between major mechanical failure				

TABLE 4: NSP SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Table 5 presents baseline numbers for each of the performance measures. HCTD collected the past five (5) years of reported data to develop the rolling averages listed in the table.





TABLE 5: BASELINE 2019 SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Mode	Fatalities	Rate of Fatalities*	Injuries	Rate of Injuries*	Safety Events	Rate of Safety Events*	Mean Distance Between Major Mechanical Failure
Fixed Route (Bus)	0	0	1	.00016%	2	.00038%	9,383 VRM
Demand Response	0	0	3	.00018%	5	.00029%	17,584 VRM

*rate = total number for the year/total revenue vehicle miles traveled

While safety has always been a major component of the HCTD operation, the adoption of this ASP will result in changes across all aspects of the organization. The SPTs set in Table 6 and Table 7 reflect an acknowledgment that SMS implementation will produce new information that will be needed to accurately set meaningful SPTs. We will set our targets at the current NTD reported five-year average as we begin the process of fully implementing our SMS and developing our targeted safety improvements. This will ensure that we do no worse than our baseline performance over the last five years.

TABLE 6: FIXED ROUTE (BUS) SAFETY PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Mode	Baseline	Target
Fatalities	0	0
Rate of Fatalities*	0	0
Injuries	1	0
Rate of Injuries*	.00016%	.00000%
Safety Events	2	1
Rate of Safety Events*	.00038%	.00017%
Mean Distance Between	0.282.\/DN4	10 221 \/DM
Major Mechanical Failure	9,383 VRIVI	10,321 VRIVI

*rate = total number for the year/total revenue vehicle miles traveled

TABLE 7: DEMAND RESPONSE SAFETY PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Mode	Baseline	Target
Fatalities	0	0
Rate of Fatalities*	0	0
Injuries	3	2
Rate of Injuries*	.00018%	.00012%
Safety Events	5	3
Rate of Safety Events*	.00029%	.00018%
System Reliability	17,584 VRM	19,342 VRM
Other	0	0

*rate = total number for the year/total revenue vehicle miles traveled

As part of the annual review of the ASP, HCTD will reevaluate our SPTs and determine whether the SPTs need to be refined. As more data is collected as part of the SRM process discussed later in this plan,





HCTD may begin developing safety performance indicators to help inform management on safety related investments.

G. Safety Performance Target Coordination – 673.15(a)(b)

HCTD will make our SPTs available to TxDOT and the KTMPO to aid in those agencies' respective regional and long-range planning processes. To the maximum extent practicable, HCTD will coordinate with TxDOT and KTMPO in the selection of State and MPO SPTs as documented in the Interagency Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Each year during the FTA Certifications and Assurances reporting process, HCTD will transmit any updates to our SPTs to both the KTMPO and TxDOT (unless those agencies specify another time in writing).



Hill Country Transit District Agency Safety Plan



4. SAFETY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS – 673 SUBPART C

As noted previously, FTA has adopted SMS as the basis for improving safety across the public transportation industry. In compliance with the National Safety Program, National Public Transportation Safety Plan, and 49 CFR Part 673, HCTD has adopted an SMS as the basis for directing and managing safety and risk at our agency. HCTD has always viewed safety as a core business function. All levels of management and employees are accountable for appropriately identifying and effectively managing risk in all activities and operations in order to deliver improvements in safety and reduce risk to the lowest practical level during service delivery. Over the next year, HCTD will be reviewing and modifying, if necessary, our current Safety Management Systems to ensure that the procedures comply with 49 CFR Part 673.

SMS is comprised of four basic components - SMP, SRM, SA, and SP. The SMP and SP are the enablers that provide structure and supporting activities that make SRM and SA possible and sustainable. The SRM and SA are the processes and activities for effectively managing safety as presented in Figure 2.

FIGURE 2: SAFETY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS







Implementing SMS at HCTD will be a major undertaking over the next several years. This ASP is the first step to putting in place a systematic approach to managing the agency's risk. HCTD has already taken several steps to implement SMS, such as developing this initial ASP and designating a CSO. During the first year of implementation, HCTD will identify SMS roles and responsibilities, key stakeholder groups and key staff to support this process. HCTD will also ensure that these key staff receive SMS training, develop a plan for implementing SMS, inform stakeholders about the ASP, and discuss our progress with the HCTD Board of Directors and planning partners.

A. Safety Risk Management - 673.25

By adopting this ASP, HCTD is establishing the SRM process presented in Figure 3 for identifying hazards and analyzing, assessing and mitigating safety risk in compliance with the requirements of 49 CFR Part 673.25. The SRM processes described in this section are designed to implement the HCTD SMS.

FIGURE 3: SAFETY RISK MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Safety Hazard

Identification

Safety Risk Assessment Safety Risk Mitigation

The implementation of the SRM component of the SMS will be carried out over the course of the next year. The SRM components will be implemented through a program of improvement during which the SRM processes will be implemented, reviewed, evaluated and revised, as necessary, to ensure the processes are achieving the intended safety objectives as the processes are fully incorporated into HCTD's SOPs.

The SRM is focused on implementing and improving actionable strategies that HCTD has undertaken to identify, assess and mitigate risk. The creation of a Risk Register provides an accessible resource for documenting the SRM process, tracking the identified risks, and documenting the effectiveness of mitigation strategies in meeting defined safety objectives and performance measures. The draft Risk Register is presented in Figure 4.







As the SRM process progresses through the steps of identifying what may be wrong, what could happen as a result, and what steps HCTD is taking to resolve the risk and mitigate the hazard, the CSO completes and publishes the various components of the Risk Register. These components include the use of safety hazard identification, safety risk assessment, and safety risk mitigation, as described in the following sections.

I. Safety Hazard Identification – 673.25(b)

HCTD's Urban Site Operating Procedures (Appendix A) document includes two sections regarding hazard identification. Lists of these hazards are provided in the Special Transit Service (STS) Hazardous Locations and Fixed Route Service (FRS) Hazardous Locations sections.

Safety Data Sheets (SDS) are on display for all employees to view and access. These sheets are maintained by the Urban Fleet Manager. The SDS policy is provided in *Section 8 Safety Data Sheet* of the *TAMP* (Appendix A). Also provided in HCTD's *TAMP* is *Section 11 Facility Inspection and Maintenance*. As part of these procedures, a Preventive Maintenance Inspection (PMI) is conducted and a PMI Report produced which includes safety concerns identified during the PMI process.

Although the current procedures have been effective in achieving our safety objectives, to ensure compliance with 49 CFR Part 673, HCTD is working to implement the following expanded SRM process.

The HCTD SRM process is a forward-looking effort to identify safety hazards that could potentially result in negative safety outcomes. In the SRM process, a hazard is any real or potential condition that can cause injury, illness, or death; damage to or loss of the facilities, equipment, rolling stock, or infrastructure of a public transportation system; or, damage to the environment.





Hazard identification focuses on out-of-the-norm conditions that need special attention or immediate action, new procedures, or training to resolve a condition that is unacceptable and return conditions to an acceptable level. HCTD uses a variety of mechanisms for identifying and documenting hazards, namely:

- Through training and reporting procedures, HCTD ensures personnel can identify hazards and that each employee clearly understands that the employee has a responsibility to immediately report any safety hazards identified to the employee's supervisors. Continued training helps employees to develop and improve the skills needed to identify hazards.
- Employee hazard training coupled with the ESRP ensures that HCTD has full use of information from frontline employees for hazard identification.
- Upon receiving the hazard report, supervisors communicate the identified hazard to the CSO for entry into the risk register for risk assessment, classification and possible mitigation.
- In carrying out the risk assessment, the CSO uses standard reporting forms (e.g. *Pre- and Post-Trip Inspection Forms, Defect Card, Road Call Report and Accident Report*) and other reports completed on a routine basis by administrative, operations and maintenance. The HCTD *Employee Handbook* contains procedures for flagging and reporting hazards as a part of day-to-day operations.
- Supervisors in particular are responsible for performing and documenting regular safety assessments, which include reporting and recommending methods to reduce identified hazards.
- HCTD uses incident reports and records to determine specific areas of training that need to be covered with employees to ensure safety hazard identification is continually improved, and thus ensure that hazards are identified before an event recurrence.
- Incident reports are also analyzed by the risk management team to identify any recurring patterns or themes that would help to identify underlying hazards and root causes of the event that can be mitigated to prevent recurrence.
- If a hazard is such that an employee would be reluctant to report the information due to perceived negative consequences (e.g. disciplinary action), alternative, anonymous reporting mechanisms are available through an anonymous suggestion box or anonymous online reporting form, or other secure mechanism.
- To increase the safety knowledge of our agency, the CSO, risk management personnel and subject matter experts are also encouraged to participate in available professional development activities and peer-to-peer exchanges as a source of expertise and information on lessons learned and best practices in hazard identification.
- Other sources for hazard identification include:





- o ESRP
- o Inspections of personnel job performance, vehicles, facilities and other data
- o Investigations of safety events
- o Safety trend analysis on data currently collected
- o Training and evaluation records
- o Internal safety audits
- o External sources of hazard information could include:
 - FTA and other federal or state authorities
 - Reports from the public
 - Safety bulletins from manufacturers or industry associations

In addition to identifying the hazard, the hazard identification process also classifies the hazard by type (organizational, technical or environmental) to assist the CSO in identifying the optimal combination of departmental leadership and subject matter expertise to select in assembling the safety risk assessment team.

The various hazard types can also be categorized by subcategory for each type. For example, organizational hazards can be subcategorized into resourcing, procedural, training or supervisory hazards. Each of the subcategories implies different types of mitigation strategies and potentially affect overall agency resources through varying costs for implementation. Technical hazards can be subcategorized into operational, maintenance, design and equipment. Additionally, environmental hazards can be subcategorized into weather and natural, which is always a factor for every operation.

II. Safety Risk Assessment – 673.25(c)

As part of the new SRM process, HCTD has developed methods to assess the likelihood and severity of the consequences of identified hazards, and prioritizes the hazards based on the safety risk. The process continues the use of the Risk Register described in the previous section to address the next two components.

To accurately assess a risk, HCTD may need to perform an investigation. HCTD currently investigates accidents or crashes, but will need to develop a full investigation procedure to inform the SRM process. The investigation procedure will start with the STS and FRS Hazardous Locations list and framework found in the *Urban Site Operating Procedures* and will be developed to cover all risk assessment. Once fully developed, the document will become the Investigation SOP. The SOP will include accident investigation procedures as well as risk investigation procedures. These procedures will be used to investigate risks identified from multiple sources including the ESRP.

Safety risk is based on an assessment of the likelihood of a potential consequence and the potential severity of the consequences in terms of resulting harm or damage. The risk assessment also considers





any previous mitigation efforts and the effectiveness of those efforts. The results of the assessment are used to populate the third and fourth components of the Risk Register as presented in Figure 5.

Hazard	Туре	Likelihood	Consequence	Resolution

FIGURE 5: SAFETY RISK ASSESSMENT STEPS IN POPULATING THE RISK REGISTER

The risk assessment is conducted by the CSO and their risk management team supplemented by subject matter experts from the respective department or section to which the risk applies. The process employs a safety risk matrix, similar to the one presented in Figure 6, that allows the safety team to visualize the assessed likelihood and severity, and to help decision-makers understand when actions are necessary to reduce or mitigate safety risk.

RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX SEVERITY Catastrophic Critical Marginal Negligible (1) (4) (2) (3) LIKELIHOOD Frequent (A) High Medium High High Probable (B) Medium Medium High High Occasional (C) Medium Medium High Low Medium Medium Remote (D) Low Low Improbable (E) Medium Low Low Low

FIGURE 6: SAFETY RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX

Although the current version of the matrix relies heavily on the examples and samples that are listed on the PTASP Technical Assistance Center website, lessons learned from the implementation process during





the coming years will be used to customize the matrix that HCTD will use to address our unique operating realities and leadership guidance.

The Risk Assessment Matrix is an important tool. If a risk is assessed and falls within one of the red zones, the risk is determined to be unacceptable under existing circumstances. This determination means that management must take action to mitigate the situation. This is the point in the process when SRMs are developed. If the risk is assessed and falls within one of the yellow zones, the risk is determined to be acceptable, but monitoring is necessary. If the risk falls within one of the green zones, the risk is acceptable under the existing circumstances.

Once a hazard's likelihood and severity have been assessed, the CSO enters the hazard assessment into the Risk Register that is used to document the individual hazard and the type of risk it represents. This information is used to move to the next step, which is hazard mitigation.

