



FY 2023 – 2026

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM (TIP)

SHERMAN-DENISON
METROPOLITAN AREA

Prepared by the Grayson County Metropolitan Planning Organization
in cooperation with the
Texas Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of
Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration

Opportunities for Public Comment

Public Meeting
May 11, 2022

Technical Advisory Committee Meetings
Action: May 18, 2022

Policy Board Meetings
Action: June 1, 2022

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

 A. Background 1

 1. Historical 1

 2. Organization..... 1

 3. Legislation 2

 4. Performance Measures..... 5

 5. Air Quality 8

 6. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) 8

 7. Environmental Justice 9

 8. Transit 9

 B. Purpose 10

 C. Definition of Area..... 10

 D. Public Participation Process..... 11

 E. Project Selection Process 12

 F. Project Costs 17

 1. Total Project Costs 17

 2. Year of Expenditure (YOE)..... 17

 G. Funding 17

 1. Highway Funding..... 18

 2. Transit Funding 19

 H. Progress from Previous TIP (FY 2021-2024)..... 21

 I. Revisions and Administrative Changes 21

II. FUNDED HIGHWAY PROJECTS 23

 A. Fiscal Year 2023 Projects..... 23

 B. Fiscal Year 2024 Projects..... 24

 C. Fiscal Year 2025 Projects..... 25

 D. Fiscal Year 2026 Projects..... 26

 E. Map of Funded Highway Projects 27

III. FUNDED TRANSIT PROJECTS..... 28

 A. Fiscal Year 2023 Projects..... 28

 B. Fiscal Year 2024 Projects..... 30

 C. Fiscal Year 2025 Projects..... 32

 D. Fiscal Year 2026 Projects..... 34

IV. FINANCIAL SUMMARY	36
A. Highway Financial Summary	36
B. Transit Financial Summary	38
V. LOCALLY FUNDED PROJECTS.....	39
VI. GLOSSARY	40
A. Definitions.....	40
B. Acronyms	41
VII. DISCLAIMER	41
APPENDIX A – SHERMAN-DENSION MPA	42
APPENDIX B – 2022 UTP PROGRAMMING GUIDANCE.....	43
APPENDIX C – GROUPED PROJECT CSJs	49
APPENDIX D – MPO SELF CERTIFICATION	52
APPENDIX E – PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING PERFORMANCE TARGETS	53
APPENDIX F – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT DOCUMENTATION.....	54
APPENDIX G – DETAILS OF REVISIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES	61

Tables

Table 1: Implementation Timeline.....	5
Table 2: TxDOT Safety Performance Measure Targets	6
Table 3: Bridge and Pavement Performance Measure Targets	7
Table 4: System Performance Measure Targets	7
Table 5: Project Selection Criteria.....	14
Table 6: Let and/or Completed Projects from the 2021-2024 TIP.....	21

Figures

Figure 1: TxDOT Funding Sources by UTP Category.....	19
Figure 2: TIP Revision Process.....	22

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

1. Historical

“Prior to 1836 the inhabitants of Grayson County were the Indians, the Spaniards, and the Frenchmen who passed through the county without leaving permanent distinguishing features. The first English speaking white man to look upon the area, which was later to be known as Preston Bend, was probably John Hart. Hart was a trapper, with headquarters in Fort Smith, Arkansas Territory, and he was known to be in the area in 1822. Holland Coffee came to the Preston Bend area in 1836. Indian troubles multiplied in the late 1830's which caused Fort Johnson and Fort Preston to be built in 1840.

The creation of Grayson County in 1846 called for the location of the county seat within four miles of the geographic center of the new county. The county seat was named for Sidney Sherman, one of Sam Houston's staunchest political and personal foes. Sherman was probably one of the most versatile of the leaders of the Republic. He was born in Massachusetts in 1803 and died in Galveston in 1873. To Sherman is due the credit for originating the famous cry of the San Jacinto warriors, "Remember the Alamo; Remember Goliad." The only worthy monument to the memory of Sidney Sherman is the naming of the county seat of Grayson County, a town which he never visited. The naming was a political compromise which brought together the names of Grayson, the pro-Houston Democrat, and Sherman, the anti-Houston Whig. Grayson County was named for Peter W. Grayson, born in Bardstown, Kentucky in 1788. He held various offices of honor and trust under the Republic including the office of Attorney General under President David G. Burnet and Sam Houston, whom he actively supported. In 1838 he campaigned for the Presidency of the Republic. Before the election could be determined, Grayson committed suicide.

*In 1872 the people of Grayson County were given the opportunity of voting a \$150,000 subsidy to the Missouri-Kansas and Texas Railroad. The appropriation of the subsidy would have insured the completion of the tracks to Sherman, and would indeed have been quickly repaid in profit for the whole area and for Sherman in particular. But most people thought the threat of the Katy not to come was idle, and the issue failed. A town was laid out in 1872, north of Sherman, and named for George Denison, Vice President of the Katy. Denison's competition from Red River City was swept away with the flooding of the Red River. **By 1890, Denison was the 8th largest and Sherman was the 10th largest cities in the State of Texas. In 1880 Grayson County's population was higher than any other Texas county and in 1890 it was second only to Dallas County.**”*

- Excerpt from Sherman-Denison Transportation Plan Annual Report 1978-79

2. Organization

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 states that after July 1, 1965, in any urban area of more than fifty thousand population, highway projects must be based on a comprehensive, cooperatively developed and continuing planning process. In order to conform to this directive, the State of Texas, Cities of Sherman and Denison, and the County of Grayson entered into an agreement on the 27th day of September, 1968, for a complete and comprehensive transportation study of the Sherman-Denison Study Area.

To assure that the "continuing" requirements of the Act would be met, the same parties entered into a Continuing Phase Agreement on June 29, 1972, which outlined the organization of the study, scope of the continuing phase, responsibilities of the study members, operation of the continuing study, and financial responsibilities of the participating governmental agencies. A subsequent agreement entered into by these parties on May 10, 1973, made revisions in the organizations of committees.

On April 24, 1974, Governor Dolph Briscoe designated the Texoma Regional Planning Commission as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Sherman-Denison Urbanized Area. The designation, as planning partners of the State, received the concurrence of the Cities of Sherman and Denison and Grayson County. A continuing phase agreement addendum, of October 11, 1979, recognized the Texoma Regional Planning Commission as a party to the transportation planning process. The MPO designation was extended to August 31, 1981 when it became continuous.

On June 30, 2011, the Texas Transportation Commission with authority from Governor James Richard (Rick) Perry authorized Minute Order 112728 to redesignate the MPO by separating the MPO from the Texoma Regional Planning Commission (name changed to Texoma Council of Governments in 1992) and designated Grayson County as the fiscal agent. Policy directive for transportation planning within the Sherman-Denison Urban Area has been carried out under the direction and guidance of the Sherman-Denison MPO Policy Board (PB), which was established by agreement between the State, Grayson County and the cities of Denison and Sherman. On September 29, 2021, the PB elected to change the name of the Sherman-Denison MPO to the Grayson County MPO. Acting through the PB, the MPO, in cooperation with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), administers the transportation planning process in the Sherman-Denison urbanized area.

The PB is the governing body of the MPO. It is comprised of elected public officials from local government and the Paris District Engineer. They work collaboratively to plan for the transportation network in Grayson County. The PB performs its duties in accordance with state & federal laws and is organized under its published By-Laws. All meetings held by the PB are in accordance with the Open Meetings Act. The Grayson County MPO also has a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) whose membership consists of technical staff from the member local governments and TxDOT representatives. The TAC is responsible for advising the PB on all urban transportation planning matters and to help guide the metropolitan planning process. Additionally, this committee advises on issues of a technical nature and provides recommendations of MPO policy issues, provides input regarding the development of all of the MPO's planning documents, any special studies that may arise, and has developed a project selection process.

3. Legislation

Over the years additional legislation enforced the need for coordinated planning: Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) in 1998, and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act - A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) in 2005 (the Surface Transportation Extension Act of Purpose 2012, Part II extended the time of SAFETEA-LU until September 30, 2012). SAFETEA-LU required the Metropolitan Planning Organizations provide for consideration of projects and strategies in their UPWPs that will serve to advance eight (8) transportation planning factors:

1. Support economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;

2. Increase safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
3. Increase security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
4. Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and freight;
5. Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns;
6. Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
7. Promote efficient system management and operation; and
8. Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) took effect on October 1, 2012 and reinforced the eight planning factors listed in SAFETEA-LU. MAP-21 was a milestone for the U.S. economy and the surface transportation program through its ability to guide the system's growth and development. MAP-21 created a streamlined and performance based surface transportation program and builds on many of the highway, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian programs and policies that were established in 1991. MAP-21 originated a new set of performance measure requirements that will transform federal highway programs and provide a means to insure that federal transportation funds are invested properly by focusing on national transportation goals, increasing the accountability and transparency of the federal highway programs, and improving transportation investment decision-making through performance based planning and programming. This performance based system will establish national performance goals to achieve the following:

1. Safety – to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads;
2. Infrastructure condition – to maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair;
3. Congestion reduction – to achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System (NHS);
4. System reliability – to improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system;
5. Freight movement and economic vitality – to improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development;
6. Environmental sustainability – to enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment;
7. Reduced project delivery delays – to reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices.

On December 4, 2015, the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act was enacted. It was the first federal law in over a decade to provide long-term funding certainty for surface transportation infrastructure planning and investment. The FAST Act authorized \$305 billion over fiscal years 2016 through 2020 for highway, safety, public transportation, rail, and research, technology, and statistics programs. The FAST Act improves mobility on the highways, creates jobs and supports economic growth, and accelerates project delivery and promotes innovation. The FAST Act took the eight (8) planning factors of SAFETEA-LU and added two additional ones:

9. Improve the transportation system's resiliency and reliability and reduce or mitigate storm-water impact of surface transportation; and
10. Enhance travel and tourism.

On February 17, 2017, FHWA finalized the third and last in a series of three (3) related rulemakings that established twelve (12) areas of performance measures for State Department of Transportation (State DOT) and MPOs to use as required by the FAST Act. The performance measures are as follows (23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 490.207(a)(1-5); 23CFR Part 490.307(a)(1-4); 23CFR Part 490.407(c)(1-2); 23CFR Part 490.507(a)(1-2), 490.507(b), 490.607, 490.707(a-b), 490.807)):

1. Serious injuries per vehicle miles traveled (VMT);
2. Fatalities per VMT;
3. Number of serious injuries;
4. Number of fatalities;
5. Pavement condition on the Interstate System;
6. Pavement condition on the non-Interstate (NHS);
7. Bridge condition on the NHS;
8. Performance of the Interstate System;
9. Performance of the non-Interstate NHS;
10. Freight movement on the Interstate System;
11. Traffic congestion; and
12. On-road mobile source emissions.

On November 15, 2021, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) was enacted. The purpose of the IIJA was to make a historic investment that will modernize our roads, bridges, transit, rail, ports, airports, broadband, and drinking water and wastewater infrastructure. The IIJA authorized \$550 billion over fiscal years 2022 through 2026 for highway, rail, safety, public transit, ports and waterways, airports, clean school buses and ferries, electric vehicle charging infrastructure, and to reconnect communities.

Texas House Bill 20 (HB 20), which was passed during the 84th Legislature, instructs the Texas Transportation Commission (TTC) to develop and implement a performance-based planning and programming process dedicated to providing the executive and legislative branches of government with indicators that quantify and qualify progress toward attaining all department goals and objectives established by the legislature and the TTC. HB 20 further instructs the TTC to develop and implement performance metrics and performance measures as part of the:

1. Review of strategic planning in the Statewide Transportation Program (STIP), rural transportation plans, and the Unified Transportation Program (UTP);
2. Evaluation of decision-making on projects selected for funding in the UTP and STIP; and
3. Evaluation of project delivery for projects in the department's letting schedule.

Finally, HB 20 states that the TTC shall adopt and review performance metrics and measures to:

1. Assess how well the transportation system is performing and operating in accordance with the requirements of 23 USC Section 134 or 135;
2. Provide the department, legislature, stakeholders, and public with information to support decisions in a manner that is accessible and understandable to the public;
3. Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of transportation projects and service;
4. Demonstrate transparency and accountability; and
5. Address other issues the commission considers necessary.

In accordance to HB 20, MPOs shall develop their own project recommendation criteria, which must include consideration of:

1. Projected improvements to congestion and safety;
2. Projected effects on economic development opportunities for residents of the region;
3. Available funding;
4. Effects on the environment including air quality;
5. Socioeconomic effects, including disproportionately high and adverse health or environmental effects on minority or low-income neighborhoods; and
6. Any other factors deemed appropriate by the planning organization.

4. Performance Measures

State DOTs are required to measure performance, establish targets, assess progress toward these targets, and report on performance measure targets. At this time, MPOs can establish their own performance measure targets or support the State DOT’s statewide target. The MPO, TxDOT, and TAPS have executed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlining a process toward attainment of these performance measures targets for the region of the MPO and the collection of data for the State asset management plan. There are three (3) different sets of performance measures that the State DOTs and MPOs must comply with. They include Safety Performance Measures (PM1), Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Measures (PM2), and System Performance Measures (PM3). These different types of targets have different deadlines as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Implementation Timeline

Final Rule	Effective Date	States Set Target By	MPOs Set Target By	LRSTP, MTP, STIP and TIP Inclusion
Safety Performance Measures (PM1)	April 14, 2016	Aug. 31, 2017	Up to 180 days after the State sets targets, but not later than February 27, 2018	Updates or amendments on or after May 27, 2018
Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Measures (PM2)	May 20, 2017	May 20, 2018	No later than 180 days after the State sets targets	Updates or amendments on or after May 20, 2019
System Performance Measures (PM3)	May 20, 2017	May 20, 2018	No later than 180 days after the State sets targets	Updates or amendments on or after May 20, 2019

Safety Performance Measures (PM1)

Compliance with the PM1 performance based planning requirements began on May 27, 2018 for MPOs. Rather than setting its own targets for PM1, the PB passed resolutions on January 22, 2018 for FY 2018, December 5, 2018 for FY 2019, December 4, 2019 for FY 2020, June 3, 2020 for FY 2021, and June 1, 2022 for FY 2022 adopting the targets for PM1 established by TxDOT as published in TxDOT’s Highway Safety Improvement Program Annual Report. The targets are based on five-year rolling averages for the five safety performance measures and can be found in Table 2. These targets were developed using a data-driven, collaborative process and are aligned with the state’s Highway Safety Improvement Program

(HSIP) and Highway Safety Plan (HSP). They reflect a two percent (2%) reduction from the original trend line projection. When a trend line is decreasing, the target mirrors that projection.

