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UTP was initiated as the **Project Development Plan** (PDP) and acted as a guide for planning and project development activities.

- **1997/1998**: PDP renamed the **Unified Transportation Program** and expanded to include other modes.
- **2004**: UTP was divided to align with budget strategies of the 2003-2007 Strategic Plan (the **Statewide Mobility Plan** “Build It” and **Statewide Preservation Plan** “Maintain It”).
- **2009**: Due to rescissions in funding, scenarios were considered in lieu of a full UTP.
- **2010**: UTP became fiscally constrained under Finance Division cash flow forecast.
- **2011**: TAC rules adopted for UTP development, project selection and public involvement.
- **2014**: UTP expanded to list and rank all projects, designate Major Transportation projects and be more user-friendly.
- **2015**: UTP includes reference to Supplemental Program Authority to account for unanticipated future funding and performance-based project assessments.
Look Back to the 2010 UTP

Since 2010, actual UTP funding exceeded forecast.

- 2010 UTP forecast letting volume = $15.5B (through 2014)
- Actual letting volume = $24.9B (through 2014)
- Resulting Difference = $9.4B
- 5,433 projects let – record levels

Why? Increasing funding uncertainty.

- Higher levels of federal funds ($3.5 billion since 2010)
  - August 2009 – the federal transportation law SAFETEA-LU expires with no replacement.
  - July 2012 - MAP-21 is signed, for an 18-month period only.
- Non-traditional funding from Category 3 increased as a share of the department’s total budget:
  - New capacity authorized by the state legislature ($3 billion in Prop. 12).
  - Efforts to leverage funds through CDAs/PPPs.
  - Refinancing with favorable interest rates increased bond capacity.
Statewide bridge performance has steadily improved, but recent years have had only moderate improvement.

**Percent of Bridges Statewide in Good or Better Condition**

- 2002: 70.0%
- 2004: 72.0%
- 2006: 74.0%
- 2008: 76.0%
- 2010: 78.0%
- 2012: 80.0%
- 2014: 82.0%

**West 7th Street Bridge in Fort Worth**
Additional Funding to Maintain Highway Conditions

Statewide pavement performance ratings have generally held their ground since 2004. Recent energy sector impacts are presenting new challenges.

Percentage of Lane Miles in "Good" or Better Condition

* University of Texas, Center for Transportation Research
$1.2 billion in safety bond programs approved 2004 and 2009 helped improve safety across the state. Despite progress from 2004-2011, recent trends have shown an increase in statewide fatality and crash rates.

Statewide Crash Trends

- Fatal Crash Rate (per MVM*)
- Total Crash Rate (per MVM*)

* MVM – Million vehicle miles of travel
Since 2005, the Texas Transportation Commission has utilized funding to advance major and strategic projects to address congestion and connectivity across the state.

- **2005-2009**: $0.9B in authorized funding from Categories 3 & 12 supported $4.0B in total project cost.
- **2010-2014**: $6.3B in authorized funding from Categories 3 & 12 supported $8.1B in total project cost.
- These numbers include $5.7B of state/federal investment in CDA/PPPs that have leveraged a total value of nearly $11B.
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Lessons Learned are Valuable

- Traditional funding (motor fuels tax) is declining.
- Non-traditional funding has and will continue to contribute a larger proportion of state transportation funds.
- Funding swings can be significant.
- TxDOT should balance need for conservative financial forecasts due to unpredictable funding levels with preparation for potential opportunities.
  - Programming commitment should align with conservative funding levels.
  - Planning should align with reasonable projections of future funding levels.
- Continue preparing to deliver as new funding becomes available.
Historical and Projected UTP Funding
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Future Project Funding Opportunities – Maintenance, Safety and Energy

UTP Projects Funded (2015-2024)
- $3.1B in Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation.
- $4.3B in Pavement Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Energy.
- $533M in Safety.

Supplemental Program Authority Projects Awaiting Funding that Represents Priorities of a $2B Annual Need
- $201M in Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation.
- $1.6B in Pavement Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Energy.
- $895M in Safety.
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Sample Needs

FM 2625 - Atlanta District
FM 798 - Corpus District
OSR - Bryan District

SH 7 - Bryan District
FM 916 - Dallas District
FM 2265 - Fort Worth District
Future Project Funding Opportunities - Strategic Projects

UTP Projects Funded (2015-2024)
- $13.7B in Mobility Projects
- $1.1B in CDA/PPPs

Supplemental Program Authority Projects Awaiting Funding that Represents Priorities of an $80B Statewide Need
- $19.8B in Mobility Projects
- $16.1B in CDA/PPPs
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Strategic Planning and Investment Needs Continue

- Significant transportation issues exist involving safety, maintenance and energy sector concerns.
- Texas population and traffic is growing.
  - Since 2010 VMT has grown faster than population in Texas.
  - By 2035, population is projected to exceed 33 million, increasing by 43%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period/Source</th>
<th>Texas Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 Census</td>
<td>25,146,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Estimate (Census)</td>
<td>25,640,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Estimate (Census)</td>
<td>26,060,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Estimate (Census)</td>
<td>26,448,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Texas State Data Center projections were examined for available years 2011 and 2012 and found to be comparable (7/27/2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Texas Annual VMT Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4.0 M (-1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4.2 M (+5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.3 M (+2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 (Preliminary)</td>
<td>4.4 M (+3.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Volume Trends, FHWA Travel Monitoring Program (based on annual May values, accessed on-line on 7/27/2014).
Looking forward....UTP Progression

– November Revision to the UTP.
  • 9 month MAP-21 extension.
  • End of year adjustments and carry-overs.
  • Consider needs for on-going strategic project priorities.
– Respond to outcome of Proposition 1 ballot measure.
– Continued improvement:
  • Quality of information on projects in the UTP and SPA.
  • Transparency of information and engagement with stakeholders and partners.
  • Incorporation of performance measures and targets related to MAP-21, as outlined in statewide and regional plans.