III. Safety Risk Mitigation – 673.25(d)

Upon completion of the risk assessment, the CSO and the safety team continue populating the Risk Register by identifying mitigations or strategies necessary to reduce the likelihood and/or severity of the consequences. The goal of this step is to avoid or eliminate the hazard or, when elimination is not likely or feasible, to reduce the assessed risk rating to an acceptable level (Figure 7). However, mitigations do not typically eliminate the risk entirely.



FIGURE 7: RISK REGISTER MITIGATION COMPONENT

To accomplish this objective, the CSO, through the risk management team, works with subject matter experts from the respective department or section to which the risk applies. The risk management team then conducts a brainstorming exercise to elicit feedback from staff and supervisors with the highest level of expertise in the components of the hazard.

Documented risk resolution and hazard mitigation activities from previous Risk Register entries and the resolution's documented level of success at achieving the desired safety objectives may also be reviewed and considered in the process. If the hazard is external (e.g., roadway construction by an





outside agency) information and input from external actors or experts may also be sought to take advantage of all reasonably available resources and avoid any unintended consequences.

Once a mitigation strategy is selected and adopted, the strategy is assigned to an appropriate staff member or team for implementation. The assigned personnel and the personnel's specific responsibilities are entered into the Risk Register. Among the responsibilities of the mitigation team leader is the documentation of the mitigation effort, including whether the mitigation was carried out as designed and whether the intended safety objectives were achieved. This information is recorded in the appendix to the Risk Register for use in subsequent SA activities and to monitor the effectiveness of the SRM program.

B. Safety Assurance - 673.27 (a)

Safety Assurance means processes within the HCTD SMS that function to ensure a) the implementation and effectiveness of safety risk mitigation, and b) HCTD meets or exceeds our safety objectives through the collection, measurement, analysis and assessment of information.

SA helps to ensure early identification of potential safety issues. SA also ensures that safeguards are in place and are effective in meeting HCTD's critical safety objectives and contribute towards SPTs.

I. Safety Performance Monitoring and Measuring – 673.27 (b)

As the first step in the HCTD's SA program, HCTD collects and monitors data on safety performance indicators through a variety of mechanisms described in the following sections. Safety performance indicators can provide early warning signs about safety risks. HCTD currently relies primarily on lagging indicators representing negative safety outcomes that should be avoided or mitigated in the future. However, initiatives are underway to adopt a more robust set of leading indicators that monitor conditions that are likely to contribute to negative outcomes in the future. In addition to the day-to-day monitoring and investigation procedures detailed below, HCTD will review and document the safety performance monitoring and measuring processes as part of the annual update of this ASP.

MONITORING COMPLIANCE AND SUFFICIENCY OF PROCEDURES - 673.27 (B)(1)

HCTD monitors our system for personnel compliance with operations and maintenance procedures and also monitors these procedures for sufficiency in meeting safety objectives. A list of documents describing the safety related operations and maintenance procedures cited in this ASP is provided in Appendix A of this document.

Supervisors monitor employee compliance with HCTD SOPs through direct observation and review of information from internal reporting systems such as the procedures in HCTD's *Employee Handbook* from both employees and customers.

HCTD addresses non-compliance with standard procedures for operations and maintenance activities through a variety of actions, including revision to training materials and delivery of employee and





supervisor training if the non-compliance is systemic. If the non-compliance is situational, then activities may include supplemental individualized training, coaching, and heightened management oversight, among other remedies.

Sometimes personnel are fully complying with the procedures, but the operations and maintenance procedures are inadequate and pose the risk of negative safety outcomes. In this case, the cognizant person submits the deficiency or description of the inadequate procedures to the SRM process. Through the SRM process, the SRM team will then evaluate and analyze the potential organizational hazard and assign the identified hazard for mitigation and resolution, as appropriate. The SRM team will also conduct periodic self-evaluation and mitigation of any identified deficiencies in the SRM process itself.

MONITORING OPERATIONS - 673.27(B)(2)

Supervisors are required to monitor investigation reports of safety events and SRM resolution reports to monitor the department's operations to identify any safety risk mitigations that may be ineffective, inappropriate, or not implemented as intended. If it is determined that the safety risk mitigation did not bring the risk to an acceptable level or otherwise failed to meet safety objectives, then the supervisor resubmits the safety risk/hazard to the SRM process. The CSO will work with the supervisor and subject matter experts to reanalyze the hazard and consequences and identify additional mitigation or alternative approaches to implementing the mitigation.

II. Safety Event Investigation – 673.27(B)(3)

HCTD currently conducts investigations of safety events through the Accident Review Committee (ARC). From an SA perspective, the objective of the investigation is to identify causal factors of the event and to identify actionable strategies that HCTD can employ to address any identifiable organizational, technical or environmental hazard at the root cause of the safety event.

Safety Event Investigations that seek beyond superficial circumstances to identify and document the root cause of an accident or other safety event are a critical component of the SA process because they are a primary resource for the collection, measurement, analysis and assessment of information. HCTD uses a variety of mechanisms for identifying and documenting root causes of accidents and incidents, including but not limited to:

- 1. Obtain from the Operator the following information:
 - a. The location of the incident and what direction they were traveling (inbound or outbound); if in station, indicate the situation.
 - b. The bus number and the route that they are on.
 - c. If there are injuries, describe how serious they appear (don't be too graphic, just generalize).
 - d. Provide information about any other vehicles or pedestrians involved and their descriptions.
- 2. Remind the operator of the safety procedures:



Hill Country Transit District Agency Safety Plan



- a. Turn on 4-way flashers. Place traffic warning devices (orange triangles).
- b. Recheck anyone with injuries, do not move the seriously injured.
- c. Render comfort and aid to anyone injured, as may be appropriate.
- d. Evacuate the bus, if necessary.
- e. Keep the two-way radio on and monitored.
- f. Hand out courtesy cards to the passengers and to any witnesses.
- g. Move the vehicle to the side of the road unless it is inoperable.
- 3. Notify the following:
 - a. Call the Police. Call Emergency Medical Personnel (EMP) 911
 - b. Notify/call the CSO and immediate supervisor on duty at the time.
- 4. The supervisor will:
 - a. Determine whether the General Manager or Assistant General Manager needs to be contacted but will give them a report when the supervisor finishes the initial assessment.
 - b. Let the Operator know that Police and supervision have been contacted and help and is on the way.
 - c. Assign a Standby Operator to pre-trip a bus in case a standby must drive the next round for the operator on that route. When needed, the Standby Operator may take a bus out to continue a route.
 - d. Let the Operator know that a Standby Operator and bus have been assigned to continue the route or that support personnel are bringing another bus out to them.
 - e. Refer the operator for required drug and alcohol testing in compliance with 49 CFR § 655.44 Post-accident testing, if the safety event meets the definition of accident in 49 CFR § 655.4.
 - f. Return to the station.
 - g. Record all accident information on the Daily Dispatch log, any missed trips, downtime, or bus change outs.
- 5. Dispatcher on duty will give the Operator an incident report to complete before the Operator leaves that day. Dispatcher will put the Operator's report in the CSO's box.
- 6. The CSO, working with content specialists, evaluates the incident report and other available information to determine the root cause of the accident/event. Follow up with driver or other cognizant parties may be necessary to elicit additional information.
- 7. The CSO identifies any hazards noted in the incident report and refers those hazards to the SRM process.

MONITORING INTERNAL SAFETY REPORTING PROGRAMS - 673.27(B)(4)

As a primary part of the internal safety reporting program, HCTD monitors information reported using Defect Cards, Road Call Reports, Accident Reports, Incident Reports and Personal Injury Reports. When a report originating through the ESRP process documents a safety hazard, the supervisor submits the hazards identified through the internal reporting process, including previous mitigation in place at the time of the safety event. The supervisor submits the hazard report to the SRM process to be analyzed, evaluated and, if appropriate, assigned for mitigation/resolution.





OTHER SAFETY ASSURANCE INITIATIVES

Because leading indicators can be more useful for safety performance monitoring and measurement than lagging indicators, HCTD is undertaking efforts to implement processes to identify and monitor more leading indicators or conditions that have the potential to become or contribute to negative safety outcomes. This may include trend analysis of environmental conditions through monitoring National Weather Service data; monitoring trends toward or away from meeting the identified SPTs; or other indicators as appropriate.

C. Safety Promotion - 673.29

Management support is essential to developing and implementing SMS. SP includes all aspects of how, why, when and to whom management communicates safety related topics. SP also includes when and how training is provided. The following sections outline both the safety competencies and training that HCTD will implement and how safety related information will be communicated.

I. Safety Competencies and Training – 673.29(a)

HCTD provides comprehensive training to all employees regarding each employee's job duties and general responsibilities. This training includes safety responsibilities related to the employee's position. In addition, regular driver safety meetings are held to ensure that safety related information is relayed to the key members of our agency's safety processes.

As part of SMS implementation, HCTD will be conducting the following activities:

- Conduct a thorough review of all current general staff categories (administrative, driver, supervisor, mechanic, maintenance, etc.) and the respective staff safety related responsibilities.
- Assess the training requirements spelled out in 49 CFR Part 672 and the various courses required for different positions. (HCTD is not subject to the requirements under 49 CFR Part 672 but will review the training requirements to understand what training is being required of other larger agencies in the event these trainings might be useful).
- Assess the training material available on the FTA PTASP Technical Assistance Center website.
- Review other training material available from industry sources such as the Community Transportation Association of America and the American Public Transportation Association websites.
- Develop a set of competencies and trainings required to meet the safety related activities for each general staff category.
- Develop expectations for ongoing safety training and safety meeting attendance.
- Develop a training matrix to track progress on individuals and groups within the organization.





• Include refresher training in all trainings an apply it to the agency personnel and contractors.

II. Safety Communication – 673.29(b)

HCTD regularly communicates safety and safety performance information throughout our agency's organization that, at a minimum, conveys information on hazards and safety risks relevant to employees' roles and responsibilities and informs employees of safety actions taken in response to reports submitted through the ESRP (noted in 3.A.I) or other means.

HCTD staff report any safety related information to the HCTD Board of Directors at their regular meetings and include safety performance information. In addition, HCTD holds regularly scheduled meetings with drivers to ensure that any safety related information is passed along that would affect the execution of the drivers' duties. HCTD also posts safety related and other pertinent information in a common room for all employees.

HCTD will begin systematically collecting, cataloging, and, where appropriate, analyzing and reporting safety and performance information to all staff. To determine what information should be reported, how the information should be reported and to whom, HCTD will answer the following questions:

- What information does this individual need to do their job?
- How can we ensure the individual understands what is communicated?
- How can we ensure the individual understands what action must be taken as a result of the information?
- How can we ensure the information is accurate and kept up-to-date?
- Are there any privacy or security concerns to consider when sharing information? If so, what should we do to address these concerns?

In addition, HCTD will review our current communications strategies and determine whether others are needed. As part of this effort, HCTD has conducted, and will continue to conduct, a Safety Culture Survey to understand how safety is perceived in the workplace and what areas HCTD should be addressing to fully implement a safety culture at our agency.