Table 2: TxDOT Safety Performance Measure Targets

Performance Measure	Statewide Target (Expressed as Five-Year Average)				
	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
Total number of traffic related fatalities on all public roads	3,704	3,791	3,840	3,687	3,563
Rate of traffic related fatalities on all public roads per 100 million VMT	1.432	1.414	1.406	1.33	1.27
Total number of traffic related serious injuries on all public roads	17,565	17,751	17,394	17,151	16,677
Rate of traffic related serious injuries on all public roads per 100 million VMT	6.740	6.550	6.286	6.06	5.76
Total number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads	2,150.6	2,237.6	2,285.0	2,316.4	2,367

Working in partnership with local agencies, TxDOT safety investments were identified and programmed into the HSIP. Projects chosen for HSIP investments are based on crash history, roadway characteristics, and the existence of infrastructure countermeasures that can address the types of crashes present. These projects will construct effective countermeasures to reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries. The MPO supports the state’s PM1 targets by reviewing and programming all HSIP projects within the MPO boundary that are included in TxDOT’s Transportation Improvement Program. For project selection, safety is one of the criteria where technical points are awarded. Many projects adopted in the TIP support achieving these targets established for safety. Additionally, the PB supports the planning and programming of projects that contribute to the achievement of these targets. A presentation was given to the Policy Board on December 4, 2019 detailing the five year trends for FY 2018. Staff will continue to monitor the established targets and report achievements to the PB.

Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Measures (PM2)

Compliance with the PM 2 performance based planning requirements began on May 20th, 2019 for MPOs. Rather than setting its own targets for PM2, the PB passed a resolution on February 3, 2021 adopting the PM2 targets established by TxDOT for FY 2019-2022. The targets for PM2 can be found in Table 3.

Table 3: Bridge and Pavement Performance Measure Targets

Federal Performance Measure	Baseline	2020 Target	2022 Target
Pavement on IH			
% in “good” condition			66.5%
% in “poor” condition			0.2%
Pavement on non-IH NHS			
% in “good” condition	54.4%	52.0%	54.1%
% in “poor” condition	14.0%	14.3%	14.2%
NHS Bridge Deck Condition			
% in “good” condition	50.7%	50.6%	50.4%
% in “poor” condition	0.9%	0.8%	1.5%

System Performance Measures (PM3)

Compliance with the PM3 performance based planning requirements began on May 20th, 2019 for MPOs. On June 21, 2018 the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) adopted six (6) targets for System Performance Measures (PM3). Five (5) of these targets apply to interstates, excessive delay per capita in the Dallas-Fort Worth and Houston-Galveston Metropolitan Areas, and air quality goals in areas not in attainment. Since these do not apply to the Grayson County MPO, the Policy Board passed a resolution on December 5, 2018 adopting one system performance measure, which is: percentage of person-miles traveled on Non-Interstate National Highway System facilities rated "reliable" (TTR Non-IH). The target for the performance measure was produced by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute and can be found in Table 4. The performance measure is currently at 99.9%, but will degrade as Grayson County grows. The current level of transportation funding is only sufficient to slow the degradation and cannot prevent it entirely.

Table 4: System Performance Measure Targets

Federal Performance Measure	Baseline	2020 Target	2022 Target
NHS Travel Time Reliability			
Non-IH Level of Travel Time Reliability	99.9%	90.0%	85.0%

Transit

MAP-21 and later the FAST Act and IIJA mandated the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to develop a rule establishing a strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, and improving public capital assets effectively through their entire life cycle. TAM’s main objective is that of enhancing safety, reducing maintenance costs, increasing reliability, and improving performance. Under the Transit Asset Management (TAM) Final Rule, the FTA established four (4) performance measures to approximate the State of Good Repair for the four (4) categories of capital assets. These performance measures will help the Texoma Area Paratransit System (TAPS) quantify the condition of their assets and help facilitate target setting that supports local funding prioritization. Compliance with TAM performance based planning requirements began October 1, 2018. Since that time, the Policy Board approved resolutions on June 20,

2017 for FY 2018, December 5, 2018 for FY 2019, December 4, 2019 for FY 2020, December 2, 2020 for FY 2021, and December 1, 2021 for FY 2022 supporting TAPS's performance measures. The PB commits to supporting, planning and programming projects that contribute to the accomplishments of said targets.

Authority for the FTA to establish and enforce a comprehensive framework to oversee the safety of public transportation throughout the United States was also included in MAP-21 and later the FAST Act and the IIJA. This 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). In compliance with these provisions, FTA promulgated a Public Transportation Agency Safety Program (PTASP) 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. Transit providers were required to set targets by July 20, 2020. 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. Since that time, the Policy Board approved a resolution on September 2, 2020 supporting TAPS's performance measures. The PB commits to supporting, planning and programming projects that contribute to the accomplishments of said targets.

Public transit capital projects included in the TIP align with the TAM planning and targets setting processes undertaken by TAPS in conjunction with the Grayson County MPO. Investments are made in alignment with TAM plans with the intent of keeping the state's public transit vehicles and facilities in a state of good repair and meeting transit asset management targets. TxDOT allocates funding for transit rolling stock in accordance with the Public Transit Management System process. Additional state and federal funding sources that can be used by transit agencies for vehicle and facility improvements are outlined in the funding chapter of the Transit section of the TIP. TAPS determines the uses of these sources for capital and operating expenses based on their needs.

5. Air Quality

The Clean Air Act of 1990 places several requirements on communities to maintain and improve urban air quality. In response to the Act, the U.S. Department of Transportation has identified those communities in the nation with poor air quality as non-attainment areas and those with good air quality are classified as attainment areas. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) conformity requirements, found in 10 CFR 51, require air quality in non-attainment and maintenance areas for significant projects funded with Federal Funds. These requirements do not apply to the Grayson County MPO as Grayson County is currently in attainment under all categories of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, according to the EPA classification.

6. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

The ADA was designated to establish equal rights for persons with disabilities. The ADA requires the development of programs that do not discriminate against persons with disabilities solely on the basis of a physical or mental disability. The ADA addresses several areas including employment, public services, nondiscrimination in the private sector, and telecommunications access. The MPO encourages the involvement of people with disabilities in the development and improvement of transportation and para-

transit plans and services by conducting all meetings in locations that are accessible to persons with mobility limitations and other aids as needed. All accommodations for the visual and/or hearing impaired individuals are provided upon request prior to all public meetings.

Many of the projects in the TIP include enhancements to make the various transportation amenities accessible to the disabled. All federally funded transportation projects will be developed in compliance with the ADA.

7. Environmental Justice

Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 2000d-1) states that “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” A 1999 Presidential Executive Order on Environmental Justice further amplified Title VI by providing that “each federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.”

Transportation projects affect the environment and the way we live. Low-income and minority populations should receive an equitable distribution of proposed transportation benefits without suffering from excessively high and difficult impacts to their quality of life. As such, the Grayson County MPO in its long range plan, called the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), outlines a three step process to address this important planning component:

1. Identifying the block groups in the planning area that have high concentrations of minority and low-income residents;
2. Identifying the block groups in which planned or proposed transportation projects are located; and
3. Assessing whether minority residents and low-income residents are benefitting from a proportional share of the projects.

8. Transit

Public transportation consists of a variety of modes of transportation such as buses, commuter rail, light rail, etc. TAPS is the primary provider of public transit in the Sherman-Denison urbanized and rural areas. Buses are the primary type of service available for use by the general public through TAPS. Coordination between TAPS and the MPO is critical to meeting the needs of the general public.

As a FTA Section 5307 recipient, TAPS must follow a Public Participation Plan (PPP). The FTA allows TAPS to rely on a locally adopted public participation plan for the submittal of their projects in lieu of a separate Program of Projects (POP) if the grantee has coordinated with the MPO and ensured that the public is aware that the MPO's plan is being used to satisfy the POP public participation requirements. To comply with this requirement, it will be specifically stated in the TIP and in legal notices that "*The public involvement/comment period for the draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) will also satisfy Texoma Area Paratransit System's (TAPS) public participation requirement for the POP (Section 5307 Funds).*"

B. Purpose

Transportation is an important factor in all our lives. Getting to and from work, school, hospitals, shopping centers and recreational facilities is important to us all. The ability to travel affects our socio-economic well-being. On a larger scale, Grayson County's economy and environment depend heavily on the condition and efficient performance of our transportation system. Appropriate transportation planning, recognizing the mobility needs and identifying the available resources allow for the maintenance and improvement of our transportation system, therefore affecting our economy and quality of life.

The TIP is the programming document for transportation projects in our area. The TIP identifies those projects from the MTP that are being worked on during this time period. The TIP is mandated by the metropolitan planning requirements set forth by 23CFR, Part 450, Subpart C, §324 which states that the MPO, in cooperation with the State and any affected public transportation operator(s), shall develop a TIP for the metropolitan planning area. The TIP shall cover a period of no less than four (4) years, be updated at least every two (2) years, and be approved by the MPO and the Governor. The TIP may be updated more frequently, but the cycle for updating the TIP must be compatible with the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) development and approval process. TIPs from MPOs are approved at the local level and then submitted for inclusion in their respective states' STIP. The STIP is a four (4) year capital improvement program for the state, which is federally approved and is required for projects to be eligible for funding. The TIP expires when the FHWA/FTA approval of the STIP expires. Copies of any updated or revised TIPs must be provided to FHWA and FTA.

The TIP includes capital and non-capital surface transportation projects (or phases of projects) within the boundaries of the Sherman-Denison MPA proposed for funding. It contains a prioritized list of surface transportation improvement projects that are expected to be carried out within a four (4) year period after the adoption of the TIP. These projects are planned to develop, improve, and maintain an integrated transportation system for the Sherman-Denison Metropolitan Area. The construction and improvement of roadways and transportation facilities listed in the TIP will have a positive impact on safety, mobility, and connectivity throughout the region. Some improvements will affect conditions only within the area in which they are located, yet the impact of others will extend far beyond their immediate locations. These transportation improvement projects can be expected to decrease fatal and serious injury crashes, provide travel options, reduce congestion, improve air quality, conserve energy, enhance quality of life and maintain a transportation system beneficial to the entire region.

C. Definition of Area

The metropolitan planning area is the geographic area in which the metropolitan transportation planning process required by 23 United States Code (USC) 134 and Section 5307 of the Federal Transit Act (FTA) must be carried out. Each metropolitan planning area encompasses the census boundary, the urbanized boundary, and the Metropolitan Urban Area Boundary.

The Sherman-Denison MPA is located in the north central portion of the State of Texas, sharing the northern boundary with the Red River/Oklahoma border and touches Lake Texoma, Eisenhower State Park and the Hagerman National Wildlife Refuge. The southern, eastern and western boundaries extend to the limits of Grayson County and are shared with Collin and Denton Counties to the south, Fannin County to the east, and Cooke County to the west. US Highway 75 running North/South basically splits the area in half and US 82 running East/West intersects US 75 and splits the urban area into quadrants.

The MPO is comprised of the following cities: Sherman, Denison, Howe, Gunter, Pottsboro, Van Alstyne, Bells, Collinsville, Dorchester, Pilot Point, Sadler, Southmayd, Tioga, Tom Bean, Whitesboro, and Whitewright. The MPO is also comprised of unincorporated areas of Grayson County, which are likely to become urbanized in the next 20 years. A map of the study area is included in Appendix A. The population of the urbanized area is 61,900 according to the 2010 U.S. Census and the MPA is 135,543 according to the 2020 U.S. Census.

D. Public Participation Process

The Grayson County MPO recognizes that public participation and public involvement is essential to the success of transportation planning. For this reason and to be compliant with 23 CFR 450.316(a), the Grayson County MPO has adopted a PPP. The PPP is the MPO's official policy for the provision of meaningful, active public participation and involvement in transportation planning and related activities. It is designed to educate the public on transportation planning, to seek out and provide opportunity for interested parties to comment on transportation ideas and proposals, and to actively contribute to the transportation policy and decision-making process. The intent of the PPP is to provide guidance for a proactive and comprehensive process to reach out to the community and encourage input from citizens, affected public agencies, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, agencies and officials involved with tourism and natural disaster risk reduction, representatives of users of public transportation including pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities, representatives of low income areas, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties. Comments and feedback from these parties provide the MPO with information about where the transportation needs and priorities are greatest. From project identification to project prioritization, the public plays an important role in shaping the local transportation system. By sharing information between the citizens, stakeholders, board members and staff, the MPO is able to develop plans that best meet the future transportation needs. The PB approved a revision to the PPP on June 23, 2021 to be compliant with 23 CFR 450.316(a), and to insure that the public has ample opportunity to provide feedback.

The procedures outlined in the PPP include posting the public meetings on our website at www.gcmpo.org, advertising in local communication media and maintaining a current mailing list of those persons who are interested in the transportation process. The PPP is available for review at the MPO and can be found on our website. Additionally, MPO staff is available to answer stakeholders' questions and requests for information. In accordance with the PPP, all meetings of the TAC and PB are advertised and are open to the public and include a public comment period after the acknowledgment of a quorum by the chairman at each meeting. To foster an atmosphere of public cooperation and in the spirit of 23 CFR 450.316(a), the MPO staff actively participates in various public organizations. A mailing list of those who have expressed interest is maintained.

