

## **11. Financial Information - DRAFT**

---

### **Accomplishments Over the Past Five Years**

Since the adoption of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan in December 2004, several financial mechanisms, such as the Advanced Transportation District and Pass Through Financing, have been used successfully to advance construction projects. Additionally, the MPO participated in the year 2006 statewide update of the Texas Metropolitan Mobility Plan to identify unfunded transportation needs and gap sources of funding. Additional funding for transportation, either through increased federal and/or state taxes, local option taxes or user fees, continues to be a priority for the region.

### **Background**

Fiscal constraint has remained a key component of transportation plan and program development since enactment of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) in 1991 followed by the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21) in 1998 and most recently by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) on August 10, 2005.

Traditionally, financing future transportation projects would begin with an examination of historical state and federal funding levels. To estimate future federal and state funding for the region, a forecast based on previous authorizations would be made. However, the insolvency of the Highway Trust Fund, federal funding rescissions, the current economic recession, and periods of high gas prices that reduced the overall amount of driving coupled with more efficient vehicles, make estimating the future funding levels based on historical data, a challenge. Simply projecting current revenues over the past several years for the future is no longer a viable methodology for revenue forecasting.

Additionally, as noted by both the Sunset Commission and the State Auditor's office, there has been a general lack of consistency among Texas' Metropolitan Planning Organizations in terms of their assumptions and methodologies in producing their long-term transportation plans. This inconsistency in turn reduces the utility of a statewide plan encompassing the MPO plans.

To address this situation, a joint Texas Association of MPOs (TEMPO)/Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) workgroup, with the assistance of the Texas Transportation Institute, developed the most sophisticated revenue forecasting model used to date. This model, known as TRENDS (*Transportation Revenue Estimation and Needs*

*Determination System*), produces an estimate of expected conventional revenues through 2035, and quantification of possible revenue enhancements.

## **TRENDS model**

The TRENDS model is usable for transportation planning activities statewide. Incorporating the consensus critical assumptions allows credible planning and “what-if” analysis.

Variables used in the TRENDS model are state population growth, anticipated fuel efficiency, and Federal Trust Fund availability. In addition, the analysis includes selected scenarios of potential revenue enhancements. There are obviously an enormous number of possible combinations of these factors that could be examined. TRENDS allows for extensive and rapid “what-if” analyses by policymakers of scenarios of the critical factors affecting revenues as well as alternative policy options.

In terms of results, the Unified Transportation Program (UTP) “Baseline” scenario (containing “middle-of-the-road” assumptions and parameters but no revenue enhancements), has no funds left for the mobility categories, and would require further reductions even in maintenance funding. Of the additional three scenarios constructed with varying revenue-impacting assumptions but with no enhancements, only the one with all high-revenue assumptions produced enough to fund a small amount of additional mobility investment.

This study found that over the next two decades, fuel consumption will decrease because the impact of greatly increased fuel efficiency will likely surpass the increase in driving. This would actually decrease motor fuel tax revenues relative to today; and when accounting for inflation, greatly decrease them.

It is clear that some form of additional financing will be needed for the state; otherwise, there will be continued increases in congestion and likely even reduced levels of maintenance. And it is highly unlikely that the Federal Highway Trust Fund, itself also subject to fuel-efficiency erosion, will solve the problem for Texas.

## **Additional Financing**

In addition, new, “but reasonably expected to be available” funding sources can be explored as alternatives. New revenue sources usually require some degree of official action, (enabling legislation, referendum, or jurisdictional decision). In order to be considered a strategy for funding sources must ensure the availability of the new revenue in the years when the funds are needed for project development and implementation. Structures to administer new revenue sources may also need to be established if not

already in place. New initiatives will continue to be considered during the process of developing the Financial Plan of the MTP Update. Financial planning is a dynamic process, and should always be adaptable to new innovations as they are identified. In a tight economy, the challenge is finding creative ways to optimize and/or augment existing financing strategies.