5. APPENDIX A

TABLE 8: PTASP SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

File Name	Revision Date	Document Name	Document Owner
19-04 Urban Performance Report - Final.pdf	N/A	The HOT- Performance Reports	Hill Country Transit District
2018 EE Handbook December 2018.pdf	Dec-18	Employee Handbook	Hill Country Transit District
Accident Record Trends and Analysis.xls	Jul-05	Accident Record Trends and Analysis Excel	Hill Country Transit District
Accident Review Committee Procedures - Update as of April 2, 2019 - Final.pdf	N/A	Accident Review Committee Procedures	Hill Country Transit District
Board By-Laws Revised 2-11- 19.doc	N/A	Hill Country Transit District By- Laws	Hill Country Transit District
Complaint Process 19-05-14.docx	May-19	Urban Process/Procedure Customer Comments & Complaints	Hill Country Transit District
CTAA Accreditation Checklist.pdf	N/A	The Community Transportation Safety and Security Accreditation (CTSSA) Program. Reviewer Accreditation Checklist	Community Transportation Association
DRAFT Drug Alcohol Policy 11- 2018.doc	Nov-18	Policy for Drug and Alcohol Abuse Testing	Hill Country Transit District
Driver Training Manual.pdf	N/A	Urban Site Operating Procedures	Hill Country Transit District
Emergency Alarm 15-07-01.docx	3/15/2017	Emergency Alarm Process	Hill Country Transit District
Emergency Evacuation Drills 14- 08-21.docx	3/15/2017	Urban Divisions Emergency Evacuation Process	Hill Country Transit District
Emergency Management Plan.docx	N/A	Emergency Management Plan and Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Plan	Hill Country Transit District
Employee Manual 2018 New Hire Orientation.pdf	N/A	Employee Manual 2018 New Hire Orientation	Hill Country Transit District
Employee Training Policy 04- 2014.pdf	Apr-14	Employee Training Policy	Hill Country Transit District
Hazard Locations Log.pdf	10/1/2018	STS Hazardous Locations	Hill Country Transit District



Hill Country Transit District Agency Safety Plan



File Name	Revision Date	Document Name	Document Owner
HCTD Fact Sheet.doc	N/A	HCTD Fact Sheet	Hill Country Transit District
HCTD Org Chart 07-01-17.xls	N/A	Org Chart	Hill Country Transit District
HCTD Profile.docx	N/A	Grantee Profile	Hill Country Transit District
Internal Control Manual Rev. 2019.pdf	2/28/2019	Internal Control Manual	Hill Country Transit District
IT Infrastructure.doc	N/A	IT Infrastructure and Cyber Security Summary	Hill Country Transit District
KTMPO-TxDOT-HCTD MOU 1- 18.pdf	1/23/2019	Memo of understanding KTMPO and TxDOT and HCTD	N/A
MAINTENANCE PLAN FOR 2018 final 171211 rsa.pdf	Jan-18	Maintenance Plan and Transit Asset Management Plan (TAMP)	Hill Country Transit District
Procurement Policy Rev. 2018.pdf	Dec-18	Procurement Policies and Procedures Manual	Hill Country Transit District
Rural Maintenance Plan Feb. 2018.pdf	Feb-18	Fleet Maintenance Plan Rural Division	Hill Country Transit District
Safety & Security Plan 2018.pdf	1/30/2018	Safety Management System	Hill Country Transit District
Safety & Security Summary.pdf	12/31/201 8	Safety CY 2018 Reporting- 60091	Hill Country Transit District
SAFETY INITIATIVES.docx	N/A	Safety Initiatives	N/A
Shop Safety Presentation.pptx	12/18/201 7	Shop Safety Power Point	Hill Country Transit District
System Safety Program Plan.pdf	5/22/2014	System Safety Program Plan	Hill Country Transit District
TAMP 2019.pdf	2019	Transit Asset Management Plan (TAMP) Annual Report 2019	N/A
TAP Manuel 12-11.pdf	Nov-11	Techniques in Assisting Passengers Training Program	Hill Country Transit District/MGM Training Center
Triennial Review Report 2017.pdf	2017	Triennial Review Report 2017	USDOT FTA
UPWP-2018-2019-approved- 2017.05.17-Rev-2017.07.26.pdf	2018- 2019	UPWP 2018-2019	Killeen-Temple MPO





File Name	Revision Date	Document Name	Document Owner
Urban Fixed Route Driver 1-18.pdf	1/2/2018	Job Description: Urban Fixed Route Bus Driver	Hill Country Transit District

A. Glossary of Terms

Accident: means an event that involves any of the following: a loss of life; a report of a serious injury to a person; a collision of transit vehicles; an evacuation for life safety reasons; at any location, at any time, whatever the cause.

Accountable Executive (typically the highest executive in the agency): means a single, identifiable person who has ultimate responsibility for carrying out the SMS of a public transportation agency, and control or direction over the human and capital resources needed to develop and maintain both the agency's PTASP, in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5329(d), and the agency's TAM Plan in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 5326.

Agency Leadership and Executive Management: means those members of agency leadership or executive management (other than an Accountable Executive, CSO, or SMS Executive) who have authorities or responsibilities for day-to-day implementation and operation of an agency's SMS.

Chief Safety Officer (CSO): means an adequately trained individual who has responsibility for safety and reports directly to a transit agency's chief executive officer, general manager, president, or equivalent officer. A CSO may not serve in other operational or maintenance capacity, unless the CSO is employed by a transit agency that is a small public transportation provider as defined in this part, or a public transportation provider that does not operate a rail fixed guideway public transportation system.

Corrective Maintenance: Specific, unscheduled maintenance typically performed to identify, isolate, and rectify a condition or fault so that the failed asset or asset component can be restored to a safe operational condition within the tolerances or limits established for in-service operations.

Equivalent Authority: means an entity that carries out duties similar to that of a Board of Directors, for a recipient or subrecipient of FTA funds under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53, including sufficient authority to review and approve a recipient or subrecipient's PTASP.

Event: means an accident, incident, or occurrence.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA): means the Federal Transit Administration, an operating administration within the United States Department of Transportation.

Hazard: means any real or potential condition that can cause injury, illness, or death; damage to or loss of the facilities, equipment, rolling stock, or infrastructure of a public transportation system; or damage to the environment.





Incident: means an event that involves any of the following: a personal injury that is not a serious injury; one or more injuries requiring medical transport; or damage to facilities, equipment, rolling stock, or infrastructure that disrupts the operations of a transit agency.

Investigation: means the process of determining the causal and contributing factors of an accident, incident, or hazard, for the purpose of preventing recurrence and mitigating risk.

Key staff: means a group of staff or committees to support the Accountable Executive, CSO, or SMS Executive in developing, implementing, and operating the agency's SMS.

Major Mechanical Failures: means failures caused by vehicle malfunctions or subpar vehicle condition which requires that the vehicle be pulled from service.

National Public Transportation Safety Plan (NSP): means the plan to improve the safety of all public transportation systems that receive Federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53.

Occurrence: means an event without any personal injury in which any damage to facilities, equipment, rolling stock, or infrastructure does not disrupt the operations of a transit agency.

Operator of a Public Transportation System: means a provider of public transportation as defined under 49 U.S.C. 5302(14).

Passenger: means a person, other than an operator, who is on board, boarding, or alighting from a vehicle on a public transportation system for the purpose of travel.

Performance Measure: means an expression based on a quantifiable indicator of performance or condition that is used to establish targets and to assess progress toward meeting the established targets.

Performance Target: means a quantifiable level of performance or condition, expressed as a value for the measure, to be achieved within a time period required by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

Preventative Maintenance: means regular, scheduled, and/or recurring maintenance of assets (equipment and facilities) as required by manufacturer or vendor requirements, typically for the purpose of maintaining assets in satisfactory operating condition. Preventative maintenance is conducted by providing for systematic inspection, detection, and correction of anticipated failures either before they occur or before they develop into major defects. Preventative maintenance is maintenance, including tests, measurements, adjustments, and parts replacement, performed specifically to prevent faults from occurring. The primary goal of preventative maintenance is to avoid or mitigate the consequences of failure of equipment.

Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP): means the documented comprehensive agency safety plan for a transit agency that is required by 49 U.S.C. 5329 and this part.

Risk: means the composite of predicted severity and likelihood of the potential effect of a hazard.





Risk Mitigation: means a method or methods to eliminate or reduce the effects of hazards.

Road Calls: means specific, unscheduled maintenance requiring either the emergency repair or service of a piece of equipment in the field or the towing of the unit to the garage or shop.

Safety Assurance (SA): means the process within a transit agency's SMS that functions to ensure the implementation and effectiveness of safety risk mitigation and ensures that the transit agency meets or exceeds its safety objectives through the collection, analysis, and assessment of information.

Safety Management Policy (SMP): means a transit agency's documented commitment to safety, which defines the transit agency's safety objectives and the accountabilities and responsibilities of the agency's employees regarding safety.

Safety Management System (SMS): means the formal, top-down, data-driven, organization-wide approach to managing safety risk and assuring the effectiveness of a transit agency's safety risk mitigation. SMS includes systematic procedures, practices, and policies for managing risks and hazards.

Safety Management System (SMS) Executive: means a CSO or an equivalent.

Safety Objective: means a general goal or desired outcome related to safety.

Safety Performance: means an organization's safety effectiveness and efficiency, as defined by safety performance indicators and targets, measured against the organization's safety objectives.

Safety Performance Indicator: means a data-driven, quantifiable parameter used for monitoring and assessing safety performance.

Safety Performance Measure: means an expression based on a quantifiable indicator of performance or condition that is used to establish targets and to assess progress toward meeting the established targets.

Safety Performance Monitoring: means activities aimed at the quantification of an organization's safety effectiveness and efficiency during service delivery operations, through a combination of safety performance indicators and safety performance targets.

Safety Performance Target (SPT): means a quantifiable level of performance or condition, expressed as a value for a given performance measure, achieved over a specified timeframe related to safety management activities.

Safety Promotion (SP): means a combination of training and communication of safety information to support SMS as applied to the transit agency's public transportation system.

Safety Risk: means the assessed probability and severity of the potential consequence(s) of a hazard, using as reference the worst foreseeable, but credible, outcome.



Hill Country Transit District Agency Safety Plan

Safety Risk Assessment: means the formal activity whereby a transit agency determines SRM priorities by establishing the significance or value of its safety risks.

Safety Risk Management (SRM): means a process within a transit agency's Safety Plan for identifying hazards, assessing the hazards, and mitigating safety risk.

Safety Risk Mitigation: means the activities whereby a public transportation agency controls the probability or severity of the potential consequences of hazards.

Safety Risk Probability: means the likelihood that a consequence might occur, taking as reference the worst foreseeable, but credible, condition.

Safety Risk Severity: means the anticipated effects of a consequence, should the consequence materialize, taking as reference the worst foreseeable, but credible, condition.

Serious Injury: means any injury which:

- Requires hospitalization for more than 48 hours, commencing within seven days from the date that the injury was received;
- Results in a fracture of any bone (except simple fractures of fingers, toes, or nose);
- Causes severe hemorrhages, nerve, muscle, or tendon damage;
- Involves any internal organ; or
- Involves second- or third-degree burns, or any burns affecting more than 5 percent of the body surface.

Small Public Transportation Provider: means a recipient or subrecipient of Federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. 5307 that has one hundred (100) or fewer vehicles in peak revenue service and does not operate a rail fixed guideway public transportation system.

State: means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, or the Territories of Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

State of Good Repair: means the condition in which a capital asset is able to operate at a full level of performance.

State Safety Oversight Agency: means an agency established by a State that meets the requirements and performs the functions specified by 49 U.S.C. 5329(e) and the regulations set forth in 49 CFR part 674.

Transit Agency: means an operator of a public transportation system.

Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan: means the strategic and systematic practice of procuring, operating, inspecting, maintaining, rehabilitating, and replacing transit capital assets to manage their





performance, risks, and costs over their life cycles, for the purpose of providing safe, cost-effective, and reliable public transportation, as required by 49 U.S.C. 5326 and 49 CFR part 625.

Vehicle Revenue Miles (VRM): means the miles that vehicles are scheduled to or actually travel while in revenue service. Vehicle revenue miles include layover/recovery time and exclude deadhead; operator training; vehicle maintenance testing; and school bus and charter services.

B. Additional Acronyms Used

ARC: Accident Review Committee ASP: Agency Safety Plan dba: doing business as **EMP:** Emergency Medical Personnel ESRP: Employee Safety Reporting Program FAST Act: Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act FRS: Fixed Route Service HCTD: Hill Country Transit District **KTMPO:** Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization MAP-21: Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act **MOU:** Memorandum of Understanding MPO: Metropolitan Planning Organization **NTD:** National Transit Database SDS: Safety Data Sheet **SOP:** Standard Operating Procedure **STS:** Special Transit Service TAMP: Maintenance Plan and Transit Asset Management Plan **TxDOT:** Texas Department of Transportation





6. APPENDIX B

A. Board Minutes or Resolution

Board of Directors Resolution, adopting the HCTD PTASP, is shown on the following page.



Hill Country Transit District Agency Safety Plan



HILL COUNTRY TRANSIT DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS RESOLUTION

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF SAN SABA

On the 25th day of June, 2020, at a meeting of the Board of Directors of Hill Country Transit District, held in the city of San Saba, San Saba County, with a quorum of the Directors present, the following business was conducted:

It was duly moved and seconded that the following Resolution be adopted:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the above District, as the governing entity responsible for policy decisions, have reviewed and do hereby approve the Hill Country Transit District Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP), which will provide guidance to HCTD staff in achieving the highest practicable level of safety. The Plan includes processes for Safety Risk Management, Safety Assurance, and Safety Promotion, and supports the National Safety Program.

The above resolution was passed by a majority of those present and voting in accordance with the By-Laws.

I certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and correct copy of a part of the minutes of a meeting of the Board of Directors of Hill Country Transit District held on the 25th day of June, 2020.

Board Chair

Subscribed and sworn to before me, <u>hourse</u> Moreno, a Notary Public for the State of Texas, on the <u>29th</u> day of <u>June</u>, 2020.



Notary Public

State of Texas Warma Signature:



Item 9: Public Input



_ _ _ _ _ _ .