Additional information about the MPO's TIP and PPP can be found on the MPO website at www.gcmpo.org. The site also contains downloadable copies of current and past plans and programs including the TIP, notices of meeting dates, and MPO contact information. This site is designed to ensure that the public is informed about transportation issues and to allow adequate opportunities to discuss projects. Links to public documents and agencies such as the latest Federal Transportation Law (IIJA), FHWA, FTA, TxDOT, cities, and county governments may also be found on the MPO website. Citizens are encouraged to contact the MPO staff with their questions, comments, and concerns on any metropolitan transportation issue by mail, e-mail, phone call, visiting our office or contacting staff at any of our meetings, and also to join our e-mail lists for notification about upcoming meetings and events.

The public was afforded the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed TIP. Public comments were accepted during the TAC meeting held on May 18, 2022. Additionally, a public notice was published in the May 6, 2022 copy of the Herald Democrat announcing that the draft 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) would be available for the public to review and comment at a virtual public meeting held on May 11, 2022. The notice stated that comments would be received through May 24, 2022 until 2:00 pm. This information was also posted on the MPO website at www.gcmmpo.org, providing the public with the opportunity to attend the TAC meeting and/or to contact the MPO with any questions, comments, or concerns. The notice was sent via email to members of the media, area chambers of commerce, area economic development corporations, the Tourism/Main Street Manager for the City of Sherman, the Main Street Director for the City of Denison, and others that have expressed an interest in the transportation planning process. Documentation regarding the public participation process can be found in Appendix F.

In addition to the TAC and public meeting, a meeting was held with the Director of the Grayson County Office of Emergency Management on May 11, 2022. The meeting entailed soliciting input on the draft TIP in order to reduce the risk of natural disasters, improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system, and reduce or mitigate storm-water impacts of surface transportation.

In accordance with 23 CFR 450.316(b) and with the aim of enhancing the travel and tourism components of our economy, staff consulted with the Tourism/Main Street Manager for the City of Sherman and the Main Street Director for the City of Denison about the draft TIP and how it could be utilized to enhance travel and tourism in our region.

The PB is anticipated to take action on the final TIP at the June 1, 2022 meeting. **As of the May 24, 2022 deadline, no comments were received.**

E. Project Selection Process

Another crucial component of the transportation planning process is the establishment of a project selection process. The Project Selection Process fulfills several needs in the metropolitan planning process. First, it defines a process to choose each project or idea and select the project that meets the intended need. Second, the process helps distinguish between a viable project and an idea. While project ideas and participation are encouraged, there must be some way to decide which project to include and that project's priority compared to other current projects. Since projects can vary greatly, it is important to have a device that helps to compare projects. Often there will be a number of suggested projects but not enough resources, money or time to undertake all of the projects. For this reason, a system for evaluating projects and ideas are necessary.

Projects included in the TIP are selected from the following sources:

- From last two fiscal years' projects of the previous TIP;
- Projects that have not let for construction can also be advanced from earlier fiscal years of the previous TIP;
- Projects from the financially constrained component of the MTP;
- From TxDOT's ten-year Unified Transportation Program (UTP), including environmental and feasibility studies; and
- Additional projects from local governments, transit agencies, and other member agencies.

All selected projects must satisfy the following criteria:

- Be included in the current MTP;
- Have a committed local contribution source by the project sponsor; and
- Federal and state-funded projects must be located on a TxDOT/FHWA approved functional classification system.

The Sherman-Denison metropolitan area is among the smallest populations designated to be served by an MPO in the State of Texas. As a result, the amount of funding received for the Grayson County MPO is inadequate to meet the needs of the region, and is typically only substantial enough to fund a single project. It is impossible to pick a single project that would assist the state in achieving its performance targets. Therefore it is imperative to select the project or projects that collectively make the largest impact on all of the performance targets.

In order to accomplish this, projects considered for funding by the MPO are ranked utilizing the Project Selection Criteria and associated Subcriteria identified in Table 5. These align with the performance measures outlined in PM1, PM2 PM3, and HB 20, and include additional Project Selection Criteria that are important to our region. These include:

- Safety (PM1),
- Preservation (PM2),
- Congestion Reduction (includes elements of PM3),
- Effect on Economic Development (includes elements of PM3),
- Effect on the Environment,
- Transportation Choices, and
- Community Support.

Projects submitted for consideration for funding will be scored utilizing Decision Lens. TxDOT selected the Decision Lens software to enable performance-based investment planning built around agency goals and objectives, priorities, and performance targets. Ranking projects in this manner will allow the MPO to build a pipeline of projects that, when funded, will allow the MPO to meet and exceed federally-mandated performance levels while satisfying requirements for objectivity, transparency, and accountability. The results from Decision Lens will be divided by the percent of TxDOT funds allocated to the project to arrive at the Final Score for the project as calculated in (1).

Table 5: Project Selection Criteria

CRITERIA	CRITERION %	SUBCRITERIA		% OF TOTAL	
SAFETY	28.00%	Crash Count 25%	Estimated Impact on Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes 50%	3.5000%	
			Estimated Impact on Total Crashes 50%	3.5000%	
		Crash Rate 25%	Estimated Impact on Fatal and Serious Injury Crash Rate 50%	3.5000%	
			Estimated Impact on Total Crash Rate 50%	3.5000%	
		Societal Cost Savings 25%			7.0000%
		Safety Importance 25%	Safety Project Classification Y/N 50%	3.5000%	
			Evacuation Route Y/N 50%	3.5000%	
		PRESERVATION	18.58%	Bridge Condition 50%	Reduction in Structurally Deficient Deck Area 50%
Deck Area Receiving Preventive Maintenance 50%	4.6450%				
Pavement Condition 50%	Reduction in Poor Lane Miles (by Ride Score) 25%			2.3225%	
	Lane Mile Receiving Preventive Maintenance (by Ride Score) 25%			2.3225%	
	Reduction in Poor Lane Miles (by Distress Score) 25%			2.3225%	
	Lane Miles Receiving Preventive Maintenance (by Distress Score) 25%			2.3225%	

CRITERIA	CRITERION %	SUBCRITERIA		% OF TOTAL
CONGESTION	17.12%	Congestion Reduction 100%	Benefit Congestion Index - Auto 50%	8.5600%
			Benefit Congestion Index - Truck 50%	8.5600%
CONNECTIVITY	12.02%	Enhanced Connectivity 100%	Congestion/Connectivity Related Y/N 25%	3.005%
			Trunk System Route Y/N 25%	3.005%
			Intermodal Connector Y/N 25%	3.005%
			Lane Miles of New Connectivity 25%	3.005%
ECONOMIC	8.74%	Economic Importance 50%	National Highway System (NHS) Route Y/N 33.34%	1.4570%
			National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) Y/N 33.33%	1.4565%
			Energy Sector Route Y/N 33.33%	1.4565%
		System Usage 50%	Base ADT 50%	2.1850%
			Base ADTT 50%	2.1850%
ENVIRONMENT	4.64%	Environmental Related Program Y/N 50%	Environmental Mitigation Cost 50%	2.3200%
			Environmental Mitigation Cost 50%	2.3200%

CRITERIA	CRITERION %	SUBCRITERIA	% OF TOTAL
TRANSPORTATION CHOICES	3.90%	Accesses schools, parks, large employer, multifamily or mixed-use residential, or shopping Y/N 25.00%	0.4875%
		Population densities in surrounding area 25.00%	0.4875%
		Access to transit stops Y/N 25.00%	0.4875%
		Serves both bicyclists and pedestrians Y/N 25.00%	0.4875%
		Project Included in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (BPP) Y/N 50.0%	1.9500%
COMMUNITY SUPPORT	7.00%	Survey Results 100%	7.0000%

$$Final\ Score = \frac{Result\ from\ Decision\ Lens}{1 - Local\ Contribution\ (Percent)} \quad (1)$$

Information on how the projects selected makes progress toward meeting these Performance Measures can be found in Appendix E.

F. Project Costs

1. Total Project Costs

Not all project phases may be implemented within the time-frame of the TIP/STIP. An additional line of information has been added to each Federally Funded Highway project listed by State Category within this TIP reflecting the Total Project Cost as calculated by TxDOT Connect. Information on the additional line includes: preliminary engineering (PRELIM ENG), Right-of-Way Purchase (ROW PURCH), construction (CONST COST), construction engineering (CONST ENG), contingencies (CONTING), indirect (INDIRECT) bond finance (BOND FIN), and potential change order (POT CHG ORD) costs. These estimates are based on averages and actual costs for individual projects may vary significantly.

2. Year of Expenditure (YOE)

Federal regulations stipulate that the TIP include financial plans that reflect YOE dollars for project cost estimates. For highway construction cost, historic trends are used to determine future costs and the future revenues for a project. These project funds are shown in YOE dollars. YOE dollars are dollars that are adjusted for inflation from the present time to the expected year of construction. The annual rate of inflation for cost estimates is usually four percent (4%) for project costs. Using the YOE dollars produces a more accurate cost estimate for a project, which is used for planning, programming and implementation.

Transit operation expenses by year were developed by TAPS.

G. Funding

Federal regulations and guidelines require the TIP be fiscally constrained and have a financial plan. Fiscally constrained applies to projects listed in the TIP and it means demonstrating an assurance that there will be sufficient funds (federal, state, local and private) to implement proposed transportation system improvements. This also includes any maintenance and operation costs. A financial plan is a comprehensive document that details costs associated with a project and the revenue structure that will be used to fund the project.

Developing a financially constrained program requires an open, cooperative process among the state, local and regional stakeholders and the MPO. More than a simple review and comment of each project, the necessity of financial considerations requires constant involvement by all those in the development of the estimated funds and the testing of the reasonableness of the financial projections. During the development phase of the TIP, the MPO coordinates with TxDOT to gather estimates of federal and state funds available. TxDOT works with the various transportation entities to develop the best technical method for projecting state and federal funds for several years ahead. To demonstrate that there are funds available for a project, estimates are used for anticipated revenues. The TIP shows these estimated funds in the fiscal year in which they will be received.

The TIP is the product of these estimates for all projects (highway and transit) that will be implemented during the life of the document. The federal, state and local funds shown in the TIP are consistent with

the MTP. The financial constraint enables the TIP to be a meaningful document for implementing the metropolitan transportation goals. The TIP becomes useful for community planning purposes, for meeting environmental protection laws, and for projecting economic, transportation access and mobility performance. The TIP provides a reasonable guide for highway and transit transportation spending based on the assessment of projected available resources.

Proper use of the financial constraint rationalizes and democratizes the planning process and the program, which implements the metropolitan area's visionary goals. The region can have a proper sense of purpose and proportion through the financial constraint. By forcing us to live within our means, the TIP with a financial constraint becomes a meaningful transportation priority-setting investment plan.

Under 23 CFR 450.326(h) projects proposed for FHWA and/or FTA funding that are not considered by State and MPO of appropriate scale for individual identification in a given program are grouped together based on function, geographical area, and work type by using applicable classifications under 23 CFR 771.117(c) and (d), and/or 40 CFR part 93. TxDOT in cooperation with FHWA/FTA allocates lump-sums based on various funding categories to grouped projects. These projects are identified using specific CSJ numbers and are usually not determined as regionally significant. According to Title 23 USC Section 135 Statewide Planning, MPO handles grouped projects as an administrative modification as long as the lump-sum is identified and approved in the MTP. Projects which fall in this category will be identified with an asterisk (*). These grouped CSJ numbers can be found in Appendix C.

1. Highway Funding

TxDOT has twelve (12) different categories of funding in which they can assign to a project. Figure 1 below shows a brief look at the funding categories. A detailed description of the funding categories can be found in Appendix B. A project may have numerous categories attached to it depending on what is being done to the project. Not all categories of funding apply to the Sherman-Denison MPO's planning area, such as Categories 5 and 7.

Figure 1: TxDOT Funding Sources by UTP Category

12 FUNDING CATEGORIES	FEDERAL FUNDS	STATE FUNDS	OTHER STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS
1. Preventive Maintenance and Rehabilitation	Yes	Yes	No
2. Metro and Urban Area Corridors	Yes	Yes	No
3. Non-Traditionally Funded Projects	No	Yes	Yes
4. Statewide Connectivity Corridors	Yes	Yes	No
5. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality*	Yes	No	No
6. Structures Replacement (Bridges)	Yes	Yes	No
7. Metropolitan Mobility and Rehabilitation*	Yes	No	No
8. Safety	Yes	Yes	No
9. Transportation Alternatives*	Yes	No	No
10. Supplemental Transportation Projects	Yes	Yes	No
11. District Discretionary	Yes	Yes	No
12. Strategic Priority	Yes	Yes	No

* While funding in these categories is primarily from federal sources, state funding may also be used.

Fund Definitions: Federal funds are appropriated by Congress through the Federal Highway Trust Fund

State funds are appropriated by the Texas Legislature through the State Highway Fund

Other state & local funds include the Texas Mobility Fund, bond revenue, concessions and regional toll revenue, and local funds

Source: TxDOT 2022 Unified Transportation Program (UTP)

2. Transit Funding

Congress establishes the funding for FTA programs through authorizing legislation that amends Chapter 53 of Title 49 of the U.S. Code. On November 15, 2021, President Biden signed the IIJA, reauthorizing surface transportation programs through Fiscal Year 2026. Federal funding used by the public transportation providers is based on an appropriations process. Annually, FTA apportions (divides up) the annual appropriation from Congress to fund a variety of public transit activities which require matching funds. All federal grants are awarded on a reimbursement basis, so expenses must be incurred before FTA disburses the federal funds. The public transit providers also receive State funds, which are also disbursed on a reimbursement basis and are appropriated biennially by the Texas Legislature. State funds may be used to meet the match requirements of federal grants or for any other purpose that is allowable under federal or state law and a local match is not required. Listed below are the funding categories listed in the FTA website and used by TAPS.