## Goals and Objectives

The following goals and objectives support the vision of a workable, cost beneficial transportation system that efficiently serves area mobility and accessibility needs:

**Goal 1** Effectively use available resources for the development, operations, and maintenance of the transportation system.

Objective 1.1 Develop and maintain a financing program that leverages all available funding

Objective 1.2 Develop and maintain a process for continually monitoring financial needs and resource management

**Goal 2** Base cost effective transportation system expansion decisions on both capital investment and operation and maintenance costs

Objective 2.1 Consider operation and maintenance cost when making capital investment decisions

Objective 2.2 Adequately finance operational and maintenance activities which will extend facility life cycle and improve system efficiency

## Selected Funding Sources

### Texas Mobility Fund

A constitutional amendment establishing the Texas Mobility Fund was approved by the State of Texas in the November 2001 election. This fund allows TxDOT to issue bonds for road construction (including toll roads) and other transportation investments through secured future revenue such as transportation-related fees. The fund provides the Texas Department of Transportation the ability to issue bonds and allow mobility projects to commence earlier.

## Surface Transportation Program – Metropolitan Mobility Funds

Funds from the Surface Transportation Program – Metropolitan Mobility (STP-MM) program are administered in Bexar County by the MPO. The original source of these monies is primarily the federal gas tax and various truck taxes. Funds from this source are flexible and can be spent on various transportation projects.

## Special Funding Programs

Recent special funding programs include the various components of the nationwide American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and state funding sources including Proposition 12 and Proposition 14. These are not considered traditional funding sources because, to date, they have provided one-time only funds.

## Transit Formula Funds (FTA Section 5307)

For transit projects, these revenues are provided directly to VIA Metropolitan Transit., through a funding formula. The program is also known as Section 5307 funds and come from federal gas taxes and the general fund. The funds are primarily for transit capital purchases such as buses and transit maintenance facilities and fund 80% of a total project's cost and require a 20% local match.

## Fare Box Revenue

The passenger fare revenues from VIA Metropolitan Transit support operation and maintenance of the transit system.

## VIA Metropolitan Transit Sales Tax

A transit sales tax of ½ % is collected within VIA Metropolitan Transit's service area. The revenues from the sales tax are administered by VIA and support operation, maintenance and capital expenditures for transit.

## Advanced Transportation District

Creation of an Advanced Transportation District and authorization of the imposition of a local sales and use tax for advanced transportation (Senate Bill 769) was enacted by the Texas Legislature during the 76th session in 1999. The Texas Legislature amended this legislation in 2003. Advanced transportation as defined in the legislation includes light rail, commuter rail, fixed guideways, traffic management systems, busways, bus lanes, technologically advanced bus transit vehicles and systems, bus rapid transit vehicles and systems, passenger amenities, transit centers, stations, electronic transit-related information, fare, and operating systems, high occupancy vehicle lanes, traffic signal

prioritization and coordination systems, monitoring systems, and other advanced transportation facilities, equipment, operations, systems, and services, including planning, feasibility studies, operations, and professional and other services in connection with such facilities, equipment, operations, systems, and services.

This legislation authorizes that the board of an authority in which the sales and use tax is imposed at a rate of one-half of one percent and in which the principal municipality has a population of more than 700,000 (VIA Metropolitan Transit) may order an election to create an advanced transportation district within the authority's boundaries and to impose a sales and use tax for advanced transportation under this subchapter. Locally, VIA ordered an election for November 2, 2004. Voters in Bexar County approved the sales tax increase at the rate of one-fourth of one percent. Half of the revenue generated from this sales tax is allocated to VIA Metropolitan Transit to fund transit projects, with the remainder equally divided between the City of San Antonio and the Texas Department of Transportation to fund streets, roads and interstate projects.

#### Transit Discretionary Capital Funds (FTA Section 5309)

These funds are available for major new capital projects. These monies come from federal gas taxes and the federal general fund. Transit service providers apply directly to the FTA for these funds to build a particular project.