Agenda Item #9

Public Input Received

KTMPO has been collecting public comments received online, via emails, public hearings, meetings, social media accounts, web maps and other forms of communication. Staff bring these to the TAC and TPPB on a regular basis to ensure the MPO boards are aware of public concerns and have the opportunity to respond accordingly. Public input received through November 2020 is included in meeting packet.

Action Needed: No action needed; for discussion only.

	KILLEEN-TEMPLE metropolitan planning organization							
			KTMPO Public Comments					
	FY21							
Date	Name	Means of Public Comment	Public Comment	Date Comment Was Presented to TAC	Public Comment Topic	Jurisdiction		

Grant Opportunities

• Texas Volkswagen Environmental Mitigation Program:

Deadline first come first served

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ):

The purpose of this grant is to replace or repower local freight and port drayage trucks. Any person or entity who operates an eligible local freight or port drayage truck at least 51% of the vehicle's annual mileage in one of the Priority Areas is potentially eligible to apply for the grant. Bell County is one of the Priority Areas. More information can be found at the below website.

Estimated Funding Available: \$33,000,000

https://www.tceq.texas.gov/news/releases/texas-volkswagen-environmental-mitigationprogram-accepting-applications

• Emissions Reduction Incentive Grants (ERIG) Program:

Deadline January 11, 2021

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ):

The purpose of this grant is to replace or repower heavy duty or station equipment, marine vessels, and locomotives or retrofit engine systems to electrify them or reduce emissions. All replaced or retrofitted projects must be used at least 55% of the time in one of the Priority Areas is potentially eligible to apply for the grant. The Austin area is an eligible Priority Area. More information can be found at the below website. Estimated Funding Available: \$10,000,000

https://www.tceq.texas.gov/airquality/terp/erig.html

Websites:

Grants.Gov: https://www.grants.gov/

TxDOT: https://www.txdot.gov/government/funding.html

USDOT: https://www.transportation.gov/grants

FTA: https://www.transit.dot.gov/funding/grants/grant-programs

TERP: https://www.tceq.texas.gov/airquality/terp

KTMPO Contacts, Acronyms, and Terms



Chairman:

Mayor Jose Segarra City of Killeen 101 N. College Street Killeen, Texas 76540 <u>mayor@killeentexas.gov</u> Phone: (254) 290-0548 Alternate: Kent Cagle, Danielle Singh

Vice Chairman:

Mayor Bradi Diaz City of Copperas Cove PO Drawer 1449; 914 S. Main St., Ste. C Copperas Cove, TX 76522 Phone: (254) 547-4221 bdiaz@copperascovetx.gov

Alternate: Ryan Haverlah, Dan Yancey, Bobby Lewis

Mayor Tim Davis City of Temple 2 North Main #103, Temple TX 76501

Phone: (254) 298-5301 Fax: (254) 298-5637 tdavis@templetx.gov

Alternate: Brynn Myers, Lynn Barrett, Brian Chandler, Jason Deckman, Erin Smith

Councilmember Susan Long City of Temple 2 North Main St., STE 103 Temple, TX 76501 Phone: (254) 774-5700 susan.long@templetx.gov Alternate: Erin Smith, Brynn Myers, Jason Deckman

Mayor Spencer Smith City of Harker Heights 305 Miller's Crossing, Harker Heights, TX 76548 Phone: (254) 953-5600 Fax: (254) 953-5605 <u>shsmith@harkerheights.gov</u> Alternate: David Mitchell, Kristina Ramirez

Councilmember Butch Menking City of Killeen 101 N. College Street Killeen, TX 76540 Phone: (254) 501-7600 <u>bmenking@killeentexas.gov</u> Alternate: Danielle Singh

5

Councilmember Jim Kilpatrick City of Killeen 101 N. College Street Killeen, TX 76540 Phone: (254) 526-2710 jkilpatrick@killeentexas.gov

Alternate: Kent Cagle, Daniele Singh

Councilmember David Leigh City of Belton 333 Water Street, Belton, TX 76513 Phone: (254) 933-1000 <u>dkleigh@beltontexas.gov</u> Alternate: Sam Listi, Marion Grayson, Bob Van Til

Judge David Blackburn Bell County Historic Courthouse 101 E. Central Avenue Belton, Texas 76513 Phone: (254) 933-5105 Fax: (254) 933-5179 David.blackburn@bellcounty.texas.gov Alternate: Bobby Whitson

Judge Roger Miller Coryell County Main Street Annex 800 E. Main Street, Suite A Gatesville, TX 76528 Phone: (254) 865-5911, ext. 2222 Fax: (254) 865-2040 countyjudge@coryellcounty.org Alternate:

POLICY BOARD



POLICY BOARD

Commissioner Mark Rainwater

Lampasas County P.O. Box 231 Lampasas, TX 76550 Phone: (512)734-0742 Fax: (512)556-8270 rainwater150@gmail.com

Alternate: Robert Carroll

Darrell Burtner

Director of Urban Operations, Hill Country Transit District 4515 W US 190, Belton, TX 76513 Phone: (254) 933-3700 <u>dburtner@takethehop.com</u> Alternate: Derek Czapnik

Stan Swiatek, P.E. District Engineer, TxDOT Waco 100 S. Loop Drive Waco, TX 76704 Phone: (254) 867-2700 Fax: (254) 867-2890 <u>Stan.swiatek@txdot.gov</u> Alternate: Victor Goebel, Liz Bullock, Brenton Lane

Elias Rmeili, P.E. TxDOT Brownwood District Engineer 2495 Hwy 183 North Brownwood, TX 76802 Phone: (325) 643-0411 Fax: (325) 643-0364 elias.rmeili@txdot.gov Alternate: Jason Scantling

NON VOTING MEMBERS

Brian Dosa Ft. Hood Public Works Director Building 4612 Fort Hood, TX 76544 Phone: (254) 287-2113 brian.l.dosa.civ@mail.mil

Alternate: Kristina Manning

Justin P. Morgan

Federal Highway Administration, Texas Division 300 East 8th Street, Rm 826 Austin, Texas 78701 (512) 536-5943 Justin.morgan@dot.gov



Kent Cagle

Killeen City Manager 101 N. College St., Killeen, TX, 76541 Phone: (254) 501-7700 <u>kcagle@killeentexas.gov</u> Alternate: MD Hossain, Danielle Singh

Robert Lewis

Copperas Cove Planning Director P.O. Drawer 1449 Copperas Cove, TX 76522 Phone: (254) 547-4221 rlewis@copperascovetx.gov Alternate: Ryan Haverlah

Kristina Ramirez

Harker Heights Planning Director 305 Miller's Crossing Harker Heights, TX 76548 Phone: (254) 953-5663 <u>kramirez@harkerheights.gov</u> Alternate: David Mitchell

Bob van Til

Belton Interim Planning Director 333 Water St., Belton, TX 76513 Phone: (254) 933-5813 <u>bvantil@beltontexas.gov</u> Alternate: Sam Listi

Brian Chandler

Temple Planning Director 2 North Main, Temple, TX 76501 Phone: (254) 298-5272 <u>bchandler@templetx.gov</u> Alternate: Don Bond, Lynn Barrett, Brynn Myers, Jason Deckman, Erin Smith, David Olson

Bryan Neaves, P.E. Bell County Engineer P. O. Box 264, Belton, TX 76513 Phone: (254) 933-5275 bryan.neaves@bellcounty.texas.gov Alternate: Malcolm Miller

Judge Roger Miller

Coryell County Main Street Annex 800 E. Main Street, Suite A Gatesville, TX 76528 Phone: (254) 865-5911, ext. 2221 Fax: (254) 865-2040 countyjudge@coryellcounty.org Alternate:

Commissioner Mark Rainwater

Lampasas County P.O. Box 231 Lampasas, TX 76550 Phone: (512)734-0742 Fax: (512)556-8270 rainwater150@gmail.com Alternate:

Victor Goebel, P.E.

Director, Transportation Planning & Development, TxDOT Waco 100 South Loop Drive, Waco TX 76704-2858 Phone: 254-867-2865 Fax: 254-867-2738 <u>victor.goebel@txdot.gov</u> Alternate: Christi Bonham, Brenton

Lane Jason Scantling, P.E.

Director, Transportation Planning & Development, TxDOT Brownwood 2495 Hwy 183 North, Brownwood, TX 76802 Phone: 325-643-0411 Fax: 325-643-0364 jason.scantling@txdot.gov Alternate:

Darrell Burtner

Director of Urban Operations, Hill Country Transit District 4515 W US 190, Belton, TX 76513 Phone: (254) 933-3700 dburtner@takethehop.com Alternate: Derek Czpanik

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

NON VOTING MEMBERS

Brian Dosa Ft. Hood Public Works Director Building 4612 Fort Hood, TX 76544 Phone: (254) 287-2113 brian.l.dosa.civ@mail.mil

Justin P. Morgan

Federal Highway Administration, Texas Division 300 East 8th Street, Rm 826 Austin, TX 75093 justin.morgan@dot.gov

Brigida Gonzalez

TxDOT TPP MPO Coordinator 118 E. Riverside Dr. Austin, TX 78704 Phone: (512) 486-5048 brigida.gonzalez@txdot.gov

Christi Bonham

TxDOT Waco District Transportation Planner 100 South Loop Drive, Waco TX 76704-2858 Phone: (254) 867-2751 Fax: (254) 867-2738 christi.bonham@txdot.gov

Stephen Kasberg

TxDOT Waco District/Bell County Area Engineer 410 West Loop 121 Belton, TX 76513 Phone: (254) 939-3778 stephen.kasberg@txdot.gov

Kara Escajeda

Nolanville City Manager 101 North 5th Street Nolanville. TX 76559 Phone: (254) 698-6335 kescajeda@nolanvilletx.us


Chair Kara Escajeda

Nolanville City Manager Phone: (254) 317-5004 101 North 5th Street, Nolanville, TX 76559 Email: <u>kescajeda@nolanvilletx.us</u>

Vice Chair Brian Chandler

Temple Planning Director Phone: (254) 493-4971 2 North Main Street, Temple, TX 76501 Email: <u>bchandler@templetx.gov</u> Alternate: Jason Deckman

Courtney Peres

City of Harker Heights Phone: (254) 953-5643 305 Miller's Crossing, Harker Heights, TX 76548 Email: <u>cperes@harkerheights.gov</u>

Matt Bates Belton Park and Recreation Director Phone: (254) 317-0687 P.O. Box 120 401 N. Alexander, Belton, TX 76513 Email: <u>mbates@beltontexas.gov</u>

Pete Vento

Killeen Parks & Recreation Manager Phone: (254) 501-7877 2201 E Veterans Memorial Blvd, Killeen, TX 76543 Email: <u>pvento@killeentexas.gov</u>

Jeff Stoddard

Copperas Cove Parks & Recreation Director Phone: (254) 542-2719 1206 W. Ave. B, Copperas Cove, Texas 76522 Email: jstoddard@copperascovetx.gov

Erika Kunkel

TxDOT Waco District Phone: (254) 867-2728 100 S. Loop Drive, Waco, TX 76704 Email: <u>Erika.Kunkel@txdot.gov</u>

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Kristina Manning Ft. Hood Phone: (254) 458-6678 Email: <u>Kristina.I.manning.civ@mail.mil</u> Alternate: Michael Love

Pamela Terry Citizen Representative Email: <u>TERRYP8@nationwide.com</u>

Carlos Santiago Fort Hood Riders and Roadkill Cycling Club Representative Phone: (720) 521-2653 Email: <u>cl.santiago_83@yahoo.com</u>

Keller Matthews BS&W Cycling Club/Citizen Representative 600 S 25th St, Temple, TX Email: KMATTHEWS@sw.org

John Wiist King of the Mountain Cyclery Phone: (254) 444-0566 100 A North Main St, Nolanville, TX 76559 Email: <u>1komjohn@gmail.com</u>

Chad Welch

Tri-City Bicycles/Citizen Representative 112 N East St, Belton, TX 76513 Email: <u>welchc01@live.com</u> Alternate: Mike Anderson

Mike Anderson Tri-City Bicycles/Citizen Alternate Email: <u>mikeande@att.net</u>



Liz Bullock

Transportation Planner TxDOT Waco District 100 South Loop Drive, Waco TX 76704-2858 Phone: (254) 867-2751 Fax: (254) 867-2738 liz.bullock@txdot.gov

Raul Amado

SVP Logistics Baylor Scott and White 2401 S. 31st St, Temple, TX 76508 Phone: (254) 724-6605 ramado@sw.org

Tiffany Melvin

President,NASCO 4347 W. Northwest Hwy, Suite 130-250 Dallas, TX 75220 Phone: (214) 744-1042 tiffany@nasconetwork.com

Judge David Blackburn

County Judge Bell County 101 E. Central Avenue Belton, TX 76513 Phone: (254) 933-5105 davidblackburn@bellcounty.texas.gov