49 U.S.C. Chapter 53, Sections 5303, 5304 & 5305

Program Purpose: Provide funding and procedural requirements for multimodal transportation planning in metropolitan areas and states that is cooperative, continuous and comprehensive, resulting in long-range plans and short-range programs of transportation investment priorities. The planning programs are jointly administered by FTA and FHWA, which provides additional funding. The funding in this category is

usually used to develop transportation plans and programs, plan, design and evaluate a public transportation project, and conduct technical studies related to public transportation.

49 U.S.C. Chapter 53, Sections 5307 & 5340

Program Purpose: The Urbanized Area Formula Funding program makes Federal resources available to urbanized areas and to Governors for transit capital and operating assistance, and for transportation related planning in urbanized areas. An urbanized area is an incorporated area with a population of 50,000 or more that is designated as such by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. The funding in this category is usually used for planning, engineering design and evaluation of transit projects and other technical transportation-related studies; capital investments in bus and bus-related activities such as replacement of buses, overhaul and rebuilding of buses; crime prevention and security equipment; construction of maintenance and passenger facilities; and capital investments in new and existing fixed guideway systems including rolling stock, overhaul and rebuilding of vehicles, track, signals, communications, and computer hardware and software. All preventive maintenance and some ADA complementary paratransit service costs are considered capital costs. For urbanized areas with 200,000 in population and over, funds are apportioned and flow directly to a designated recipient selected locally to apply for and receive Federal funds.

Chapter 53 Section 5310

Program Purpose: To improve mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities by removing barriers to transportation service and expanding transportation mobility options. This program supports transportation services planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special transportation needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities in all areas – large urbanized (over 200,000), small urbanized (50,000-200,000), and rural (under 50,000). Eligible projects include both traditional capital investment and nontraditional investment beyond the ADA complementary paratransit services. The funding in this category should at least 55% of program funds must be used on capital or “traditional” 5310 projects. The remaining 45% is for other “nontraditional” projects.

Chapter 53 Section 5339

Program Purpose: The Grants for Buses and Bus Facilities program (49 U.S.C. 5339) makes Federal resources available to States and designated recipients to replace, rehabilitate and purchase buses and related equipment and to construct bus-related facilities including technological changes or innovations to modify low or no emission vehicles or facilities. Funding is provided through formula allocations and competitive grants. A sub-program provides competitive grants for bus and bus facility projects that support low and zero-emission vehicles. The funding in this category uses capital projects to replace, rehabilitate and purchase buses, vans and related equipment, and to construct bus-related facilities, including technological changes or innovations to modify low or no emission vehicles or facilities.

Transportation Development Credits

Transportation Development Credits have been used by both public transit providers, and they are a federal transportation funding tool that can be utilized by states as a means of meeting local and state matching requirements for federal funding. State credits are accrued when capital investments are made in federally-approved tolled facilities including toll roads and bridges. These credits can then be used as

a “soft match”, meaning that they do not represent an actual source of funding. Essentially, these credits reduce the amount of funding a state or local entity has to contribute and allow many programs to be funded with 100 percent federal funds as opposed to the traditional 80/20 percent split between federal and state/local funding sources. One major advantage of this is that it frees local matching funds for other projects.

H. Progress from Previous TIP (FY 2021-2024)

Table 6 lists all of the projects that were let and/or completed in the previous TIP.

Table 6: Let and/or Completed Projects from the 2021-2024 TIP

Facility	Limits		Description	Total Cost
	From	To		
FS 121	FM 121	GRAYSON COUNTY LINE	CONSTRUCT NEW 2-LANE HIGHWAY	\$8,000,000

I. Revisions and Administrative Changes

Since the TIP is a four (4) year document, TIP revisions and administrative changes can occur on a quarterly basis.


During the TIP revision process, the MPO solicits input from the public. In order to provide the citizens with an opportunity to review the proposed revisions, a public review period and comment period is initiated. During this time, the MPO makes the revised document available in the office as well as online. The public review period is normally concurrent with the public comment period. Comments received during the public comment or review periods are presented to the TAC and PB. Figure 2 shows the general flow of the amendment process to the TIP. Examples of changes that require a TIP revision include:

- Adding federally funded projects;
- Adding regionally significant state or local funded projects;
- Changing the estimated cost of a project that results in a fifty percent (50%) increase in cost and a cost that exceeds \$1.5 million;
- Changes to project limits or scope of work for federally funded projects; and
- Changing the funding sources for a project from non-federal to federal funds.

Administrative changes do not require any formal action or public comment periods. Examples of changes that can be completed through an administrative change include:

- Changes to project identification numbers (such as Control-Section-Job (CSJ) numbers)
- Updating the project’s let date;
- Change in the estimated cost of a project that does one, but not both, of the following: a) exceeds 50% and b) results in a cost exceeding \$1.5 million;
- Splitting or combining projects without modification to original project design concept and scope;
- Modifying the project cost estimate without altering the limits or scope;
- Moving a project from one federal funding category to another;
- Moving a project from one state funding category to another;
- Changing a project’s funding source from federal to state funding; and
- Changes to projects within the “grouped” category.

Figure 2: TIP Revision Process



II. FUNDED HIGHWAY PROJECTS

A. Fiscal Year 2023 Projects

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM									
SHERMAN-DENISON MPO - HIGHWAY PROJECTS									
2023									
NO PROJECTS AT THIS TIME									

B. Fiscal Year 2024 Projects

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM									
SHERMAN-DENISON MPO - HIGHWAY PROJECTS									
FY 2024									
NO PROJECTS AT THIS TIME									

C. Fiscal Year 2025 Projects


TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM									
SHERMAN-DENISON MPO - HIGHWAY PROJECTS									
FY 2025									
DISTRICT	MPO		COUNTY		CSJ	HWY	PHASE	CITY	YOE COST
PARIS	GRAYSON COUNTY		GRAYSON		0047-13-033	US 75	C,E,R	VAN ALSTYNE	\$ 55,540,800
LIMITS FROM: FM 902					PROJECT SPONSOR: GRAYSON COUNTY MPO				
LIMITS TO: COLLIN COUNTY LINE (MPO BOUNDARY)					REVISION DATE: 08/2022				
PROJECT: WIDEN FROM 4 LANE TO 6 LANE					MPO PROJECT NUM: SD2024-01				
DESCR:					FUNDING CAT(S): 2U,4,12,3LC,11				
REMARKS P7:					PROJECT HISTORY:				
TOTAL PROJECT COST INFORMATION			AUTHORIZED FUNDING BY CATEGORY/SHARE						
PRELIM ENG:	\$ 2,429,910		CATEGORY	FEDERAL	STATE	REGIONAL	LOCAL	LC	TOTAL
ROW PURCH:	\$ -	COST OF	2U	\$ 11,040,000	\$ 2,760,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,800,000
CONST COST:	\$ 49,540,000	APPROVED	3LC	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,710,000	\$ 4,710,000
CONST ENG:	\$ 2,361,757	PHASES	4	\$ 2,128,000	\$ 532,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,660,000
CONTING:	\$ 991,800	\$55,540,800	11	\$ 480,000	\$ 120,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 600,000
INDIRECT:	\$ 1,581,777		12	\$ 27,016,640	\$ 6,754,160	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33,770,800
BOND FIN:	\$ -		TOTAL	\$ 40,664,640	\$ 10,166,160	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,710,000	\$ 55,540,800
POT CHG ORD:	\$ 3,962,241								
TOTAL COST:	\$ 60,867,485								
DISTRICT	MPO		COUNTY		CSJ	HWY	PHASE	CITY	YOE COST
PARIS	GRAYSON COUNTY		GRAYSON		0047-18-089	US 75	C,E,R	DENISON	\$ 88,480,000
LIMITS FROM: NORTH LOY LAKE ROAD					PROJECT SPONSOR: GRAYSON COUNTY MPO				
LIMITS TO: US 82					REVISION DATE: 08/2022				
PROJECT: WIDEN FROM 4 LANE TO 6 LANE					MPO PROJECT NUM: GC2025-01				
DESCR:					FUNDING CAT(S): 2U,4,12				
REMARKS P7:					PROJECT HISTORY:				
TOTAL PROJECT COST INFORMATION			AUTHORIZED FUNDING BY CATEGORY/SHARE						
PRELIM ENG:	\$ -		CATEGORY	FEDERAL	STATE	REGIONAL	LOCAL	LC	TOTAL
ROW PURCH:	\$ -	COST OF	2U	\$ 53,520,000	\$ 13,380,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 66,900,000
CONST COST:	\$ -	APPROVED	3LC	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000
CONST ENG:	\$ -	PHASES	4	\$ 8,080,000	\$ 2,020,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,100,000
CONTING:	\$ -	\$88,480,000	12	\$ 7,584,000	\$ 1,896,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,480,000
INDIRECT:	\$ -		TOTAL	\$ 69,184,000	\$ 17,296,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 88,480,000
BOND FIN:	\$ -								
POT CHG ORD:	\$ -								
TOTAL COST:	\$ -								

PHASE: C = CONSTRUCTION, E = ENGINEERING, R = ROW, T = TRANSFER

D. Fiscal Year 2026 Projects

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM									
SHERMAN-DENISON MPO - HIGHWAY PROJECTS									
FY 2026									
NO PROJECTS AT THIS TIME									

E. Map of Funded Highway Projects



III. FUNDED TRANSIT PROJECTS

A. Fiscal Year 2023 Projects

FY 2023 TRANSIT PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS			
GRAYSON COUNTY MPO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
			YOE = Year of Expenditure
<u>General Project Information</u>		<u>Funding Information (YOE)</u>	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5307
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS23	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$64,279
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$0
		Other Funds	\$16,070
Apportionment Year	2023	Fiscal Year Cost	\$80,349
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Planning (80/20)	Total Project Cost	\$80,349
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Amendment Date & Action			
<u>General Project Information</u>		<u>Funding Information (YOE)</u>	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5307
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS23	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$334,715
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$214,310
		Other Funds	\$120,405
Apportionment Year	2023	Fiscal Year Cost	\$669,430
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Operating (50/50)	Total Project Cost	\$669,430
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Amendment Date & Action			
<u>General Project Information</u>		<u>Funding Information (YOE)</u>	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5307
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS23	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$178,590
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$0
		Other Funds	\$44,648
Apportionment Year	2023	Fiscal Year Cost	\$223,238
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Preventative Maintenance (80/20)	Total Project Cost	\$223,238
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Amendment Date & Action			

FY 2023 TRANSIT PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS			
GRAYSON COUNTY MPO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
			YOE = Year of Expenditure
General Project Information		Funding Information (YOE)	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5307
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS23	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$1,500,000
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$0
		Other Funds	\$0
Apportionment Year	2023	Fiscal Year Cost	\$1,500,000
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Capital (80/20)	Total Project Cost	\$1,500,000
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$375,000
Sec 5309 ID Number		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Amendment Date & Action			

* These 5307 funds will be used for the TAPS Admin Building located at 6104 Texoma Parkway, Sherman, TX. TxDOT will be furnishing \$3,000,000 of Rural 5339 funds.

General Project Information		Funding Information (YOE)	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5339
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS23	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$150,000
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$0
		Other Funds	\$0
Apportionment Year	2023	Fiscal Year Cost	\$150,000
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Bus Acquisition or Bus Facility (80/20)	Total Project Cost	\$150,000
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$27,500
Sec 5309 ID Number		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Amendment Date & Action			

B. Fiscal Year 2024 Projects

FY 2024 TRANSIT PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS			
GRAYSON COUNTY MPO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
		YOE = Year of Expenditure	
<u>General Project Information</u>		<u>Funding Information (YOE)</u>	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5307
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS24	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$64,344
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$0
		Other Funds	\$16,086
Apportionment Year	2024	Fiscal Year Cost	\$80,430
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Planning (80/20)	Total Project Cost	\$80,430
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Amendment Date & Action			
<u>General Project Information</u>		<u>Funding Information (YOE)</u>	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5307
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS24	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$339,736
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$214,524
		Other Funds	\$125,212
Apportionment Year	2024	Fiscal Year Cost	\$679,472
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Operating (50/50)	Total Project Cost	\$679,472
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Amendment Date & Action			
<u>General Project Information</u>		<u>Funding Information (YOE)</u>	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5307
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS24	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$181,268
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$0
		Other Funds	\$45,317
Apportionment Year	2024	Fiscal Year Cost	\$226,585
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Preventative Maintenance (80/20)	Total Project Cost	\$226,585
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Amendment Date & Action			

FY 2024 TRANSIT PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS			
GRAYSON COUNTY MPO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
		YOE = Year of Expenditure	
General Project Information		Funding Information (YOE)	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5339
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS24	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$175,000
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$0
		Other Funds	\$0
Apportionment Year	2024	Fiscal Year Cost	\$175,000
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Bus Acquisition or Bus Facility (80/20)	Total Project Cost	\$175,000
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$35,000
		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number			
Amendment Date & Action			

C. Fiscal Year 2025 Projects

FY 2025 TRANSIT PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS			
GRAYSON COUNTY MPO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
		YOE = Year of Expenditure	
<u>General Project Information</u>		<u>Funding Information (YOE)</u>	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5307
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS25	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$65,630
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$0
		Other Funds	\$16,408
Apportionment Year	2025	Fiscal Year Cost	\$82,038
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Planning (80/20)	Total Project Cost	\$82,038
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Amendment Date & Action			
<u>General Project Information</u>		<u>Funding Information (YOE)</u>	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5307
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS25	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$346,530
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$216,885
		Other Funds	\$129,645
Apportionment Year	2025	Fiscal Year Cost	\$693,060
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Operating (50/50)	Total Project Cost	\$693,060
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Amendment Date & Action			
<u>General Project Information</u>		<u>Funding Information (YOE)</u>	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5307
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS25	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$184,890
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$0
		Other Funds	\$46,223
Apportionment Year	2025	Fiscal Year Cost	\$231,113
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Preventative Maintenance (80/20)	Total Project Cost	\$231,113
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Amendment Date & Action			