#### Federal Transit Administration New Starts Program

The FTA's discretionary "New Starts" program is the Federal government's primary financial resource for supporting locally-planned, implemented, and operated transit "guideway" capital investments. Transit guideway capital investments include heavy rail, light rail, commuter rail, bus rapid transit systems and streetcars. The New Starts program has helped to make possible hundreds of new or extended transit fixed guideway systems across the country. These rail and bus investments, in turn, have improved the mobility of millions of Americans, have helped to reduce congestion and improve air quality in the areas they serve.

#### Statewide Transportation Enhancement Program

The Transportation Enhancement Program is a statewide competitive program and is administered by the Texas Department of Transportation in accordance with applicable federal and state rules and regulations. The funds are provided by the Federal Government under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and are on a cost reimbursement basis. Projects undertaken with enhancement funds are eligible for reimbursement of up to 80% of allowable costs. The governmental entity nominating a project is responsible for the remaining cost share, including all cost overruns.

## Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Funding

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement program (CMAQ) was created in 1991 by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration. The intent of the program is to help fund areas with poor air quality. Although not currently available to the MPO Study Area, the CMAQ funding is considered as a future potential revenue source of this Financial Plan. This funding is available to states for distribution to metropolitan areas in non-attainment of national ambient air quality standards. The San Antonio area is currently in “attainment for ozone” status.

## Safe Routes to Schools Program

The Statewide Safe Routes to School Program was created by House Bill 2204 of the 77<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature. This program is a competitive construction program designed to improve children’s safety in and around school areas. The Texas Department of Transportation has, on occasion, issued a call for projects for the Statewide Safe Routes to School Program. The MPO, as part of its Walkable Community Program, conducts Safe Routes to Schools workshops. At the workshops, citizens, community groups and stakeholders identify needed improvements and safety hazards near schools. MPO staff produces a written report documenting the workshop process and the public’s input in identifying potential safety improvements in the community.

## State Infrastructure Bank

A State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) is an infrastructure investment fund created at the state level. Established in 1995 as part of the National Highway Designation Act (NHS) and approved in 1997 by the 75th Texas Legislature, the Texas Department of Transportation's state infrastructure bank maintains a revolving loan fund that may be made available (through application) to appropriate public and private entities to borrow money to finance transportation projects, subject to approval by the Texas Transportation Commission. This mechanism allows accelerated funding for needed transportation projects, provided they comply with federal and state standards.

## Toll Collection/User Fees

Facilities could be constructed through the selling of bonds and be operated and maintained by toll collections. Surplus revenues from toll collections could also be used to help finance other non-toll facilities. Toll revenue estimates would depend on: 1) traffic volumes of the roadway, 2) trip length, and 3) established user fee. There are currently no existing toll facilities in the region.

## **Funding Partners**

### San Antonio Mobility Coalition

An important partner in transportation is the San Antonio Mobility Coalition, Inc., more commonly referred to as SAMCo. Organized in December 2001 as a non-profit corporation, SAMCo's purpose is "to identify and advocate transportation and mobility solutions for the San Antonio Metropolitan area." Funding for this endeavor is provided by public agencies (Bexar County, City of San Antonio, VIA Metropolitan Transit) and private interests (area chambers of commerce, major San Antonio corporations, transportation construction and supply companies, real estate developers, consulting engineers, and other interested organizations). Examples of SAMCo's efforts include expressing the funding and mobility needs of the region to the greater San Antonio Legislative delegation.

### Alamo Regional Mobility Authority

Approval of Proposition 15 (which established the Texas Mobility Fund) and passage of Texas Senate Bill 342 in 2001 allowed for the creation of Regional Mobility Authorities (RMA). On August 12, 2003, Bexar County Commissioners Court adopted a resolution supporting the formation of a RMA and authorized the County Judge to execute a petition to the Texas Transportation Commission to form the RMA. Today, the Alamo RMA (ARMA) is overseen by a seven member board of directors and is a local transportation authority that can build, operate and maintain transportation projects including toll roads. Information specific to the Alamo Regional Mobility Authority can be found at [www.alamorma.org](http://www.alamorma.org).