Kara Escajeda

City Manager City of Nolanville 101 N. 5th St Nolanville, TX 76559 Phone: (254) 698-6335 <u>Kara.escajeda@ci.nolanville.tx.us</u>

Don Bond

Director of Public Works City of Temple 3210 E. Ave H, Bldg. A, Ste. 107 Temple, TX 76501 Phone: (254) 298-5621 dbond@templetx.gov

David A. Olson

Assistant City Manager City of Temple 2 N. Main Street Suite #306 Temple, TX 76501 Phone: (254) 298-5600 dolson@templetx.gov

Georgi Ann Jasenovec

Freight Operations and Int'l Border FHWA—TX Division 300 E. 8th St. Austin, TX 78701 Phone: (512) 536-5921 Georgi.jasenovec@dot.gov

Sondra D. Johnson

Transportation Planner—Freight TxDOT 125 E. 11 St. Austin, TX 78701 Phone: (512) 936-0922 Sondra.johnson@txdot.gov

Keith Fruge

Chief-Master Planning Branch Ft. Hood Bldg 4622 Engineer Dr. Ft. Hood, TX Phone: (254) 288-2756 keith.j.fruge.civ@mail.mil

FREIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Phil Haggerty

Asst. Superintendent of Business Services Belton ISD P.O. Box 269 Belton, TX 76513 Phone: (254) 215-2065 phil.haggerty@bisd.net

Matthew Van Valkenburgh

Executive Director of Aviation Killeen-Ft. Hood Regional Airport 8701 S. Clear Creek Rd. Killeen, TX 76541 Phone; (254) 501-8701 mvanvalkenburgh@killeentexas.gov

James O'Donley

Regional Manager BNSF Railway-Temple 2100 Barker Blvd. Temple, TX 76501 Phone: (817) 867-6137 James.odonley@bnsf.com

Michael Bolin, P.E.

Deputy District Engineer TxDOT Waco District 100 South Loop Dr. Waco, TX 76704 Phone: (254) 867-2740 mchael.bolin@txdot.gov

David Lutz

Operations Manager Temple & Central Texas Railway (Patriot Way) 3111 Eberhart Rd. Temple, TX 76504 Phone: (254) 931-9545 David.Lutz@PatriotRail.com



Kaylon Page

Project Manager Wheeler Coatings Asphalt (Old Castle Materials) 1320 Arrow Point Dr. Suite 600 Cedar Park, TX 78613 Phone: 903-348-8651 kaylon.page@oldcastlematerials.com

Barry Egbert

Operations Manager Wheeler Coatings Asphalt (Old Castle Materials) 1320 Arrow Point Dr. Suite 600 Cedar Park, TX 78613 Phone: (512) 694-6915 barry.egbert@oldcastlematerials.com

James Tarvin

Operations Manager Wheeler coatings Asphalt (Old Castle Materials) 701 S. Loop 340 Waco, TX 76706 Phone: (254) 752-7557 james.tarvin@oldcastlematerials.com

Joe Barber

Manager Wheeler Coatings Asphalt (Old Castle Materials) 1320 Arrow Point Dr, Suite 600 Cedar Park, TX 78613 Phone: (512) 861-7100 jbarber@oldcastlematerials.com

Rex Ross

General Manager Miller Springs Materials 6218 N. Hwy 317 Belton, TX 76513 Phone: (254) 780-9959 rexross@millerspringsmaterials.com

Jim Boultinghouse

Quarry Manager Miller Springs Materials 6218 N. Hwy 317 Belton, TX 76513 Phone: (254) 780-9959 jboultinghouse@prim.com

Rick Lewis

Area Manager, Belton Operations PSC James Construction Group 5880 W. US 190 Belton, TX 76513 Phone: (254) 939-8610 rlewis@jcgllc.com

Michael Smart

Field Service Representative DRS Technologies 7720 Airport Blvd, Building 13 Temple, TX 76502 Phone: (254) 770-3220 mrsmart@drs-rsta.com

Brian Ranly

Manager, Logistics & Operations Wilsonart Inc. 10535 NW HK Dodgen Loop Temple, TX 76502 Phone: (254) 207-6372 ranlyb@wilsonart.com

Jim Butler

General Manager Fikes Wholesale P.O. Box 6115 2828 Industrial Blvd Temple, TX 76501 Phone: (254) 774-1932 jbutler@gpscarriers.com

FREIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Jim VonAchen

Director of Transportation Support McLane Company Inc. P.O. Box 6115 2828 Industrial Blvd Temple, TX 76501 Phone: (254) 771-7590 jim.vonachen@mclaneco.com

Danny Rimbert

Transportation Manager McLane Company Inc 2828 Industrial Blvd Temple, TX 76501 Phone: (254) 770-2893 danny.rimbert@mclaneco.com

Ginger Watkins

Economic Development Director Cameron Industrial Foundation 102 E. First St. Cameron, TX 76520 Phone: (254) 697-4970 gwatkins@cameronindustrialfoundati on.com

Kale Driemeier

Planner, Freight and International Trade Section Texas Department of Transportation 125 East 11th St., Austin, TX 78701 Phone: (512) 936-0961 Kale.Driemeier@txdot.gov

Justin Morgan

Transportation Planner FHWA-Texas Division J.J. Pickle Federal Building 300 E. 8th Street, Suite 826 Austin, TX 78701 Phone: (512) 536-5943 Justin.Morgan@dot.gov



FREIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

James Mulheron

Traffic Management Specialist LRC, Transportation Division Fort Hood Fort Hood, TX Phone: (254)553-1921 james.a.mulheron.civ@mail.mil

Daniel Dougherty

LRC, Transportation Division Fort Hood Fort Hood, TX Phone: (254) 288-4587 daniel.w.dougherty.civ@mail.mil

Collin Hill

Location Manger Livestock Nutrition Center 713 B. Industrial Blvd Cameron, TX 76520 Phone: (254) 605-0705 collinh@lnc-online.com



STAFF

Uryan Nelson MPO Director Phone: (254) 770-2373 Fax: (254) 770-2360 uryan.nelson@ctcog.org

Kendra Coufal Planning Services Manager Phone: (254) 770-2363 Fax: (254) 770-2360 kendra.coufal@ctcog.org

James McGill

Regional Planner Phone (254) 770-2366 Fax: (254) 770-2360 james.mcgill@ctcog.org

Helen Owens

Regional Planner Phone (254) 770-2364 Fax: (254) 770-2360 helen.owens@ctcog.org



Commonly Used Transportation Related Acronyms and Terms

Organizations	Terms
КТМРО	ТМА
Killeen – Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization	Transportation Management Area
ТРРВ (КТМРО)	MAP - 21
Transportation Planning Policy Board	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21 st Century
	(legislation replaced SAFETEA-LU in July 2012)
TAC (KTMPO)	SAFETEA – LU
Technical Advisory Committee	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation
	Equity Act
FHWA	MPO
U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration	Metropolitan Planning Organization
FTA	UPWP
U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration	Unified Planning Work Program
TxDOT	МТР
Texas Department of Transportation	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
TCEQ	TIP
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality	Transportation Improvement Program
тті	STIP
Texas A&M Transportation Institute	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
CTCOG	STP-MM
Central Texas Council of Governments	Surface Transportation Program – Metropolitan Mobility
HCTD or "The HOP"	ТАР
Hill Country Transit District	Transportation Alternatives Program
CTRTAG	UTP
Central Texas Regional Transportation Advisory Group	Unified Transportation Program
BPAC	CMAQ
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement
	Program
	UA or UZA
	Urbanized Area
	EJ or "Title VI"
	Environmental Justice
	СМР
	Congestion Management Process
	ITS
	Intelligent Transportation Systems
	NAAQS
	National Ambient Air Quality Standards

A comprehensive listing with definitions is available under Transportation Planning Resources at <u>www.ktmpo.org</u>. Pages 61-65 of the publication "The Transportation Planning Process... is a great resource for commonly used Transportation terms.

2045 MTP Project Listing



2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Project Listing

				MPO PROPOSITION 1/CATEGORY 2 PROJE	CTS (METRC)POLITAN C	ORRIDOF	RS)				
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
C30-03b	0231-02-062	Business US 190 Phase I	FM 1113 (Avenue D) to Constitution Dr	Construction of a raised median and conversion of one travel lane in each direction to a sidewalk/bicycle lane	81.00	4	4	\$10,000,000	2021	Yes	EJ	
W40-04a (1)	2502-01-021	Loop 121 Phase 1a	Lake Rd (FM 439) to US 190	Widen from two lanes to four lanes with a raised median	56.45	14	5	\$28,000,000	2021	Yes	EJ, H, P	, A
W35-07	0320-06-008	NW Loop 363	Industrial Blvd to Lucius McCelvey Dr	Construct interchange and expand two to four lanes with frontage roads	72.00	3	1	\$45,000,000	2025	Yes	Н	4-year UT
W35-01	0231-19-003	US 190 Bypass	Lampasas County Line to US 190 W of Clarke Rd	Widen from two lanes to four lanes divided and construct interchange	68.27	9	2	\$48,150,000	2025	Yes	L, H,	
				CATEGORY 4 PROJECTS (STATEWI	DE URBAN C	ONNECTIVI	TY)					
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
W45-01	0231-03-152	IH 14 Advanced Traffic Management System	Coryell County Line to FM 3423 (Indian Trail)	Construction of fiber optics, traffic cameras and Dynamic Message Boards	73.33	2	11	\$6,200,000	2021	Yes	EJ, L, H	4-y W
			CATEGC	ORY 7 PROJECTS (SURFACE TRANSPORTATI	ON PROGR	AM-METR	OPOLIT	AN MOBILI	TY)			
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
T40-15	0184-03-039 0232-01-053	Adams Ave/Central Ave. Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements	IH-35 to MLK Jr Blvd (Spur 290)	Installation of ADA compliant sidewalks traveling east on Central Avenue from 31st Street to 3rd Street and west on Adams Avenue from 3rd Street to 31st Street with tapered connections to existing sidewalks at bridges	92.00	2	2	\$1,913,044	2021	Yes	EJ, H	
T40-07a	0909-36-168	Temple Outer Loop West-Phase I	522 ft South of Jupiter Dr to 20 ft North of Riverside Trail	Widen from two to four lane divided roadway with a curb and gutter, Phase 1	64.67	17	4	\$10,298,198	2021	No	P, H	4-year UT
N40-04	0909-36-167	Nolanville City Park Connectivity	Park (North Mesquite) along Ave H to 10th St	Construct ADA compliant sidewalks, ramps, and crosswalks	72.34	6	3	\$1,558,802	2021	No	Р	
				MPO CATEGORY 9 PROJECTS (TRANSPOR	TATION AL	TERNATIV	e progf	RAM)				
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
B45-03	0909-36-169	13th Avenue Sidewalk & Shared Use Path	Main St (SH 317) to Waco Rd (FM 817)	Construct 5 ft sidewalks on the north side of 13th Ave from Main St to Woodall; Transition to 10 ft SUP from Woodall to Waco Rd	72.16	7	4	\$423,611	2022	No	Ρ	4-year U
			STATEW	IDE CATEGORY 9 PROJECTS (TRANSPORTA	ATION ALTE	RNATIVE S	SET-ASIC	DE PROGRA	AM)			
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
B40-05	0909-36-163	Belton Hike and Bike Trail Extension South (South Belton Shared Use Path)	IH-35 from FM 436 to Confederate Park Dr	Construct 12 ft wide hike and bike trail. Project will extend along FM 436, IH-35 northbound frontage road and Confederate Park Drive.	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,790,571	2021	No	EJ, P	
	STATEWIDE CATEGORY 9 PROJECTS (SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROGRAM)											
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
D45-03	0909-36-180	Troy - Mays Middle School SRTS	On Lee Mays Blvd and Luther Curtis Rd to Raymond Mays Middle School	Construct 0.2 miles of accessible sidewalks with crosswalks and ADA ramps.	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$277,571	2021	No	N/A	

Short Range Funded (2020-2030) Projects with Allocated Funding as of October 2020 and Listed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Funding Allocation: \$131,150,000 ITP Fiscal Constraint: \$68,585,914 Funding Allocation: \$6,200,000 year UTP Fiscal Constraint: Vaco District: \$59,730,508 Brownwood District: \$0 Funding Allocation: \$13,770,044 JTP Fiscal Constraint: \$23,549,569 Funding Allocation: \$423,611 JTP Fiscal Constraint: \$1,576,040 Funding Allocation: \$1,790,571 Fiscal Constraint: n/a Funding