FY 2025 TRANSIT PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS			
GRAYSON COUNTY MPO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
		YOE = Year of Expenditure	
General Project Information		Funding Information (YOE)	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5339
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS24	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$200,000
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$0
		Other Funds	\$0
Apportionment Year	2024	Fiscal Year Cost	\$200,000
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Bus Acquisition or Bus Facility (80/20)	Total Project Cost	\$200,000
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$50,000
		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number			
Amendment Date & Action			

D. Fiscal Year 2026 Projects

FY 2026 TRANSIT PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS			
GRAYSON COUNTY MPO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
		YOE = Year of Expenditure	
<u>General Project Information</u>		<u>Funding Information (YOE)</u>	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5307
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS26	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$66,615
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$0
		Other Funds	\$16,654
Apportionment Year	2026	Fiscal Year Cost	\$83,269
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Planning (80/20)	Total Project Cost	\$83,269
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Amendment Date & Action			
<u>General Project Information</u>		<u>Funding Information (YOE)</u>	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5307
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS26	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$398,510
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$219,270
		Other Funds	\$179,240
Apportionment Year	2026	Fiscal Year Cost	\$797,020
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Operating (50/50)	Total Project Cost	\$797,020
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Amendment Date & Action			
<u>General Project Information</u>		<u>Funding Information (YOE)</u>	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5307
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS26	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$187,660
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$0
		Other Funds	\$46,915
Apportionment Year	2026	Fiscal Year Cost	\$234,575
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Preventative Maintenance (80/20)	Total Project Cost	\$234,575
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Amendment Date & Action			

FY 2026 TRANSIT PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS			
GRAYSON COUNTY MPO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
		YOE = Year of Expenditure	
General Project Information		Funding Information (YOE)	
Project Sponsor	Texoma Area Paratransit System	Federal Funding Category	5339
MPO Project Information (reference number, etc.)	21SDHBUS26	Federal (FTA) Funds	\$225,000
		State Funds from TxDOT	\$0
		Other Funds	\$0
Apportionment Year	2026	Fiscal Year Cost	\$225,000
Project Phase	N/A		
Brief Project Description	Bus Acquisition or Bus Facility (80/20)	Total Project Cost	\$225,000
		Trans. Dev. Credits Requested	\$56,250
		Trans. Dev. Credits Awarded (Date & Amount)	\$0
Sec 5309 ID Number			
Amendment Date & Action			

IV. FINANCIAL SUMMARY
A. Highway Financial Summary

Fiscal Year	CSJ	Project #	Facility	Limits		Description						Total	
				From	To		1 - Preventive Maintenance	2U - Urban Mobility	3LC - Local Contribution	4 - Congestion, Connectivity, Corridor Projects Prop 7 (4 3C)	11 - District Discretionary		12 - Commission Discretionary
2023													
	No projects at this time												
												2023 Total	\$0
2024													
	No projects at this time												
												2024 Total	\$0
2025													
	0047-13-033	SD2024-01	US 75	FM 902	COLLIN COUNTY LINE (MPO BOUNDARY)	WIDEN FROM 4 TO 6 LANE		\$13,800,000	\$4,710,000	\$2,660,000	\$600,000	\$33,770,800	\$55,540,800
	0047-18-089	GC2025-01	US 75	NORTH LOY LAKE ROAD	US 82	WIDEN FROM 4 TO 6 LANE		\$66,900,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,100,000		\$9,480,000	\$88,480,000
												2025 Total	\$144,020,800
2026													
	No projects at this time												
												2026 Total	\$0
Total							\$0	\$80,700,000	\$6,710,000	\$12,760,000	\$600,000	\$43,250,800	\$144,020,800

Grayson County MPO											
Initial FY 2023 - 2026 Transportation Improvement Program											
Funding by Category											
Funding Category	Description	FY 2023		FY 2024		FY 2025		FY 2026		Total FY 2023 - 2026	
		Programmed	Authorized	Programmed	Authorized	Programmed	Authorized	Programmed	Authorized	Programmed	Authorized
1	Preventive Maintenance and Rehabilitation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2M or 2U	Urban Area (Non- TMA) Corridor Projects	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$80,700,000	\$80,700,000	\$0	\$0	\$80,700,000	\$80,700,000
3	Non-Traditionally Funded Transportation Project	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,710,000	\$6,710,000	\$0	\$0	\$6,710,000	\$6,710,000
3DB	Design Build (DB)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4	Urban and Regional Connectivity	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,760,000	\$12,760,000	\$0	\$0	\$12,760,000	\$12,760,000
5	CMAQ	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
6	Structures - Bridge	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
7	Metro Mobility & Rehab	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
8	Safety	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
9	TAP Set-Aside Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
10	Supplemental Transportation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
10 CBI	Corridor Border	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
11	District Discretionary	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$0	\$0	\$600,000	\$600,000
11	Energy Sector	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
12	Texas Clear Lanes	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
12	Strategic Priority	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$43,250,800	\$43,250,800	\$0	\$0	\$43,250,800	\$43,250,800
SW PE	Statewide Budget PE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SW ROW	Statewide Budget ROW	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$144,020,800	\$144,020,800	\$0	\$0	\$144,020,800	\$144,020,800
Funding Participation Source											
Source	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	Total FY 23-26						
Federal	\$0	\$0	\$109,848,640	\$0	\$109,848,640						
State	\$0	\$0	\$27,462,160	\$0	\$27,462,160						
Local Match	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0						
CAT 3 - Local Contributions (LC)	\$0	\$0	\$6,710,000	\$0	\$6,710,000						
CAT 3 - DB	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0						
CAT 3 - Prop 14 Bonds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0						
CAT 3 - Texas Mobility Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0						
CAT 3 - Vehicle Registration Fees - VTR	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0						
CAT 3 - RTR	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0						
CAT 3 - PTF	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0						
CAT 3 - TDC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0						
Statewide Budget PE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0						
Statewide Budget ROW	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0						
Total		\$0	\$0	\$144,020,800	\$0	\$144,020,800					
Annotations											
1. *Local Match should be a percent of participation on a specific category of funding except non-traditional funding.											
2. The TIP financial summary should be a total of all projects currently within your TIP, excluding grouped projects.											
3. You can add / delete funding source rows 33-43 as needed.											
4. All non-traditional programmed amount should equal all non-traditional (CAT 3) funding source amounts											

B. Transit Financial Summary

Transit Financial Summary									
Sherman-Denison Metropolitan Planning Organization									
FY 2023- 2026 Transportation Improvement Program									
All Figures in Year of Expenditure (YOE) Dollars							Current as of 04/20/2020		
Transit Program	FY 2023			FY 2024			FY 2025		
	Federal	State/Other	Total	Federal	State/Other	Total	Federal	State/Other	Total
1 Sec. 5307 - Urbanized Formula >200K			\$0			\$0			\$0
2 Sec. 5307 - Urbanized Formula <200K	\$2,077,584	\$395,433	\$2,473,017	\$585,348	\$401,139	\$986,487	\$597,050	\$409,161	\$1,006,211
3 Sec. 5309 - Discretionary			\$0			\$0			\$0
4 Sec. 5310 - Elderly & Individuals w/Disabilities			\$0			\$0			\$0
5 Sec. 5311 - Nonurbanized Formula			\$0			\$0			\$0
6 Sec. 5316 - JARC >200K			\$0			\$0			\$0
7 Sec. 5316 - JARC <200K			\$0			\$0			\$0
8 Sec. 5316 - JARC Nonurbanized			\$0			\$0			\$0
9 Sec. 5317 - New Freedom >200K			\$0			\$0			\$0
10 Sec. 5317 - New Freedom <200K			\$0			\$0			\$0
11 Sec. 5317 - New Freedom Nonurbanized			\$0			\$0			\$0
12 Other FTA	\$150,000	\$0	\$150,000	\$175,000	\$0	\$175,000	\$200,000	\$0	\$200,000
13 Regionally Significant or Other			\$0			\$0			\$0
Total Funds	\$2,227,584	\$395,433	\$2,623,017	\$760,348	\$401,139	\$1,161,487	\$797,050	\$409,161	\$1,206,211
Transportation Development Credits									
Requested		\$402,500	\$402,500		\$35,000	\$35,000		\$0	\$0
Awarded			\$0			\$0			\$0
All Figures in Year of Expenditure (YOE) Dollars									
Transit Programs	FY 2026			FY 2023-2026 Total					
	Federal	State/Other	Total	Federal	State/Other	Total			
1 Sec. 5307 - Urbanized Formula >200K			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
2 Sec. 5307 - Urbanized Formula <200K	\$652,785	\$462,079	\$1,114,864	\$3,912,767	\$1,667,812	\$5,580,579			
3 Sec. 5309 - Discretionary			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
4 Sec. 5310 - Elderly & Individuals w/Disabilities			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
5 Sec. 5311 - Nonurbanized Formula			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
6 Sec. 5316 - JARC >200K			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
7 Sec. 5316 - JARC <200K			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
8 Sec. 5316 - JARC Nonurbanized			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
9 Sec. 5317 - New Freedom >200K			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
10 Sec. 5317 - New Freedom <200K			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
11 Sec. 5317 - New Freedom Nonurbanized			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
12 Other FTA	\$225,000	\$0	\$225,000	\$750,000	\$0	\$750,000			
13 Regionally Significant or Other			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
Total Funds	\$877,785	\$462,079	\$1,339,864	\$4,662,767	\$1,667,812	\$6,330,579			
Transportation Development Credits									
Requested		\$0	\$0		\$437,500	\$437,500			
Awarded			\$0			\$0			

V. LOCALLY FUNDED PROJECTS

There are no locally funded, regionally significant projects at this time.

VI. GLOSSARY

A. Definitions

PROJECT CODE	DEFINITION	EXPLANATION
CSJ	Control Section Job Number	TXDOT – assigned number for projects entered into the Unified Transportation Plan (UTP)
PROJ ID	Project Identification	Code assigned by the MPO for local tracking/identification; used to relate projects to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan
F. CLASS	Federal Functional Classification	Federal classification of streets and highways into functional operating characteristics. Categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INTERSTATE - Interstate • FWY/EXP - Other Urban Freeways and Expressways • PRIN ART - Other Principal Arterials • MINOR ART - Minor Arterials • COLLECTOR - Urban Collectors and Rural Major Collectors • MINOR COLLECTOR - Rural Minor Collectors • LOCAL - Urban and Rural Local Streets and Roads
FED PROG	Federal Funding Category	Major categories of Federal funding were established by the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), continued through to the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and have been modified in the previous transportation bill, known as the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) and again in the FAST Act and current IIJA. Categories are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IC - Interstate Construction • IM - Interstate Maintenance • NHS - National Highway System • STP - Surface Transportation Program • CMAQ - Congestion & Mitigation Air Quality Funds • BRIDGE - On/Off System Bridge Rehabilitation • DSB - Donor State Bonus Funds • MA - Minimum Allocation Funds • FLHP - Federal Land Highway Program • FTA - Federal Transit Administration Funding
PHASE	Project Phase for Federal Funding	C – Construction E – Preliminary Engineering R – Right of Way Acquisition T – Transfers


B. Acronyms

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
DOT	Department of Transportation
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FAST	Fixing America's Surface Transportation
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FY	Fiscal Year
HB 20	Texas House Bill 20
HSIP	Highway Safety Improvement Program
HSP	Highway Safety Plan
IJA	Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991
MAP-21	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPA	Metropolitan Planning Area
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
NHS	National Highway System
PB	Policy Board
PM	Performance Measure
POP	Program of Projects
PPP	Public Participation Plan
SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act - A Legacy for Users
STIP	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TAM	Transit Asset Management
TAPS	Texoma Area Paratransit System
TEA-21	Transportation Equity Act for the 21 st Century
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
TTC	Texas Transportation Commission
TxDOT	Texas Department of Transportation
UPWP	Unified Planning Work Program
USC	United States Code
UTP	Unified Transportation Program
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
YOE	Year of Expenditure

VII. DISCLAIMER

“The preparation of this document has been financed in part through grant(s) from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, under the State Planning and Research Program, Section 505 [or Metropolitan Planning Program, Section 104(f)] of Title 23, U.S. Code. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the U.S. Department of Transportation.”