### Austin – San Antonio Intermunicipal Commuter Rail District

Formation of a Regional Rail District was granted by passage of Senate Bill 657, during the 75<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislative session. This legislation provides that the two major cities (Austin and San Antonio) and two major counties (Travis and Bexar) may, by a series of resolutions, create a Regional Rail District for the I-35 corridor. In addition, five other cities and thirteen other counties may join the district. The Austin – San Antonio Intermunicipal Commuter Rail District was fully established in 2002. The Board of Directors met for the first time in February 2003 and continues to meet regularly.

A feasibility study for the Austin – San Antonio Corridor conducted in 2004 provided a comprehensive and integrated analysis of the corridor to prepare a long-term strategy and implementation for improving freight and passenger movement. In 2006 preliminary engineering studies and interlocal agreements were established. In 2007 the San Antonio – Bexar County MPO allocated \$10 million of STP-MM funds for each Fiscal Year 2011 and 2012. In 2008 the Capital Area (Austin) MPO allocated \$5 million in FY 2009 and \$5

million in FY 2010. The Austin – San Antonio Commuter Rail District has continued to work on the authorization of funding for the Texas Rail Relocation Fund.

Although the Austin – San Antonio Intermunicipal Commuter Rail District does not have taxation power, it does have the authorization to develop, own and operate a commuter rail system, and issue revenue bonds for the general operation of the system. In addition, the Board is authorized to enter into contracts with local governments that levy property taxes to finance infrastructure, and can apply for federal planning funds, federal and state loans and grants, and is eligible for selling revenue bonds.

Additional information on the Austin – San Antonio Intermunicipal Rail District can be found at [www.asarail.org](http://www.asarail.org).

### Bexar County

Transportation improvement projects and funding for these projects (including highway and transit projects involving County financing or property) within the jurisdiction of Bexar County must be approved by Commissioners Court. The Public Works Division of the Bexar County Infrastructure Services Department has primary responsibility for administering transportation improvements for the County. The County Engineer administers the road funds for County projects.

The average annual maintenance cost per lane mile for Bexar County is \$x,xxx. This cost is based on actual Fiscal Year 2008 maintenance expenditures (\$xx,xxx,xxx) for xxx lane miles. This figure does not include rehabilitation costs, which are included as capital costs. County roadway maintenance and improvement projects are primarily budgeted through four dedicated funds: (1) Special Road and Bridge Fund, (2) Farm-to-Market and Lateral Road Fund, (3) Economic Capital Projects Fund, and (4) November 2003 Bond Referendum Fund.

### City of San Antonio

In May 2007, voters in the City of San Antonio approved the largest bond program in the city's history in the amount of \$459,049,231 million to improve and enhance existing, and acquire or construct new streets, bridges, sidewalks, and drainage facilities. Other amenities include street lighting, technology improvements and signage.

The revenue sources that contribute to the city's general fund are: (1) sales tax, (2) property tax, (3) CPS Energy, and (4) other fees. The City of San Antonio will also receive a share of the revenues generated by the sales tax increase for the Advanced Transportation District. VIA Metropolitan Transit also contributes to the maintenance of the street system. Street reconstruction augments the street maintenance program, extending

the life expectancy of city streets. This is inclusive of seal coat, rehabilitation, crack seal, asphalt overlay and base failure.

### Other Local Funding Programs

Suburban cities and surrounding counties may use local general funds, as well as dedicated road-building funds to complete regional transportation improvements. These funds rely on revenues from various sources including local sales and property taxes, fees, fines, bond levies, and private sector contributions including right-of-way dedication.

### Public/Private Partnerships

Public/private partnerships have occasionally been used in financing transportation facilities. These ventures include roadways, bridges, right-of-way, pedestrian facilities, auxiliary lanes and signalization. Public/private partnerships may also be used for parking facilities, bicycle facilities, transit improvements (including shelters), operational improvements, providing matching funds for transportation improvement projects (including enhancement projects), toll facilities, and other situations which may help leverage available financing for transportation improvements.