Allocation: \$277,571 Fiscal Constraint: n/a

Other Projects												
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	Funding
C45-01	3623-01-004	Fort Hood Access Ramps	Old Georgetown Rd to BNSF Railway	Construct exit ramp to Tank Destroyer Blvd and entrance ramp from Old Georgetown Rd	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$5,015,690	2021	N/A	_	Local Contribution (Cat 3) Allocation: \$5,015,690 Fiscal Constraint: n/a
C30-03b	0231-02-062	Business US 190 Phase I	FM 1113 (Avenue D) to Constitution Dr	Construction of a raised median and conversion of one travel lane in each direction to a sidewalk/bicycle lane	81.00	4	4	\$420,000	2021	Yes	EJ	Cat 10 Allocation: \$420,000 Fiscal Constrain: n/a
			GROU	IPED PROJECTS								4 Year Total TIP Allocation: \$159,047,487
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	FY2019-2022 TIP	FY2021-2024 TIP						*Excludes grouped projects, matches current TIP financial summary
G01-PE	Various CSJs	Preventative Projects	Various Locations	Various Descriptions	\$0	\$0						10 Year Total UTP Fiscal Constraint: \$254,490,702
G03-MT	Various CSJs	Maintenance Projects	Various Locations	Various Descriptions	\$20,009,216	\$16,146,611						MTP 10 Year Short Range Fiscal Constraint: \$49,500,000
G04-BR	Various CSJs	Bridge Projects	Various Locations	Various Descriptions	\$1,400,000	\$10,590,000						MTP Long Range Fiscal Constraint: \$405,700,000
G06-SA	Various CSJs	Safety Projects	Various Locations	Various Descriptions	\$2,690,079	\$14,418,916]					

Proposed Roadway, Transportation Choices/Livability, Transit, and Preventative Maintenance Projects

				RUADWATPRO	JIECIS							
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
W30-17	1835-01-026	FM 93 Phase 1 and 2	SH 317 to Wheat Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with a bike lane and 6 ft sidewalks	64.81	16	3	\$8,794,843	2025/2026	Yes	EJ, H, P	
T40-07b	0909-36-174	Temple Outer Loop West Phase II	454 ft South of Dove Meadow Blvd to IH-35 S	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway with a curb and gutter; includes hike and bike trail and bike dedicated lanes to incorporate multimodal transportation	64.67	17	4	\$9,701,802	2027	No	P, H	
К30-13	0909-36-175 0909-36-172	Chaparral Rd	SH 195 to FM 3481 (Stillhouse Hollow Lake Rd)	Reconstruct and widen roadway from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway with bicycle/pedestrian facilities.	59.99	27	5	\$23,000,000	2023	No	EJ, H	Voors E 10 S
D40-01	N/A	North Waco Rd (Old 81)	West Main St to West Big Elm Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes, with curb, gutter, and bridge improvements	52.64	44	6	\$4,600,000	TBD	No		UTP 10-Ye
Н30-05	0909-36-171	Warriors Path Upgrade	FM 2410 (Knights Way) to Old Nolanville Rd	Create a two lane road section with a curb, gutter, and left turn lane at a future school; 6 ft sidewalk on west side and a 10 ft wide hike and bike path on east side	48.17	50	7	\$8,968,950	2025	No	Н	*Available = L
N40-03	N/A	Old Nolanville Road Bridge Expansion and Bike/Pedestrian Project	Bridge on Old Nolanville Rd to US 190/IH 14	Reconstruct bridge on Old Nolanville Road and add multi-use trail system to connect to existing trail system.	49.84	46	8	\$1,602,700	TBD	No		Ra
S40-03	N/A	Salado West Village Road Capacity and Enhancement Project	Thomas Arnold Rd to IH-35	Widen roadway, add turn lanes and bicycle/pedestrian facilities	36.45	66	9	\$300,500	2028	No		
W25-02	0184-02-055	SH 36	SH 317 to Lake Belton Bridge	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway	71.63	5	13	\$36,715,000	2026	No	Р	
T15-06k	0015-14-109	IH 35	US 190/IH 14 to Loop 363	Reconstruct and widen to 8 lanes	78.27	1	10	\$129,700,000	2029	Yes	EJ, H	
C35-02ab⁵	0724-01-055	FM 116 Railroad Underpass	S Main (through existing parking facility) to Ave B	Create an underpass at the existing BNSF railroad with sidewalks	71.73	4	12	\$13,470,000	2023	Yes	EJ	
W35-04	N/A	FM 439	Roy Reynolds Drive to FM 3219	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	70.27	6	14	\$11,539,000	2027	No	EJ	
H45-03	0184-02-055	FM 3481 (Stillhouse Lake Rd) Phase 1	Prospector Trail to Proposed Chaprarral Rd Intersection	Widen roadway from 2 to 4 lanes with a continous center turn lane and sidewalks	69.33	7	15	\$6,566,500	2026/2027	No	H, ARZ, P	
W30-23	0184-04-051	US 190/Loop 363	FM 1741 to FM 436	Upgrade to 4 lane freeway with continous frontage roads and grade separation at MLK Blvd	68.36	8	16	\$16,784,000	2025	Yes	EJ	
C30-03a	N/A	Business US 190 - Phase II	FM 1113 (Ave D) to FM 116 South	Convert the center turn lane to a controlled left turn lane with raised median, maintain the two existing travel lanes, add curb, gutter, and bike lanes on both sides of the roadway, 6 ft sidewalk on the south side and pedestrian crossings with curb ramps at street intersections	68.16	10	17	\$7,400,000	2022	Yes	EJ	
W35-08	N/A	FM 93	FM 1741 to SH 95	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes, provide for a raised median and construct grade separation at UP RR	66.44	11	18	\$12,588,000	TBD	Yes	Н	
H45-01	N/A	E FM 2410 (E. Knights Way) Phase 1	Cedar Knob Rd to Warriors Path	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes with a continous turn lane, curb, gutter and sidewalks	66.35	12	19	\$5,561,600	TBD	Nia		
W30-13		Loop 363 at FM 2305 (Adams Ave)	Intersection of Loop 363 and FM 2305 (Adams	widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway	65.99	13	20	\$3,147,000	IBD	NO	۲	
W30-21		Reconfiguration	Ave)	Reconstruct interchange at FM 2305 (Adams Ave) and Loop 363 Widen from two to four lanes with a center turn lane and roundabouts at Featherline Rd and	65.45	14	21	\$18,000,000	1BD	Yes	EJ	
N4U-24	N/A			Stagecoach Rd and Stagecoach Rd at W.S. Young Dr	65.00	15	22	\$9,000,000	2025	NO	EJ	
H15-01	N/A	FM 3423 (Indian Trail)	Business 190 (VMB) to US 190/IH-14	Construct an urban cross-section roadway with sidewalks, median and pedestrian enhancements within the appropriate context sensitive cross section	64.55	18	23	\$3,391,800	TBD	No		Years 11-25 L MTP Long Ra
T35-36a	N/A	S 1st Street/Spur 290 Improvements	SE Loop 363 to Ave M	Widen from 4 lane undivided to 4 lane divided roadway with a curb, gutter and hike and bike trails to incorporate multimodal design	64.45	19	24	\$8,500,000	TBD	Yes	EJ	
К40-11	N/A	WS Young Dr	Mall Dr to AJ Hall Blvd	Add turn lane and relocate traffic signal at Mall Dr to AJ Hall Blvd	64.09	20	25	\$4,889,549	TBD	Yes	EJ	
N40-06	N/A	Nolanville Railroad Crossing Safety	Pleasant Hill Cemetary Rd to Jack Rabbit Road (4 RR Crossings)	Upgrade crossings for better connections and safety	63.18	21	26	\$500,000	TBD	No		
D40-03	N/A	Old TX 81 - Phase I	FM 1237 to Loves Overpass	Widen roadway from 2 to 4 lanes with bicycle lanes, a curb and gutter	61.55	22	27	\$3,500,000	TBD	No	н	
H45-04	N/A	FM 3481 (Stillhouse Lake Rd) Phase 2	Proposed Chaparral Rd Intersection to South City Limits	Widen roadway from 2 to 4 lanes with a continuous center turn lane and sidewalks	60.84	24	28	\$6,306,620	TBD	No	H, ARZ, P	
К40-16	N/A	East Trimmier Rd Improvements	Stagecoach Rd to Chaparral Rd	Widen roadway from 2 to 4 lanes with a continuous center turn lane, sidewalks and bicycle lanes	60.84	23	29	\$7,000,000	TBD	No	EJ	
H30-01	N/A	Business US 190 (Veterans Memorial Blvd)	N Roy Reynolds to US 190/IH-14	Reduce roadway profile, install curb and gutter; add access management/driveway control, drainage improvements, sidewalks, medians and other context sensitive solutions	60.19	26	30	\$5,000,000	TBD	No	EJ, L, H	
B40-10	N/A	FM 1670	US 190 to Three Creeks Blvd	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with a 10 ft hike and bike trail	59.45	28	31	\$5,643,360	TBD	No	EJ, H	
W35-02	N/A	SH 195 at FM 3470 (SS Loop) Reconstruction	Intersection of SH 195 at FM 3470 (Stan Schlueter Loop)	Upgrade interchange	59.17	29	32	\$52,450,000	TBD	Yes	EJ	
T45-16	N/A	S 1st Street Extension	Loop 363/US 190 to Blackland Rd	Constuct arterial thoroughfare with street trees, sidewalks and bike lanes.	58.49	30	33	\$10,830,000	2020	No		
К25-04	N/A	SH 195 Overpass	At Business 190	Construct grade separation over Business 190 and BNSF RR	58.35	31	34	\$20,000,000	TBD	Yes	EJ	