APPENDIX A – SHERMAN-DENISON MPA



APPENDIX B – 2022 UTP PROGRAMMING GUIDANCE

Funding Category	General Guidance	Project Selection/Approval	Project Scoring/Ranking	Programming
Category 1 Preventive Maintenance & Rehabilitation	Category 1 addresses preventive maintenance and rehabilitation of the existing state highway system, including pavement, signs, traffic signals, and other infrastructure assets. The category can be used to supplement mobility project funding as an open funding line.	TxDOT districts select projects using a performance-based prioritization process that assesses district-wide maintenance and rehabilitation needs as well as district-wide safety needs. Selections are made in accordance with each district's Pavement Management Plan and Safety Plan.	District scoring/ranking methodologies	Districts coordinate directly with FIN-Letting Management
Category 2 Metropolitan & Urban Area Corridor Projects	Category 2 addresses mobility and added capacity projects on urban corridors to mitigate traffic congestion, traffic safety, and roadway maintenance or rehabilitation. Projects must be located on the state highway system.	MPOs, in consultation with TxDOT districts, select projects within the constraint of their Category 2 10-year planning targets. MPOs use a performance-based prioritization process that assesses mobility needs within the MPO boundaries. Project funding must be authorized by the Texas Transportation Commission through the annual UTP adoption.	For each project submitted for Category 2-funding in the UTP Project Call, districts must provide a project score to TPP to demonstrate performance-based selection. MPOs must also submit their project scoring methodology to TPP. TPP additionally scores projects statewide to assign each project a tier ranking (1, 2, or 3) in the UTP document.	MPOs coordinate with districts to submit projects for approval or administrative revision to TPP-UTP with estimated letting dates dependent on fiscal constraint.
Category 3 Non-Traditionally Funded Transportation Projects	Category 3 is for transportation projects that qualify for funding from sources not traditionally part of the State Highway Fund, including state bond financing (such as Proposition 12 and Proposition 14), the Texas Mobility Fund, pass-through financing, regional revenue and concession funds, and local funding. Common project types include new-location roadways, roadway widening (both freeway and non-freeway), and interchange improvements.	Projects are determined by state legislation, Texas Transportation Commission-approved minute order, or local government commitments.		Districts coordinate with FIN-LM and forecasting
Category 3 Design-Build	Category 3 Design-Build addresses non-construction costs associated with Design-Build projects fully funded, approved for contract, and within the constraints of project development LAR approval. These costs include those associated with design, utilities and other development costs approved in the Design Build Guidance Document.	Projects selected for Design-Build are evaluated by PFD, selected and recommended by Administration. Once a project has been designated for Design-Build and is listed on the approved 2-year Design-Build schedule, it is eligible for Cat 3 Design-Build funds. Design-Build development fund sources are approved through FIN Forecasting (Silvia Morales)	Scored and ranked by PFD Design-Build selection criteria	Districts submit projects for approval/administrative revision to TPP and FIN-LM.
Category 4 Urban Connectivity	Category 4 Urban addresses mobility on major state highway system corridors, which provide connectivity in urban areas. Projects must be located within the MPO boundaries on the designated highway connectivity corridor network that includes: - The Texas Trunk System - National Highway System (NHS) - Connections to major sea ports or border crossings - National Freight Network - Hurricane evacuation routes	Districts select projects within the constraint of their Category 4U 10-year planning targets. Districts submit projects to TPP during the UTP Project Call. Projects are considered for approval by the Commission.	For each project submitted for Category 4U funding in the UTP Project Call, districts must provide a project score to TPP to demonstrate performance-based selection. TPP additionally scores projects statewide to assign each project a tier ranking (1, 2, or 3) in the UTP document.	Districts submit projects for approval or administrative revision to TPP-UTP with estimated letting dates dependent on fiscal constraint.
Category 4 Regional Connectivity	Category 4 Regional addresses mobility on major state highway system corridors, which provide connectivity between urban areas and other statewide corridors. Projects must be located outside of the MPO boundaries on the designated highway connectivity corridor network that includes: - The Texas Trunk System - National Highway System (NHS) - Connections to major sea ports or border crossings - National Freight Network - Hurricane evacuation routes	Districts submit candidate projects to TPP through the annual UTP Project Call. Projects are recommended by TPP leadership and approved by the TTC.	For each project submitted for Category 4R funding in the UTP Project Call, districts must provide a project score to demonstrate performance-based selection at the district level. TPP additionally scores Category 4R candidate projects statewide and uses this score as a factor in recommending projects for funding authorization. The statewide scores are also used to assign each project a tier ranking (1, 2, or 3) in the UTP document.	Districts submit projects for approval or administrative revision to TPP-UTP with estimated letting dates dependent on fiscal constraint.

Funding Category	General Guidance	Project Selection/Approval	Project Scoring/Ranking	Programming
Category 5 CMAQ	Category 5 addresses attainment of National Ambient Air Quality Standard in non-attainment areas (currently the Dallas-Fort Worth, Houston, San Antonio, and El Paso metro areas). Each project is evaluated to quantify its air quality improvement benefits. Funds cannot be used to add capacity for single-occupancy vehicles.	MPOs select the project in coordination with the districts	Local scoring/ranking methodologies	MPOs coordinate with TxDOT districts who then submit program funding to FIN-Letting Management
Category 6 Structures Replacement and Rehabilitation (Bridge)	Category 6 addresses bridge improvements through the following sub-programs: Highway Bridge Program: For replacement or rehabilitation of eligible bridges on and off the state highway system that are considered functionally obsolete or structurally deficient. Bridges with a sufficiency rating below 50 are eligible for replacement. Bridges with a sufficiency rating of 80 or less are eligible for rehabilitation. A minimum of 15% of the funding must go toward replacement and rehabilitation of off-system bridges. Bridge Maintenance and Improvement Program: For rehab of eligible bridges on the state highway system. Bridge System Safety Program: For elimination of at-grade highway-railroad crossings through the construction of highway overpasses or railroad underpasses, and rehabilitation or replacement of deficient railroad underpasses on the state highway system.	Category 6 funding is allocated to TxDOT's Bridge Division, which selects projects statewide.	TxDOT's Bridge Division selects projects using a performance based prioritization process. Highway Bridge projects are ranked first by condition categorization (e.g., Poor, Fair, Good) and then by sufficiency ratings. Bridge Maintenance and Improvement projects are selected statewide based on identified bridge maintenance/ improvement needs. Bridge System Safety projects involving railroad grade separations are selected based on a cost-benefit analysis of factors such as vehicle and train traffic, accident rates, casualty costs, and delay costs for at-grade railroad crossings. Other system safety projects are selected on a cost-benefit analysis of the work needed to address the safety concern at bridges identified with higher risk features	Districts submit projects for approval/administrative revision to BRG.
Category 7 Metropolitan Mobility and Rehabilitation	Category 7 addresses transportation needs within the boundaries of MPOs with populations of 200,000 or greater — known as transportation management areas (TMAs). This funding can be used on any roadway with a functional classification (FC) greater than a local road or rural minor collector (FC 6 or 7). Common project types include roadway widening (both freeway and non-freeway), new-location roadways, and interchange improvements.	MPOs select the project in coordination with the districts	Local scoring/ranking methodologies	MPOs coordinate with TxDOT districts who then submit program funding to FIN-Letting Management
Category 8 Safety	Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP): Federal aid program administered by Traffic Safety Division (TRF) to fund safety projects on and off the state highway system, with the purpose to achieve significant reductions in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. Traffic projects must align with the emphasis areas in the Texas Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) such as roadway and lane departures, intersections, older road users, and pedestrian safety. TRF provides districts with funding projections for on-system targeted, on-system systemic, and off-system projects, and districts submit project proposals for review and concurrence by TRF. The funding remains allocated to and supervised by TRF. Systemic Widening Program (SSW): Statewide program to fund the widening of high risk narrow highways on the state highway system. Road to Zero (RTZ): Program initiated by the Texas Transportation Commission in the 2020 UTP with \$600M commitment for the FY 2020-2021 biennium. Funding on the state highway system dedicated to target and reduce fatalities and suspected serious injuries in the three highest contributing categories: roadway and lane departure, intersection safety, and pedestrian safety. <i>Completed Programs with no additional project calls/selections under Category 8:</i>	HSIP: Districts submit project selections for on-system targeted, on-system systemic, and off-system projects meeting TxDOT's HSIP Guidance. TRF reviews and approves projects submitted through annual program calls. SSW: Project locations are prioritized statewide and selected based on high risk factors and cost. RTZ: Subsequent investments would be at the discretion of the Commission with program allocations and project selection managed by TRF.	HSIP: Projects are evaluated, prioritized, and selected at the district level based on three years of crash data (targeted funds) or systemic approved projects as outlined in the HSIP guidance. SSW: Projects are evaluated by roadway safety features for preventable severe crash types using total risk factor weights. RTZ: If additional program allocations are provided beyond the \$600M in FY 20 and FY 21, projects are evaluated by roadway safety factors, crash reduction factors, the safety improvement index, and time required to complete a candidate project. All evaluation factors are directly tied to the targeted top three contributing categories in fatalities and suspected serious injuries.	Districts coordinate the programming and approval of funding lines with Letting Management in the Finance Division after projects have been reviewed and approved by TRF. Updates to programmed funding lines require pre-approval by TRF.
Category 8: Rail	Rail-Highway Crossing Program (Federal Railroad Set-Aside): Funding set aside from HSIP for safety improvements to reduce fatalities, injuries, and incidents at on and off-system public at-grade crossings. Funds may also be used to mitigate blocked at-grade crossings.	Rail Division manages the selection and management of projects in line with the 2015 Rail Highway Operations Manual. Project review is based on project calls and to supplement existing HSIP or other traffic signal projects impacted by a railroad crossing.	Projects are evaluated using the railroad crossing index. Projects are ranked and rated based on criteria in the 2015 Rail Highway Operations Manual. Emphasis is placed on traffic signal preemption.	Districts coordinate the programming and approval of funding lines with FIN-Letting Management after projects have been reviewed and approved by RRD.

Funding Category	General Guidance	Project Selection/Approval	Project Scoring/Ranking	Programming
Category 9 Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program (TASA)	Category 9 includes the federal Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside Program. These funds may be awarded for the following activities: - Construction of sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle signals, traffic-calming techniques, lighting and other safety-related infrastructure, and transportation projects to achieve compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. - Conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails for pedestrian, bicyclists, or other non-motorized transportation users - Construction of infrastructure-related projects to improve the ability of students to walk and bicycle to school - Other eligible activities consistent with federal guidelines outlined in rules adopted by MPOs for their TA programs.	TxDOT allocates 50% of Category 9 funds to subareas of the state based on population (MPOs with a population over 200,000, which are designated as TMAs). The other 50% is designated for statewide use and may be transferred to other federal programs. For TMAs, MPOs select projects in consultation with TxDOT districts. In rural areas (with a population of 5,000 or less) and small urban areas (population 5,001 to 200,000) across the state, funds are administered by TxDOT's Public Transportation Division through a competitive process.		For TMA projects, MPOs coordinate with TxDOT districts who then submit programmed funding to FIN-Letting Management. For non-TMA projects, PTN approves Cat. 9 programming following any necessary actions from the Commission.
Category 10 Ferry Boat Program	Category 10 Ferry Boat Program addresses the construction and capital maintenance and rehabilitation of ferry boat facilities along the Texas coast.	Ferry Boat projects are ranked based on level of need and selected by Maintenance Division in coordination with the Houston and Corpus Christi Districts.		Districts coordinate programming funds with FIN-LM once approved by MNT.
Category 10 Federal Lands Access Program	Category 10 Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) addresses transportation facilities that are located on, are adjacent to, or provide access to federal lands.	In FLAP, project applications are scored and ranked by the Programming Decision Committee (PDC). Projects selected under FLAP are managed by TPP.		Districts coordinate programming funds with FIN-LM once approved by TPP.
Category 10 Texas Parks and Wildlife Department	Category 10 Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) addresses the construction and rehabilitation of roadways within or adjacent to state parks and other TPWD properties. Subject to memorandum of agreement between TxDOT and TPWD.	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) selects State Park Roads projects in coordination with TxDOT districts.		Districts coordinate programming funds with FIN-LM once approved by TPWD.
Category 10 Green Ribbon Program	Category 10 Green Ribbon Program addresses projects to plant trees and other landscaping to help mitigate the effects of air pollution in air quality non-attainment or near non-attainment counties	Green Ribbon allocations are based on one-half percent of the estimated letting capacity for the TxDOT districts that contain or are near air quality non-attainment counties and managed by the TxDOT Design Division.		Districts coordinate programming funds with FIN-LM once approved by DES.
Category 10 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)	Category 10 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) funds address construction or replacement of curb ramps at on-system intersections to make the intersections more accessible to pedestrians with disabilities.	ADA projects are selected statewide based on conditions of curb ramps or location of intersections without ramps.		Districts coordinate programming funds with FIN-LM once approved by DES.
Category 10 Landscape Incentive Award	Category 10 Landscape Incentive Awards allow TxDOT to execute joint landscape development projects in nine locations based on population categories in association with the Keep Texas Beautiful Governor's Community Achievement Awards Program. The awards recognize participating cities' or communities' efforts in litter control, quality of life issues, and beautification programs and projects.	Landscape Incentive Awards are managed by the TxDOT Design Division.		Districts coordinate programming funds with FIN-LM once approved by DES.
Category 10 Railroad Grade Crossing and Replanking Program	Category 10 Railroad Grade Crossing and Replanking Program addresses the replacement of rough railroad crossing surfaces on the state highway system (approximately 50 installations per year statewide).	TxDOT Rail Division in coordination with TxDOT districts selects Railroad Grade Crossing Replanking projects.		Districts coordinate programming funds with FIN-LM once approved by RRD.
Category 10 Railroad Signal Maintenance Program	Category 10 Railroad Signal Maintenance Program: uses financial contributions to each railroad company in the state for signal maintenance.	TxDOT Rail Division in coordination with TxDOT districts selects Railroad Signal Maintenance projects.		Districts coordinate programming funds with FIN-LM once approved by RRD.
Category 10 Coordinated Border Infrastructure (CBI)	Category 10 Coordinated Border Infrastructure (CBI) addresses construction of and improvements to the safe movement of motor vehicles at or across the land border between the United States and Mexico. Funding can also be used to address operational improvements, modifications to regulatory procedures and international coordination and border operation with Mexico. Projects may be used on and off system. Program funds awarded to the El Paso, Laredo and Pharr District projects within 50 miles of the international border. All CBI funds have been allocated per the 2021 UTP. Future Border State Infrastructure (BSIF) apportionment will be allocated through a Category 11 subprogram specific to and	CBI projects selected by districts with FHWA review and approval coordinated through TPP.		Districts submit projects for approval/administrative revision to TPP-Freight & International Trade.