Approval of Proposition 15 allows for public/private partnerships (exclusive development agreements) to pay for such ventures, as well as toll equity, Regional Mobility Authorities and the Texas Mobility Fund.

### **Gap Funding**

Reducing future congestion in the Bexar County region will require innovative financing techniques that increase the funding amount that the area currently receives from traditional funding sources. In order to implement this plan, leaders in this region must explore various funding and project implementation strategies, including:

Reduce project costs – agencies must evaluate projects in order to eliminate, postpone, or reduce the scope of certain planned transportation projects.

Phase projects – with limited funds, search for ways to build critical sections of roadway with logical termini and not necessarily construct the ultimate buildout of a roadway in the near term.

Borrowing – this option allows the region the opportunity to build a project sooner, with the understanding that the borrowed money will need to be repaid out of future revenue streams. This could be accomplished through the issuance of bonds.

User Fees – the need for roadway improvements come at a heavy cost. At some point alternatives may need to be implemented in order to relieve congestion and improve the reliability of the transportation system. Several options exist to charge user fees:

- Tolling added roadway capacity
- Applying congestion pricing to new facilities
- Assessing traffic impact fees/systems development charges for new development (based on expected trips that will be generated by the development)

Raise or redistribute existing taxes and fees

- Develop Local Improvement Districts, Business Improvement Districts, Tax Increment Financing Districts and other special taxing districts
- Raise the state gas tax or impose a region wide gas tax
- Develop new local revenue sources, such as a local gas tax or local sales tax such as the Advanced Transportation District
- Increase vehicle registration fees
- Implement parking fees/fines that pay for transportation improvements

Capture a larger portion of State and Federal transportation funding

- Pursue additional federal discretionary funding including FTA 5309 funding and Congressional earmarks
- Work with the Texas Transportation Commission to receive a larger portion of state and district-wide transportation funding allocated within Bexar County and a larger share of the Commission's Strategic Priority funding such as through additional pass through financing projects.

## Project List

The final roadway and transit project list reflects consultation with the public, implementing agencies and other affected stakeholders. The MPO has undertaken an extensive amount of technical analysis to arrive at the list of projects contained in this plan. Using the region's multi-modal travel demand model, these projects were tested for their ability to transport people and goods. The original roadway and transit project lists were reduced in order to meet the SAFETEA-LU planning requirements of financial constraint with projected financial resources available over the next 25 years. Lump sum figures have been included in the project list to allow for some flexibility in safety, bicycle and pedestrian projects as well as roadway preservation over the next 25 years. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan and this project list can be revised, as necessary, to meet the changing needs of the community. It is important to note this financially constrained plan will not eliminate congestion. Levels of congestion are projected to continue to grow.

An unfunded project list is also included in this section. This list shows an additional \$XB in unfunded transportation needs. Specific unfunded roadway, transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects are contained in this list

**Table 11.1 Funding Summary 2010-2035**

<b>Funding Category</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Roadway Funding Categories Total</b>	
Mobility (Category 2)	
Mobility (Texas Mobility Funds)	
Preventative Maintenance (Category 1)	
Structure Replacement and Rehab. (Category 6)	
Safety (Category 8)	
Miscellaneous (Category 10)	
District Discretionary (Category 11)	
Economic Stimulus Funding (ARRA)	
Proposition 12	
Proposition 14	
Pass Through Financing	
<b>VIA Metropolitan Transit Total</b>	
Farebox Collection	
Sales Tax	
Investment Income	
FTA Grant Section 5307	
FTA Grant Section 5309	
FTA Grant Section 5310	
FTA "New Starts" Program	
Economic Stimulus (ARRA)	
<b>Advanced Transportation District Total</b>	
TxDOT (\$8.5 M X 25 yrs)	
City of San Antonio (\$8.5 M X 25 yrs)	
VIA (\$17 M X 25 yrs)	
<b>Other Funding Sources</b>	
Surface Transportation Program – Metro Mobility (Category 7)	
Transportation Enhancement Program (Category 9)	
Congestion Mitigation Air Quality	
Commission Strategic Priority Funding (Category 12)	
FHWA Demonstration Funds	
Private Sector Investment	
<b>Total</b>	