$D \cap A \cap M / A V D O I = C T c^7$



B40-11	N/A	FM 2271 (Lake to Lake Road)	FM 1670 to FM 2271	Construct 4 lane roadway with 10 ft wide trail	57.74	32	35	\$49,700,000	TBD	No	EJ, H, P	
T45-15	N/A	Temple Outer Loop - East	IH-35 N to FM 93 at Business 190	Construct a 4 lane divided roadway with a curb and gutter; includes hike and bike trail and dedicated bike lanes to incorporate multimodal transportation	57.34	33	36	\$74,000,000	2023	No	EJ	
B40-07	N/A	Connell St	US 190/IH-14 to Loop 121	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes with center turn lane and 5 ft wide sidewalks	56.64	34	37	\$5,244,000	TBD	No	EJ	
W35-09	N/A	FM 93	SH 95 to SH 36	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes, provide for a raised median	56.37	35	38	\$5,245,000	TBD	Yes	EJ	
К40-26	N/A	Cunningham Rd	US 190/IH-14 to Little Nolan Rd	Construct and widen from 2 to 4 lane road with shoulder, median turn lane, bike and pedestrian facilities	56.27	36	39	\$7,817,350	TBD	No	EJ	
К40-03	N/A	FM 3470 Extension	SH 201 (Clear Creek Rd) to US 190 Bypass	Construct 4 lane FM Road with continuous turn lane and shoulders	56.17	37	40	\$15,000,000	TBD	No	н	
H45-02	N/A	E FM 2410 (E Knights Way) Phase 2	Warriors Path to Rummel Rd	Construct 4 lane FM Road with continuous turn lane and shoulders	55.84	38	41	\$5,149,800	TBD	No	L	
K40-17	N/A	Trimmier Rd Improvements	Stagecoach Rd to Chaparral Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes with a median	55.34	39	42	\$7,900,000	TBD	No	EJ, P	
K30-23	N/A	Jasper Bridge Expansion	S Florence Rd to Jasper Dr	Construct 8 lane overpass with pedestrian improvements and turnarounds	54.99	40	43	\$24,628,150	TBD	No	EJ	
K25-05	N/A	Florence Rd	Elms Rd to Jasper Dr	Widen from 2 to 5 lanes with curb and gutter	54.72	41	44	\$6,292,450	TBD	No	EJ	
B40-08	N/A	Sparta Rd	Loop 121 to Dunn's Canyon Rd	Construct protected turn lane with 10 ft wide hike and bike trail	54.46	42	45	\$2,080,000	TBD	No	Н, Р	
W35-05	N/A	SH 195 at US 190/IH 14	At SH 195	Upgrade interchange	54.36	43	46	\$52,450,000	TBD	Yes	EJ	
T15-02	N/A	Kegley Rd (Phase 2)	856 ft S of FM 2305 to 450 ft S of Wildflower Lane	Widen and add a middle turn lane, curb and gutter; includes 12 ft shared use path and will incorporate multimodal design	51.63	45	47	\$3,800,000	TBD	No	Н	
T45-13	N/A	Little River Rd	SE HK Dodgen Loop to FM 93	Reconstruct two lane arterial roadway with a center-turn lane, bike lanes, and 6 ft sidewalks	49.84	46	48	\$12,888,000	TBD	No	EJ	
K40-25	N/A	Bunny Trail/SH 201 (Clear Creek Rd) Traffic Signal	Intersection of Bunny Trail and SH 201 (Clear Creek Rd)	Install traffic signal	49.36	48	49	\$190,000	TBD	Yes	EJ	
W35-03	N/A	SH 195	FM 3470 (Stan Schlueter Loop) to Chaparral Rd	Reconstruct to a 4 lane freeway with frontage roads	48.45	49	50	\$39,862,000	TBD	Yes	EJ, H	
B40-02	N/A	Southwest Parkway	Loop 121 to W Ave O	Construct 2 lane roadway with center turn lane	48.10	51	51	\$4,200,500	TBD	No		
N45-01	N/A	FM 439 Roundabout	Intersection of Main St (FM 439 Spur) and Avenue I	Construction of a roundabout	47.83	52	52	\$10,000,000	2022	No		Designal
T45-11	N/A	East Young Ave	Lower Troy Rd to Loop 363	Reconstruct and realign roadway from 2 to 4 lanes with a 6 ft wide sidewalk, and a center turn lane.	47.50	53	53	\$3,940,000	2023	No	EJ	Regional
K40-06	N/A	FM 2484	SH 195 to IH-35	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway	45.08	54	54	\$35.000.000	TBD	No	H, ARZ, P	
B30-02	N/A	Shanklin Rd West - Outer Loop	IH-35 to E end of Three Creeks subdivision	Construct 4 lane roadway	44.82	55	55	\$10,820,000	TBD	No		
B40-09	N/A	West Avenue D	Loop 121 to Wheat Rd	Construct 2 lane roadway with sidewalks and bike lanes	44.09	56	56	\$4,918,500	TBD	No	EJ	
N45-03	N/A	Nola Ruth Reconfiguration	Intersection of Nola Ruth Blvd at US 190/IH-14	Improve intersection to enhance safety	43.84	57	57	\$10,000,000	2025	No		
B30-03	N/A	Belton Outer Loop East	IH-35 at Shanklin Rd to FM 436	Construct 2 lane roadway with shoulder	43.46	58	58	\$12,060,000	TBD	No		
B40-01	N/A	Huey Dr	Washington Dr to IH-35 Frontage Rd	Construct 2 lane roadway with a center turn lane	42.92	59	59	\$2,615,000	TBD	No	EJ	
T45-17	N/A	Azalea Dr	Lowes Dr to S 1st St Future Extension	Construct new 2 lane roadway with a continous center turn lane, 5 ft bike lanes, and 6 ft sidewalks	42.50	60	60	\$4,975,000	2020	No	EJ	
B30-01	N/A	George Wilson Extension	FM 93 at George Wilson Rd to FM 439	Construct 2 lane roadway with shoulder	42.19	61	61	\$1,386,984	TBD	No	EJ	
H30-03	N/A	FM 3219	Veterans Memorial Blvd/Business 190 to FM 439	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway	42.10	62	62	\$8,000,000	TBD	No	L,H	
B45-08	N/A	Mesquite Rd Improvements	IH-35 Frontage Rd to Shanklin Rd	Widen to 2 lanes with a curb, gutter, shoulders, bicycle lanes, and a 6 ft wide sidewalk on both sides	41.50	63	63	\$3,591,000	2020	No	н	
N45-02	N/A	FM 439 Shoulder Improvements & Bike Lanes	N 38th St to Sparta Rd	Construct a continuous shoulder and bicycle lane	38.17	64	64	\$1,600,000	2020	Yes	EJ, P	
N40-07	N/A	Warrior's Path Extension Phase I	Old Nolanville Rd to US 190/IH-14	Extend Warriors Path to US 190/IH -14	38.08	65	65	\$5,703,255	TBD	No	Н	
T45-10	N/A	East Ave C	14th St to 24th St	Reconstruct roadway to 2 lanes and add bicycle lanes, sidewalks, lighting, and landscaping.	35.17	67	66	\$2,630,000	2023	No	EJ	
T45-12	N/A	Lake Pointe Dr	SH 317 to Clinite Grove Blvd (Future Collector)	Construct 2 lane roadway with bike lanes and sidewalks	33.49	68	67	\$4,000,000	2023	No		
T45-14	N/A	Lower Troy Rd	East Young Ave to Loop 363	Reconstruct roadway to 2 lanes with a continuous center-turn lane and 6 ft sidewalks	29.33	69	68	\$6,920,000	2023	No	EJ	



H40-03 ⁶	N/A	Chaparral Rd	FM 3481 to Killeen City Limits on Chaparral Rd	Widen and straighten roadway and construct hike and bike trail	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	Н	
C25-02	N/A	FM 1113	Signal Light at FM 116/Ave B to Summers Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes with ADA-compliant sidewalks	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	Н	
C25-04	N/A	North Side Loop	FM 1113 to FM 116	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes with raised median curb and gutter with enclosed storm drainage	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	_	
C40-01	N/A	FM 116 South	Copperas Cove City Limits to SH 201	Upgrade Ivy Gap Rd and Ivy Mountain Rd to FM status, widen roadway from 2 to 5 lanes with curb and gutter	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	EJ, L, H, ARZ	
H40-04	N/A	E FM 2410	E side from FM 2410 Community Park to Simmons Rd	Expand roadway to include curb and gutter, access management control, turning lanes, drainage improvements, and context sensitive solutions	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	EJ, L, H	
N40-08	N/A	Warrior's Path Extension Phase II	US 190 to FM 439	Construct 2 lane roadway	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	_	
N40-10	N/A	FM 439 Safety Improvements	FM 439 at Lonesome Oak Dr	Add turning lane, shoulder expansion and possible traffic signals/signs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	_	
W30-06	N/A	Killeen Airport Entrance	SH 201 at Killeen Airport Entrance	Construct interchange	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	EJ, H	
W40-04a2	N/A	Loop 121 Phase 1b	US 190 to IH-35	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway with a raised median	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	EJ, H, P	
W40-04b	N/A	Loop 121 Phase 2	IH-35 to FM 436	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway with bicycle and pedestrian improvements	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	EJ, H, P	



				TRANSPORTATION CHOICES/	LIVABILITY	PROJECTS	8					
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	
T40-13	0909-36-173	Temple's Georgetown Rails to Trails	S 5th St to FM 93	Construct 10 ft wide hike and bike trail	84.73	3	2	\$2,000,000	2026	No	EJ, H, P	Years 5-10 S UTP 10-Ye
D40-02	N/A	North Waco Rd (Old 81) - Sidewalk	West Main St to West Big Elm	Construct 10' wide bicycle and pedestrian facility	69.02	11	5	\$1,700,000	2027	No		
К45-01	N/A	Heritage Oaks Hike & Bike Trail Segment 2	Siltstone Dr to Fawn Dr	Construct shared use path for bicyclists and pedestrians	58.57	26	6	\$1,200,000	2020	No	EJ	
S40-02	N/A	Salado Creek Off-Road Trail: Pace Park	Pace Park along Pace Park Rd	Construct 10 ft wide trail	57.44	27	7	\$199,965	TBD	No	ARZ, ES, P	
B45-01	N/A	Belton's Georgetown Rails to Trails	E Ave B to Leon River Bridge	Construct 10 ft wide shared use path to connect KTMPO projects B40-05 and T40-13	86.01	2	8	\$2,040,000	TBD	No	EJ, H	
T45-02	N/A	Downtown Sidewalks - 1st and 3rd St	Mayborn Civic Center to Ave F	Construct and repair sidewalks with ADA-compliance ramps, crosswalks and landscaping	75.42	4	9	\$2,720,000	TBD	Yes	EJ, P, H	
B45-02	N/A	6th Ave Sidewalk & Shared Use Path	Main St (SH 317) to IH 35 Frontage Rd	Construct 6 ft wide sidewalk on north side of 6th Ave, 10 ft wide SUP on the south side and relocate utilities underground.	73.44	5	10	\$6,000,000	TBD	Yes	EJ, L	
B45-05	N/A	Commerce/Industrial Shared Use Path	Sparta Rd to Main St (SH 317)	Construct 10 ft wide shared use path on east side of Commerce St and north side of Industrial Park Rd; provide curb and gutter along Commerce St	72.15	8	11	\$1,233,333	TBD	No	Н	
B40-12	N/A	Belton Hike and Bike Trail Extension Southwest	Confederate Park to Nolan Creek Pedestrian Bridge	Construct 10 ft wide hike and bike trail	71.08	9	12	\$3,252,480	TBD	No	EJ, H, P	
T45-03	N/A	E Central Sidewalks	MLK Dr to N. 22nd St	Construct 6 ft wide sidewalks, repair existing sidewalks with crosswalks and landscaping.	69.29	10	13	\$600,000	TBD	No	EJ, P	
B45-04	N/A	Beal St Sidewalk	E 24th Ave to E 6th St	Construct 5 ft sidewalk on east side from E. 24th Ave to Downing St, construct 5 ft sidewalk on both sides from E 13th Ave to Railroad Track, and construct 5 ft sidewalk on west side from Railroad Track to E. 6th Ave with bicycle signage along entire project	69	12	14	\$282,500	TBD	No	EJ, P	
T45-08	N/A	West Adams Sidewalks	Olaf Dr to IH 35	Construct 6 ft wide sidewalk	68.71	13	15	\$950,000	TBD	Yes	EJ	Years 11-25
T45-06	N/A	South Pea Ridge Greenbelt Trail	W Adams Ave (FM 2305) to Poison Oak Rd	Construct 8 ft wide trail along linear park east of S Pea Ridge Rd and through Von Rosenberg Park	66.57	14	16	\$1,680,000	2023	No	Р	MTP Long R
T40-25	N/A	Bird Creek Interceptor Trail	N side of Lions Community Park to Midway Dr (near Bonham Middle School)	Construct 8 ft wide trail	66.43	15	17	\$375,000	TBD	No	Р	
B45-07	N/A	Avenue H Sidewalk/Rd Improvements	Main St (SH 317) to Saunders St	Construct 5' wide sidewalk on north side of Ave H with Bicycle Signage and reconstruct roadway and widen to 2 lanes from Connell St. to Saunders St.	66	16	18	\$429,167	TBD	No	EJ	
T45-09	N/A	Apache Dr Sidewalks	W Adams Ave (FM 2305) to Gila Trail	Construct 6 ft. wide sidewalks and crosswalks	65.84	17	19	\$325,000	2023	No	EJ	
T45-07	N/A	Temple Lake Park Connection	FM 2271 to Temple Lake Park	Construct 8 ft wide hike and bike trail	64.56	18	20	\$2,640,000	2023	No	Р	
T25-05	N/A	FM 2271 Trail	FM 2305 to Miller Spring Park	Construct 8 ft wide trail	63.88	19	21	\$950,000	TBD	Yes	Н, Р	
T45-04	N/A	Friars Creek Trail	Friars Creek Trail Terminus to S 1st St Future Extension	Construct 10 ft wide hike and bike trail to extend and connect to existing trail sections	63.85	20	22	\$500,000	2023	No	_	
N40-05	N/A	FM 439 Spur Connectivity	Main St to North Dr	Construct 10 ft wide sidewalk, ADA ramps and crosswalks, improve shoulders at Main St	63.71	21	23	\$967,500	TBD	No		
T45-01	N/A	Canyon Creek Trail	Canyon Creek Dr to Lions Park	Construct 8 ft hike and bike trail	62.58	22	24	\$720,000	2023	No	Р	
S40-01	N/A	Salado Creek Shared Use Path - Royal St	Main St at College Hill Dr to 0.09 mi N of Royal St on Center Circle	Construct alternate transportation route consisting of shared-use path for bicyclists and pedestrians	62.42	23	25	\$368,959	TBD	No	ARZ, H, ES	
T45-05	N/A	Hickory Rd Sidewalk	Midway Dr to Aspen Trail	Construct 6 ft sidewalk with crosswalks	61.43	24	26	\$500,000	TBD	No	Р	
B45-06	N/A	Central Ave Sidewalk & Traffic Signals	Main St (SH 317) to Pearl St	Upgrade to a 5 ft wide sidewalk on north side of Central Ave and install pedestrian crossing infrastructure at intersection of Main St (SH 317) to Pearl St.	59.29	25	27	\$403,125	TBD	No		
N40-09	N/A	Pleasant Hill Rd	Lonesome Oak Dr to Ave I	Construct Class 2, buffered on-street bike lane	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$500,000	N/A	No	Н	
N40-11	N/A	Nolan Creek Off System Trail	Bridge on Old Nolanville Rd to Levy Crossing	Construct 10 ft multi-use trail bordering Nolan Creek	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	Н	
N40-12	N/A	Jack Rabbit Road Bike Thoroughfare	US 190 to FM 439 and through Park to School	Add Class 2 Bike Lanes on system	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No		Un
N40-13	N/A	Wild Wood Trail	Lonesome Uak Dr to Ave I	Construct an 8 ft wide multi use trail	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$400,000	N/A	No		
S40-04b ¹	N/A	Main St Sidewalks Phase 2	College Hill Dr to Salado Plaza Dr	main St improvements to include pavement widening, bike paths, drainage improvements.	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$2,223,044	N/A	No	H, ARZ, ES	
K40-21b	N/A	Segment 5	Property	Construct shared use path for bicyclists and pedestrians	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,300,000	N/A	No	EJ, ARZ	



	TRANSIT PROJECTS												
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
			GROUF	PED PROJECTS									
KTMPO ID	D Project Name Description Fundi				Funding								
G01-PE	Preventative Proje	ve Projects Various Locations Short Range											
G03-MT	Maintenance Proje	ects	Various Locations	Grouped CSJ Placeholder		Funding:							
G04-BR	Bridge Projects		Various Locations			\$165,803,999							
G06-SA	Safety Projects		Various Locations	nge Funded (2029-2045)									
KTMPO ID		Project Name	Description			Funding							
G01-PE	Preventative Proje	ects	Various Locations			i unung							
G03-MT	Maintenance Proje	ects	Various Locations										
G04-BR	Bridge Projects		Various Locations	Grouped CSJ Placeholder		Long Range Funding: \$295,989,993							
G06-SA	Safety Projects		Various Locations										

Notes:

¹Project score, project ranking and prioritized list is based on the scoring criteria at the time those projects were selected for funding.