Funding Category	General Guidance	Project Selection/Approval	Project Scoring/Ranking	Programming
Category 11 District Discretionary	Category 11 addresses district transportation needs at the discretion of each TxDOT District. Funds from this program should not be used for right of way acquisition. Common Category 11 project types include roadway maintenance or rehab, added passing lanes (Super 2), and roadway widening (non-freeway). The program can be used to supplement mobility project funding.	Districts select projects.	District scoring/ranking methodologies	Districts coordinate directly with FIN-Letting Management
Category 11 Energy Sector	Category 11 Energy Sector funds address safety and rehabilitation work on state highways impacted by the energy sector. These funds generally are programmed on roadways most impacted by energy sector activity, outside of MPO boundaries. This program should be reviewed on a quarterly basis to ensure funding is programmed to meet the needs of each energy play.	Districts select projects on roadways most impacted by energy sector activity, generally outside of MPO boundaries, and within their Category 11ES planning targets. Projects must be vetted and approved through the Energy Sector Program Manager and coordinated with TPP. The Energy Sector Program Manager role may rotate among members of TxDOT division or district leadership as assigned by ADM. See TPP-UTP for the current program manager.	Scored and ranked by districts and Energy Sector Committee/Program Manager	Districts coordinate with FIN-LM (once approved by Energy Sector Program Manager and TPP) with estimated letting dates dependent on fiscal constraint.
Category 12 Strategic Priority	Category 12 addresses projects with specific importance to the state, as determined by the Texas Transportation Commission (TTC), including those that improve: - Congestion and connectivity - Economic opportunity - Energy sector access - Border and port connectivity - Efficiency of military deployment routes or retention of military assets in response to the Federal Military Base Realignment and Closure Report - The ability to respond to both man-made and natural emergencies Common project types include roadway widening (both freeway and non-freeway).	Districts submit candidate projects to TPP during the annual UTP Project Call. Projects are selected and approved by the TTC.	For each project submitted for Category 12 funding in the UTP Project Call, districts must provide a project score to demonstrate performance-based selection at the district level. TPP additionally scores Category 12 candidate projects statewide and uses this score as a factor in recommending projects for funding authorization. The statewide scores are also used to assign each project a tier ranking (1, 2, or 3) in the UTP document.	Districts submit projects for approval to TPP-UTP with estimated letting dates dependent on fiscal constraint.
Category 12 TexasClearLanes	The Category 12 TexasClearLanes subprogram is dedicated to large congestion projects in the five metropolitan TxDOT districts (AUS, DAL, FTW, HOU, SAT). These projects must be vetted through the Congestion Task Force and are selected at the Texas Transportation Commission's discretion.	Projects must be presented and vetted through the Congestion Task Force. Once vetted, districts submit projects to TPP during the annual UTP Project Call. Projects are selected and approved by the TTC.	For each project submitted for Category 12 funding in the UTP Project Call, districts must provide a project score to demonstrate performance-based selection at the district level. TPP additionally scores Category 12 candidate projects statewide and uses this score as a factor in recommending projects for funding authorization. The statewide scores are also used to assign each project a tier ranking (1, 2, or 3) in the UTP document.	Districts submit projects for approval to TPP-UTP with estimated letting dates dependent on fiscal constraint.
CANDPA	Candidate Plan Authority (CANDPA) projects must be programmed outside of the 10-year UTP development window. CANDPA projects are not eligible for development activities (non-chargeable).	Districts select CANDPA projects.		District
Feasibility Studies (FEAS)	For use on studies of possible future corridors; these are not construction projects. Studies can be programmed within the 10-year UTP with the estimated let date as the anticipated year the study will be completed and the associated "construction costs" representing the cost of the study.	Districts select FEAS studies with coordination through TPP and approval from the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Business Sponsor	District scoring methodology and review/prioritization against statewide needs in coordination with TPP.	Districts coordinate with TPP who will seek approval from the ESC Business Sponsor.
PLAN	Administratively approved for Large Strategic Projects and Future Statewide Initiatives, designated for development outside of the 10-year UTP window. These projects are approved for initial schematic and environmental work. ROW and ENV clearance activities are restricted. Please refer to UTP authority programming	Districts select PLAN projects with approval from the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Business Sponsor.	District scoring methodology and review/prioritization against statewide needs potentially utilizing the Corridor Prioritization Tool (CPT)	Districts coordinate with TPP who will seek approval from the ESC Business Sponsor.
DA	DA funds represent the balance of the UTP that has not yet been programmed on specific projects. A district's DA target is equivalent to the amount of the district's non-programmed balance across allocated UTP categories. District DA targets are managed by TPP-UTP. DA projects are authorized for early development activities, including schematic approval, environmental clearance, right of way acquisition, and the start of PS&E. These projects must be programmed within Years 5-10 of the UTP. DA projects are divided into 6DA, 8DA, District DA (DDA), and Statewide DA (SWDA). 6DA is used for bridge projects, 8DA for safety projects, DDA for mobility projects chosen by the district, and SWDA for regionally significant projects likely to compete for statewide funding.	Districts have discretion to select DDA projects, which are subject to TPP-UTP review for constraint within set targets. DDA projects are eligible for eventual funding from any of the 12 categories but are primarily expected to be candidates for Categories 2 and 4U. SWDA projects are located on statewide connectivity corridors and are likely to compete for Category 4 Regional or Category 12 funding. SWDA programming is approved by TPP-leadership. Districts must submit 6DA projects to BRG for potential Category 6 funding and 8DA projects to TRF for potential Category 8 funding.	District scoring methodology	Districts submit programmed funding to FIN-Letting Management for DDA, 6DA, 8DA. TPP-UTP approval is required for SWDA and DDA and BRG and TRF for 6DA and 8DA, respectively. TPP-UTP monitors all DA balances and may coordinate with districts to address changes to DA programming.

2022 UTP AUTHORITY GUIDELINES

UTP Authority	Work Program	Terminology	Approval	Estimated Let Date	Authorized Activities	End Point	Project Types/Comments
Plan	CANDPA	Candidate/Proposed Projects	District	Estimated let date outside the current UTP 10-year window	None. For planning purposes only. No resources can be assigned and no expenditures can be made. These projects were formerly classified as "900" CSJs in DCIS.	Project is prioritized to move to Develop Authority and initiate development activities	Any proposed project.
FS	FEAS	Feasibility Studies	ESC Business Sponsor	Anticipated year of study completion	Activities within the scope of the feasibility study	Completion of feasibility study	
Plan	PLAN	Planned Projects	ESC Business Sponsor, for large strategic projects and future statewide initiatives	Estimated let date outside the current UTP 10-year window	<p>Early-stage activities. Preliminary engineering for schematics, preliminary ENV studies for corridors, initial overall cost estimate for construction.</p> <p>Environmental review can begin once a project is developed enough to determine scope and limits. However, environmental clearance cannot occur until the project is listed in a regional MTP/RTP (20-year plan). Rural projects in PLAN authority will be handled on a case by case basis coordinated with TPP. Final design cannot occur until after environmental clearance</p> <p>ROW may be acquired for a project in PLAN if the Texas Transportation Commission has authorized the acquisition of property, the project has ENV clearance or advanced acquisition approval, and the project is listed in a fiscally constrained MTP.</p>	Project is prioritized to move to Develop Authority and continue development activities	For future major projects requiring long-term development. Candidates should be submitted through TPP.
Develop	DDA	District Develop Authority	TPP-UTP	Estimated let date within Years 5-10 of the current UTP	<p>Preliminary engineering, schematic approval, environmental clearance, right of way acquisition, and the start of PS&E.</p> <p>Environmental review can begin once a project is developed enough to determine scope and limits. However, environmental clearance cannot occur until the project is listed in a regional MTP/RTP (20-year plan) and TIP/STIP (or, if outside of the 4-year window of the STIP, in an appendix to the TIP or in a rural area in an appendix to the STIP). Final design cannot occur until after environmental clearance.</p>	Project is fully funded and ready to move to Construct Authority based on its stage of development. Once fully funded, projects can remain in Develop Authority if stage of development does not warrant a move into Construct Authority.	<p>DA funds represent the balance of the UTP that has not yet been programmed on specific projects. Districts may collectively program DA up to the amount of the current UTP balance, <u>which is subject to TPP-UTP review for constraint</u>. DA targets, balances and programming levels can be viewed via the Tableau Engineering Operations DA Dashboard. This is updated twice every quarter.</p> <p>DA projects may be eligible for eventual funding from any UTP category but should not be maintenance projects.</p> <p>DA projects should be fully programmed to warrant development activities. Fully programmed means the combination of programming (category and DA funds) equals the current/latest construction estimate.</p> <p>Any DA projects no longer in active development should be moved to CANDPA.</p>
	6DA	Bridge Develop Authority	Bridge Division				
	8DA	Safety Develop Authority	Traffic Division				
	SWDA	Statewide Develop Authority	TPP leadership, for large strategic projects and future statewide initiatives				

UTP Authority	Work Program	Terminology	Approval	Estimated Let Date	Authorized Activities	End Point	Project Types/Comments
Construct	UTP Categories 1-12	Construct Authority	Commission authorization for Categories 2, 4, and 12.	Estimated let date within Years 1-4 of the current UTP	Completion of all project development activities needed for letting, including ENV clearance, ROW acquisition, utility adjustments, and PS&E activities. Under Construct Authority, projects are finalizing Federal/state requirements in anticipation of letting (CBI, CMAQ, FPAA, railroad agreements, AFA).	All development activities are complete and project goes to letting	Includes all 12 UTP Categories. Must be fully funded. No DDA/SWDA/etc. or partially funded projects. Projects on the 2-year Letting Schedule must be ready to let (RTL) or projected to be RTL by the scheduled letting date. Projects with Construct authority must also be approved within the 4-year STIP.
			Districts and Divisions decides other category programming as outlined in the UTP Programming Guidance specific to each funding category.		Environmental review can begin once a project is developed enough to determine scope and limits. However, environmental clearance cannot occur until the project is listed in a regional MTP/RTP (20-year plan) and TIP/STIP (or, if outside of the 4-year window of the STIP, in an appendix to the TIP or in a rural area in an appendix to the STIP). Final design cannot occur until after environmental clearance.		
Projects in Develop Authority can not be listed in the STIP for Construction							
<p>Note 1. District Develop Authority Targets are determined by summing up all allocated categorical funding to the district then subtracting all programming against those allocations (Statewide allocations such as Cat 6, 8, 9 PTN, and 10 as well as local/non-traditional funding (Cat 3) are zero sum and will not impact this analysis). Carryover amounts and funding from previous years also will not impact this analysis. SWDA must be approved by TPP Corridor Planning.</p> <p>Note 2. Administrative changes to authorized project funding: With TPP approval, districts may increase the Category 2 funding amount on a project by up to 10% of the current programmed amount if the district has a sufficient Category 2 balance. The 10% rule does not apply to Category 4 Urban, Category 4 Regional, or Category 12. With TPP approval, districts may shift authorized CAT 4U funding between projects on the Connectivity Corridor Network within MPO boundaries or authorized CAT 4R funding between projects on the same corridor within the same district.</p>							

APPENDIX C – GROUPED PROJECT CSJs

Table 1

GROUPED PROJECT CSJs

Definition of Grouped Projects for use in the STIP
Revised February 23, 2021

PROPOSED CSJ	GROUPED PROJECT CATEGORY	DEFINITION
5000-00-950	PE-Preliminary Engineering	Preliminary Engineering for any project except added capacity projects in a nonattainment area. Includes activities which do not involve or lead directly to construction, such as planning and research activities; grants for training; engineering to define the elements of a proposed action or alternatives so that social, economic, and environmental effects can be assessed.
5000-00-951	Right of Way	Right of Way acquisition for any project except added capacity projects in a nonattainment area. Includes relocation assistance, hardship acquisition and protective buying.
5000-00-952 5000-00-957 5000-00-958	Preventive Maintenance and Rehabilitation	Projects to include pavement repair to preserve existing pavement so that it may achieve its designed loading. Includes seal coats, overlays, resurfacing, restoration and rehabilitation done with existing ROW. Also includes modernization of a highway by reconstruction, adding shoulders or adding auxiliary lanes (e.g., parking, weaving, turning, climbing, passing, non-added capacity) or drainage improvements associated with rehabilitation [See Note 3].
5000-00-953	Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation	Projects to replace and/or rehabilitate functionally obsolete or structurally deficient bridges.
5000-00-954	Railroad Grade Separations	Projects to construct or replace existing highway-railroad grade crossings and to rehabilitate and/or replace deficient railroad underpasses, resulting in no added capacity
5800-00-950	Safety	Projects to include the construction or replacement/rehabilitation of guard rails, median barriers, crash cushions, pavement markings, skid treatments, medians, lighting improvements, highway signs, curb ramps, railroad/highway crossing warning devices, fencing, intersection improvements (e.g., turn lanes), signalization projects and interchange modifications. Also includes projects funded via the Federal Hazard Elimination Program, Federal Railroad Signal Safety Program, or Access Managements projects, except those that result in added capacity.

Table 1

GROUPED PROJECT CSJs

Definition of Grouped Projects for use in the STIP
Revised February 23, 2021

PROPOSED CSJ	GROUPED PROJECT CATEGORY	DEFINITION
5000-00-956	Landscaping	Project consisting of typical right-of-way landscape development, establishment and aesthetic improvements to include any associated erosion control and environmental mitigation activities.
5800-00-915	Intelligent Transportation System Deployment	Highway traffic operation improvement projects including the installation of ramp metering control devices, variable message signs, traffic monitoring equipment and projects in the Federal ITS/IVHS programs.
5000-00-916	Bicycle and Pedestrian	Projects including bicycle and pedestrian lanes, paths and facilities (e.g., sidewalks, shared use paths, side paths, trails, bicycle boulevards, curb extensions, bicycle parking facilities, bikeshare facilities, etc.). Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure related activities (e.g. enforcement, tools, and education programs).
5000-00-917	Safety Rest Areas and Truck Weigh Stations	Construction and improvement of rest areas, and truck weigh stations.
5000-00-918	Transit Improvements and Programs	Projects include the construction and improvement of small passenger shelters and information kiosks. Also includes the construction and improvement of rail storage/maintenance facilities bus transfer facilities where minor amounts of additional land are required and there is not a substantial increase in the number of users. Also includes transit operating assistance, preventative maintenance of transit vehicles and facilities, acquisition of third-party transit services, and transit marketing, and mobility management/coordination. Additionally includes the purchase of new buses and rail cars to replace existing vehicles or for minor expansions of the fleet [See Note 4].
5000-00-919	Recreational Trails Program	Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV), Equestrian, Recreational Water/Paddling Trails and related facilities; Recreational Trails related education and safety programs.

Note 1: Projects eligible for grouping include associated project phases (Preliminary Engineering, Right-Of-Way and Construction).

Note 2: Projects funded with Congestion Mitigation Air Quality funding require a Federal eligibility determination, and are not approved to be grouped.

Table 1

GROUPED PROJECT CSJs

Definition of Grouped Projects for use in the STIP

Revised February 23, 2021

Note 3: Passing lanes include "SUPER 2" lanes consistent with TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual.

Note 4: In PM10 and PM2.5 nonattainment or maintenance areas, such projects may be grouped only if they are in compliance with control measures in the applicable implementation plan.

Note 5: Projects funded as part of the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) and Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program consistent with the grouped project category definitions may be grouped. RTP or TA funded projects that are not consistent with the grouped project category definitions must be individually noted in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Road diet projects may not be grouped.

APPENDIX D – MPO SELF CERTIFICATION

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION

In accordance with 23 CFR Part 450.336 and 450.220 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA);, the Texas Department of Transportation, and the Grayson County Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Sherman-Denison urbanized area hereby certify that the transportation planning process is addressing the major issues in the metropolitan planning area and is being conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of:

1. [23 U.S.C. 134](#), [49 U.S.C. 5303](#), and this subpart;
2. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended ([42 U.S.C. 2000d-1](#)) and [49 CFR part 21](#);
3. [49 U.S.C. 5332](#), prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age in employment or business opportunity;
4. Section 1101(b) of the IIJA ([Pub. L. 114-357](#)) and [49 CFR part 26](#) regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in DOT funded projects;
5. [23 CFR part 230](#), regarding the implementation of an [equal employment opportunity program](#) on Federal and Federal-aid [highway](#) construction contracts;
6. The provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ([42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.](#)) and [49 CFR parts 27, 37](#), and [38](#);
7. The Older Americans Act, as amended ([42 U.S.C. 6101](#)), prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance;
8. Section 324 of title 23 U.S.C. regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender; and
9. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 ([29 U.S.C. 794](#)) and [49 CFR part 27](#) regarding discrimination against individuals with disabilities.

Noel Paramanatham, P.E.

District
Texas Department of Transportation

District Engineer

June 1, 2022

Date

Bill Magers

Metropolitan Planning Organization
Policy Board Chairman

Chairperson

June 1, 2022

Date

APPENDIX E – PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Reference Section I.E. Project Selection Process for detailed information on how the following projects were selected:

Project Number: **SD2024-01**

- **Project Description:** Reconstruct and widen US 75 from FM 902 to the Collin County Line/MPO Boundary from four (4) lane to six (6) lane.
- **Safety Improvements:** This eight (8) mile long section has had six (6) fatal and several incapacitating injury accidents over the past five (5) years. This project will reconstruct the roadway to current interstate standards and greatly improve safety.
- **Pavement and Bridge Condition Improvements:** This section of US 75 currently has a condition score class of fair. These improvements are anticipated to increase the condition score class to very good, thus greatly improving pavement conditions on the Non-Interstate NHS.
- **System Performance:** This section of US 75, which is designated as a Critical Rural Freight Corridor, has more vehicles per day traveling on it than IH 35 in Cooke County or IH 30 in Hunt County and has more commercial vehicles per day traveling on it than IH 35 in Cooke County. It is anticipated to be congested by 2038. Increasing the capacity of the roadway by adding two (2) lanes will greatly increase the system performance.

Project Number: **GC2025-01**

- **Project Description:** Reconstruct and widen US 75 from North Loy Lake Road to US 82 from four (4) lane to six (6) lane.
- **Safety Improvements:** This 4 ½ mile long section has had 10 fatal and several incapacitating injury accidents over the past five (5) years. This project will reconstruct the roadway to current interstate standards and greatly improve safety.
- **Pavement and Bridge Condition Improvements:** This section of US 75 currently has a condition score class of poor. These improvements are anticipated to increase the condition score class to very good, thus greatly improving pavement conditions on the Non-Interstate NHS.
- **System Performance:** This section of US 75, which is designated as a Critical Urban Freight Corridor, has more vehicles per day traveling on it than IH 35 in Cooke County or IH 30 in Hunt County and has more commercial vehicles per day traveling on it than IH 35 in Cooke County. It is anticipated to be congested by 2038. Additionally, this section contains one area that was identified as a safety and congestion bottleneck, one area that was identified as a safety and reliability bottleneck, and one area that was identified as a congestion bottleneck according to TxDOT Transportation Planning and Programming’s analysis of “IHS Global Insight, Freight Finder 2018.” Increasing the capacity of the roadway by adding two (2) lanes will greatly increase the system performance.

APPENDIX F – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT DOCUMENTATION



PUBLIC NOTICE

Do not remove until:
May 24, 2022

For More Information Contact:
Clay Barnett, 903-813-4524

GRAYSON COUNTY MPO RELEASES THE DRAFT 2023-2026 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

SHERMAN, TX (April 27, 2022) – The Grayson County Metropolitan Planning Organization (GCMPO) is the organization charged with transportation planning for the greater Sherman-Denison Urbanized Area, which includes Grayson County, and is the recipient of federal planning funds.

The GCMPO is releasing the draft 2023-2026 TIP for public review and comment. The TIP contains a listing of projects which the GCMPO intends to pursue over the four (4) year period. The draft 2023-2026 TIP can be found on the front page of the GCMPO's website at www.gcmppo.org. The public involvement/comment period for the draft TIP will also satisfy Texoma Area Paratransit System's (TAPS) public participation requirement for the Program of Projects (Section 5307 Funds).

In addition, the GCMPO will host a public meeting on May 11, 2022 at 5:00 pm in the Grayson County Courthouse Assembly Room located at:

100 W. Houston St.
Sherman, TX 75090

The public meeting can also be attended virtually via www.zoom.us. Instructions on how to connect to the public meeting virtually can also be found at www.gcmppo.org.

Comments may be submitted by email to: barnettc@co.grayson.tx.us. All comments must be received by 2:00 pm on May 24, 2022 to be included in the public record. The draft 2023-2026 TIP will be placed before the GCMPO Policy Board at its Wednesday, June 1, 2022 meeting for approval.

The GCMPO staff looks forward to hearing from you!

FILED FOR RECORD
2022 APR 27 AM 11:48

100 W. Houston St., Suite G1, Sherman, TX 75090
www.gcmppo.org

DEANA PATTERSON
COUNTY CLERK
GRAYSON COUNTY, TX

 **GRAYSON COUNTY MPO**
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
INTERMODAL URBAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
MEDIA RELEASE

For Immediate Release:
April 27, 2022

For More Information Contact:
Clay Barnett, 903-813-4524

GRAYSON COUNTY MPO RELEASES THE DRAFT 2023-2026 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

SHERMAN, TX (April 27, 2022) – The Grayson County Metropolitan Planning Organization (GCMPO) is the organization charged with transportation planning for the greater Sherman-Denison Urbanized Area, which includes Grayson County, and is the recipient of federal planning funds.

The GCMPO is releasing the draft 2023-2026 TIP for public review and comment. The TIP contains a listing of projects which the GCMPO intends to pursue over the four (4) year period. The draft 2023-2026 TIP can be found on the front page of the GCMPO's website at www.gcmppo.org. The public involvement/comment period for the draft TIP will also satisfy Texoma Area Paratransit System's (TAPS) public participation requirement for the Program of Projects (Section 5307 Funds).

In addition, the GCMPO will host a public meeting on May 11, 2022 at 5:00 pm in the Grayson County Courthouse Assembly Room located at:


100 W. Houston St.
Sherman, TX 75090

The public meeting can also be attended virtually via www.zoom.us. Instructions on how to connect to the public meeting virtually can also be found at www.gcmppo.org.

Comments may be submitted by email to: barnettc@co.grayson.tx.us. All comments must be received by 2:00 pm on May 24, 2022 to be included in the public record. The draft 2023-2026 TIP will be placed before the GCMPO Policy Board at its Wednesday, June 1, 2022 meeting for approval.

The GCMPO staff looks forward to hearing from you!

100 W. Houston St., Suite G1, Sherman, TX 75090
www.gcmppo.org



Welcome to transportation planning within the Sherman - Denison, Texas urban area. We are located 70 miles north of Dallas along the Red River which separates Texas and Oklahoma. Home to beautiful Lake Texoma and Hagerman National Wildlife Refuge.

UPCOMING EVENTS

Click on a highlighted date to see events for that day:

April, 2022

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
27	28	29	30	31	1	2
3	4				8	9
10	11				15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

WEBSITE ADDRESS CHANGE

Please bookmark our new website address! It is gcmpo.org. The sdmpo.org website will **cease to function** after November 16, 2022.

Draft 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program Released for Public Comment

The Grayson County Metropolitan Planning Organization (GCMPO) is the organization charged with transportation planning for the greater Sherman-Denison Urbanized Area, which includes Grayson County, and is the recipient of federal planning funds.

The GCMPO is releasing the draft 2023-2026 TIP for public review and comment. The TIP contains a listing of projects which the GCMPO intends to pursue over the four (4) year period. The draft 2023-2026 TIP can be found by clicking [HERE](#). The public involvement/comment period for the draft TIP will also satisfy Texoma Area Paratransit System's (TAPS) public participation requirement for the Program of Projects (Section 5307 Funds).

In addition, the GCMPO will host a public meeting on May 11, 2022 at 5:00 pm in the Grayson County Courthouse Assembly Room located at:

100 W. Houston St.
Sherman, TX 75090

The public meeting can also be attended virtually via:

Join Zoom Meeting
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/817604453399?pwd=ckFkSkZlSHlueWVhd0YkYmF1dDQyQ0c0Q009>
Meeting ID: 8176 0445 3399
Passcode: 515888

Comments may be submitted by email to: bairettc@gcmppo.org. All comments must be received by 2:00 pm on May 24, 2022 to be included in the public record. The draft 2023-2026 TIP will be placed before the GCMPO Policy Board at its Wednesday, June 1, 2022 meeting for approval.

The GCMPO staff looks forward to hearing from you!

REPORTS, ARTICLES AND TOPICAL DATA OF INTEREST

- 10/02/2019 SDMPPO revises bylaws regarding representative requirements
- 10/29/2019 Grayson County gives nod to Grayson Parkway Project: future toll service road
- 11/06/2019 BRIDGING THE US 75 GAP: \$163 million project awarded_start date set
- 11/07/2019 Officials say October strongest month for housing permits in modern history
- 11/12/2019 The 12 Texas cities everyone in the country is moving to
- 11/14/2019 FM 1417 improvements coming; TxDOT prioritizes plans
- 11/25/2019 TxDOT seeking feedback on Hwy 82 safety
- 12/03/2019 Denison ISD added 400 students in last five years
- 12/03/2019 CLOSING THE GAP: US 75 improvements to break ground after 25 years of discussions
- 12/04/2019 Ceremony marks start of Grayson County highway project
- 12/04/2019 Highway 75 and 82 gap project construction planned for January
- 12/04/2019 TxDOT asks the public suggestions on increasing safety to HWY 82
- 12/05/2019 FM 1417 improvements slated for 2020 start
- 12/05/2019 \$300M US 82 safety plans discussed by TxDOT
- 12/05/2019 TxDOT gives timeline of US 75 Gap project
- 01/14/2020 US 75 expansion project begins next week
- 04/24/2020 SDMPPO eyes \$3.37 million U.S. 75 project in 2024
- 07/01/2020 Report Finds Some States Diverting Large Portions of Gas Tax from Roads, Bridges
- 11/06/2020 SDMPPO talks consultant for growth
- 11/10/2020 Sherman highway upgrade is work in progress
- 12/23/2020 SDMPPO cuts scope of 4-year plan by \$16.66M amid state crunch
- 09/16/2021 Return of fixed-route services? TAPS solicits public about future transit options
- 10/28/2021 Name change: SDMPPO re-establishes its self GC MPO
- 11/19/2021 Grayson County has plans for infrastructure funds
- 12/20/2021 Transit agency planning bus routes across Texoma
- 01/17/2022 CLOSING THE GAP: US 75 expansion halfway complete
- 02/09/2022 Winter storm's lingering impact on Grayson County projects

GIVE US YOUR INPUT!

FACEBOOK FEED

Sherman-Denison Metro TAP

Sherman-Denison Metropolitan Planning Organization

HERALDDEMOCRAT.COM
Return of fixed-route services? ...
TAPS Public Transit is exploring the de...

TWITTER FEED

Tweets by @gcmppo

@heralddemocrat
CLOSING THE GAP: US 75 expansion highway complete built by SDMPPO

Jan 14, 2022



Note: the MPO is governed by a public body of directors (organization) and operates all programs and projects without regard to race, color and national origin. The Public Participation Plan describes these objectives along with the procedures to file any complaints in accordance with Title VI. Please [click here](#) for Title VI documents.

Grayson County MPO | 100 W. Houston St., Suite G1 | Sherman, Texas 75090 | 903-813-4524 | Fax: 903-870-4087 | [Disclaimer](#)

Copyright © Grayson County MPO, 2022

powered by **ezTask** titanium™

Newspaper Ad

Public Meeting Sign-In Sheet



Comment Card

Please provide your comments below on the 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program for the Grayson County Metropolitan Planning Organization.

Comments/Questions:

Please check any that apply to you:

- I am employed by TxDOT.
- I do business with TxDOT.
- I could monetarily benefit from the projects or other items about which I am commenting on.

Texas Transportation Code, §201.811(a)(5)

Join our email list:

Name: _____

Email: _____

100 W. Houston St., Suite G1, Sherman, TX 75090
www.gcmopo.org

APPENDIX G – DETAILS OF REVISIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES

There are no revisions or administrative changes at this time.