²CMP network is based on the network when that project was selected for funding and/or when project was submitted to KTMPO.

³Environmental considerations is based on the environmental conditions when that project was selected for funding and/or when project was submitted to KTMPO. Use key below for identification purposes.

Environemntal Considerations											
Symbol	Symbol										
EJ	Environmental Justice Community of Concern										
L	Landfill										
Н	Cemeteries, Archaeological Sites, Historical Markers										
ARZ	Aquifer Recharge Zone										
ES	Endangered Species										
Р	Park										

⁴Fiscal Constraints are determined by inputs into the TRENDS model as approved on March . Short range funding is estimated funding for FY2019-2028 and Long Range Funding is estimated funding for FY2029-2045

⁵Project is a combination between C35-02a and C35-02b. Projecct C35-02b was the top prioritized livability project.

⁶Project H40-03 Chaparral Rd original score, project ranking, and prioritized list order was 60.51, 25 and 30 respectively.

⁷KTMPO received a total of 69 roadway projects with an estimated total cost of \$1,008,785,911. Roadway prioritized list was recommended by TAC on November 28, 2018. During this process, five bonus points, each submitting entities' top roadway project was moved to the top of the list. The order was based on the total number of points for those top roadway projects. All remaining projects were ranked list since K30-13 overlaps with this project. Each change was discussed and agreed to during the 11/28/2018 TAC meeting. Prioritize list is not the order of funding and allocation of funds is based on various factors such as but not limited to project readiness, funding availability and project need. During discussion, it was decided that project T15-06k will retain its rank, however, this project will be skipped if this project is a candidate for funds.

⁸Note: KTMPO recieved a total of 27 livability projects with an estimated total cost of \$34,939,442. Livability ranked list was recommended by TAC on November 28, 2018. During this process, five bonus points were given to projects that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to projects that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to projects that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to projects that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to projects that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to project that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to project that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to project that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to project that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to project that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to project that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to project that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to project that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to project that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to project that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to project that were deemed a priority by BPAC (C35-02b, T40-13, N40-04, B45-05). Bonus points were given to project to 2018 along these routes. Crash rates were calculated based on data from 2013-2017. Project B45-03 recieved four bonus points as discussed by TAC at the November 28, 2018 meeting. Project was a BPAC priority route. After bonus points were assigned each submitting entities top livability project was moved to the top of the list. Each submitting entites top priority livability, and project need.

MTP Amendment Dates

July 17, 2019* September 18, 2019* October 23, 2019 February 19, 2020*

April 15, 2020 September 16, 2020

* Administrative Amendments

⁹Funding/Fiscal Constraint Notes (Cat 2, 7, 9, 11):

Short Range funding amounts (0-10 years) come from the latest TxDOT Unified Transportation Plan (UTP). Long Range funding amounts (10-15 years) are determined by outputs from the TRENDS model (see note ⁴)

How projects in the list are funded:

White - Projects in the TIP are listed first, their total estimated cost is deducted from the total UTP fiscal constraint. Green - The remaining UTP funding is then allocated to the next highest ranked projects from both the Roadway and Livability tracks until the funding cap is reached. Green colored projects are projected to receive funding within the first 10 years of the planning period. Blue - Projects following the Short Range funding section are allocated funds from the estimated Long Range MTP funding from highest ranking on down until the funding cap is reached. Blue projects are projected to receive funding during the last 15 years of the planning period. Orange - When all estimated funding sources have been exhauseted, any remaining projects are listed from high to low in the Regionally Significant Unfunded list. Orange projects are NOT projected to receive funding during the planning period Yellow - Projects that are unscored are listed at the bottom of each section and have no estimated timetable for receiving funding.

Note of Roadway vs Livability Tracks: Projects in the Livability Track are allocated funding from the latest Category 9 funding estimates only. Porjects in the Roadway Track are allocated funding from the latest Category 2 and Category 7 estimates.

Current UTP Estimates by Category (2021-2030): Category 2 - \$189,232,733 Category 7 - \$61,317,869 Category 9 - \$3,940,100

Current MTP Estimates by Category (2030-2045): Category 2 - \$115,800,000 Category 7 - \$216,900,000 Category 9 - \$41,600,000 Cateogry 11 - \$31,400,000

*Note - funding for projects in this list is not guranteed unless the project is listed in the TIP, all other project funding is subject to change

Funding⁴



	2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Project Listing												
				MTP LET PROJECTS THAT AR	E STILL ACTI	VE							
KTMPO ID	CSJ Number	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Project Score ¹	Project Ranking ¹	Prioritized List ¹	Estimated Cost	Estimated Let Date	CMP Network ²	Environmental Considerations ³	Funding Amounts	
H15-02b	2304-02-036 2304- 02-040	FM 2410	Roy Reynolds Dr to Commercial Dr	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with sidewalks, median and turn lanes incorporating context sensitive design	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$8,800,000	2016	Yes	N/A	FY15-FY17 MPO Proposition 1:	
W40-02	0231-03-143	US 190	1.0 mi W of FM 2410 to FM 3423 (Indian Trail)	Widen main lanes from 4 to 6 lane divided freeway and ramp alignments	N/A	1	N/A	\$9,000,000	2018	Yes	N/A	\$17,800,000	
W40-06	0231-03-145 0231-04-061	US 190	Knights Way to FM 2410 in W Belton	Widen main lanes from 4 to 6 lane divided freeway and ramp alignments	87.45	1	1	\$39,000,000	2019	Yes	Н	EV18-20 Category 2: \$74,000,000	
W40-05	0231-04-060	US 190	FM 2410 in W Belton to IH-35	Widen main lanes from 4 to 6 lanes and resurface	83.79	3	3	\$35,000,000	2020	Yes	EJ	1110 20 category 2. 974,000,000	
W40-03	0231-03-146	US 190 Turnaround	At Clear Creek Rd	Roadway reconfiguration to improve turning movements (Turnaround)	42.11	42	6	\$4,000,000	2018	No	EJ	FY18-20 Category 2 Funds (\$2,100,000) and Category 7 Funds (\$1,900,000): \$4,000,000	
W35-12	0185-01-030	US 190 (Rogers Relief Route)	2.0 mi S of FM 436 in Heidenheimer to Milam County Line	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided rural highway	45.56	36	38	\$62,800,000	2020	Yes	Н	FY19 Category 4 Funds: \$62,800,000	
H40-02	0909-36-153	Traffic Circle at Commercial Dr	Intersection of Commercial Dr and Heights Dr	Construct traffic circle at intersection of Commercial Dr and Heights Dr	40	6	5	\$489,249	2018	No	EJ		
K30-02	0909-36-156	Rosewood Dr Extension	Riverstone Dr to Chaparral Dr	Construction of a 4 lane roadway with center median and an off-system bridge	38	4	6	\$7,965,049	2018	No	EJ, ARZ	EV1E 17 Catagony 7 Euroday	
N40-01	2057-01-009	Main St Connectivity	Ave I to US 190 Frontage Rd	Construct ADA bicycle and pedestrian pathways along Main St and under US 190	31	3	3	\$596,386	2018	No	N/A	\$15,530,684	
T35-24	0909-36-155	Prairie View Road Enhancements	W of SH 317 to N Pea Ridge Rd	Construction of a 4 lane roadway, aligning FM 2483 to Prairie View Rd with a signalized intersection	39	5	4	\$6,480,000	2018	Yes	N/A		
к40-27 ¹	0836-02-073	SH 195	0.1 mi N of FM 3470 to 0.1 mi S of FM 3470	Turnaround underpass for northbound and southbound traffic on SH 195 frontage roads and FM 3470 (Stan Schlueter)	42.68	41	7	\$800,000	2019	Yes	EJ		
	0221 02 147	LIS 100 of EM 2410	East Central Tx Expy W to East Central Tx	Construction of a west to east turnaround at EM 2410	67.11	6	8	\$5,000,000	2020	Yes	N/A		
T40-12	1835-02-058	31st St Sidewalks (FM 1741)	Marlandwood Rd to Canvon Creek Rd	Installation of 6 ft sidewalks on both sides of FM 1741	94.35	1	1	\$500.000	2019	Yes	N/A		
C40-05	3128-01-013 3131-01-007	FM 116 & 3046 Sidewalks	Business 190 to Dennis St	Construct ADA compliant sidewalks and bike lanes	77.88	5	4	\$975,000	2020	Yes	Н, Р	FY18-20 Category 7 Funds:	
C40-04c	0909-39-133	The Narrows (Charles Tillman Way)	Charles Tillman Way from Constitution Dr to Charles Tillman Way @ RG III Blvd	Construct shared use path for bicycle and pedestrian use	70.32	11	6	\$170,000	2020	No	EJ, H	\$10,206,956	
S40-04a	2136-01-020	Main St Sidewalks Phase 1	Salado Plaza Dr to College Hill Dr (North	Main St. improvements to include lighting sidewalks, and strining for hicycles	81.01	3	7	\$1,616,956	2019	No	H, ARZ, ES		
A45-01	0909-36-170	HCTD Fleet Replacement Project	Hill Country Transit, Killeen UZA- Two. Temple UZA-One	Purchase Buses to Provide Transportation	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,145,000	2019	N/A	N/A		
C40-04a	0909-39-131	The Narrows (Constitution Drive)	Constitution Dr from Bowen Ave to 0.2 mi S Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd	Construction of sidewalks for bicycle and pedestrian use	72.78	8	9	\$850,000	2020	No	EJ,H	FY 18-20 Category 7 (\$360,000) and Category 9 (\$490,000): \$850,000	
К40-23	0909-36-160	Heritage Oaks Hike and Bike Trail, Segment 3A	Rosewood Dr from Nickelback Dr to Pyrite Dr	Construction of a hike and bike trail with lighting	23	1	1	\$800,000	2018	No	EJ, ARZ	FY15-17 Category 9 Funds: \$800,000	
C40-04b	0909-39-132	The Narrows (RG III at Old Copperas Cove Rd)	RG III Blvd from Constitution Dr to Old Copperas Cove Rd at Constitution Dr	Construct sidewalks for bicycle and pedestrian use	70.87	9	10	\$680,000	2020	No	EJ, H	FY18-20 Category 9 Funds: \$680,000	
B40-04	0909-36-157	Chisholm Trail Corridor Hike and Bike Facility Phase II	University Blvd 0.25 mi. south of Crusader Way to Tiger Dr 0.10 mi. north of Sparta Rd	Construct sidewalks and shared use pathwidths vary from 8 ft to 10 ft; includes landscaping and lighting.	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$2,670,615	2019	No	N/A	FY15 Statewide TAP Funds:	
K40-21a	0909-36-152	Killeen Heritage Oaks Hike and Bike Trail, Segment 4	Platinum Dr to Chaparral Rd	Construct shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclists	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$3,448,284	2018	No	EJ, ARZ	<i>\$0,110,000</i>	



End of Packet