**Table 11.2 Unfunded Project List**

**Table 11.3 Unfunded Bicycle Project List**

**Table 11.4 Unfunded Pedestrian Project List**

Street Name	From	To	Owner	Requested By
Austin Hwy	Broadway intersection	Loop 410	TxDOT	PMAC discussion
Babcock Rd	DeZavala	Loop 410	CoSA	PMAC discussion
Babcock Rd	Overlook	Pedestrian bridge for children	CoSA	Walkable Community Workshop
Fredericksburg Rd	IH 10	Loop 410	CoSA	PMAC Discussion/Bus Rapid Transit
Ingram (fill gaps)	Darwin	Broadview	CoSA	Walkable Community Workshop
New Braunfels Ave	Commerce St	Military Dr	CoSA	PMAC discussion
Nogalitos	Downtown	Military Dr	TxDOT	PMAC discussion
San Pedro Ave	Ave Marie	Nova Mae	CoSA	VIA Request
Wurzbach	Babcock Rd	Fredericksburg	CoSA	PMAC discussion
WW White (Loop 13)	Military Dr	IH 10	TxDOT	PMAC discussion
Commerce St	Old Hwy 90	New Braunfels Ave	CoSA	PMAC discussion
Commerce St	Union Pacific tracks	Kraft	CoSA	VIA Request
Martin Luther King	Freedom Bridge	IH 10	CoSA	PMAC discussion
Moursund Rd	Loop 410 underpass		TxDOT	PMAC discussion
Presa	Steves	Llano	CoSA	Walkable Community Workshop
S Flores	Formosa	Ashley	CoSA	VIA Request
Zarzamora	Saltillo	Merida	CoSA	VIA Request (gaps)
Ashby	San Pedro	N Flores	CoSA	VIA Request
Broadway	Downtown	Loop 410	CoSA/Alamo Hts	PMAC discussion
Goliad Rd	Southcross	Military Dr	CoSA	PMAC discussion
Hackberry (fill gaps)	Virginia	Westfall	CoSA	Walkable Community Workshop
Hamilton Wolfe	Oakdell Way	Fredericksburg	CoSA	PMAC discussion
Hildebrand	San Pedro	Broadway	CoSA	PMAC discussion
Houston	Commerce St	Eastwood	CoSA	VIA Request
Louis Pasteur	Babcock	Fredericksburg	CoSA	PMAC discussion

Street Name	From	To	Owner	Requested By
Martin Luther King	Poppy	Lacey	CoSA	VIA Request
Roosevelt	Kirkpatrick	Eads	CoSA	Walkable Community Workshop
Thousand Oaks	Nacodoches	El Sendero	CoSA	VIA Requests (gaps)
W Military Dr	Woodgate Dr	Timbercreek Dr	CoSA	Walkable Community Workshop
Zarzamora	Kirk	Linares	CoSA	VIA Request (gaps)
Castroville	Acme	41st	CoSA	VIA Request
Commerce St	Coca Cola	just west of Houston St	CoSA	VIA Request
Floyd Curl Dr	Louis Pasteur	Hamilton Wolfe	CoSA	PMAC discussion
Gembler	Entire length		CoSA	PMAC discussion
Huebner	in front of Leon Valley Elementary School		City of Leon Valley	Walkable Community Workshop
Josephine	Austin	US 281 Access Rd	CoSA	VIA Request
Military Dr (Loop 13)	IH 37	S. Presa	TxDOT	PMAC discussion
Mulberry St	US 281	Broadway	CoSA	PMAC discussion
New Braunfels Ave	Hot Wells	SE Military	CoSA	VIA Request
Old Highway 90	San Felipe	San Joaquin	CoSA	VIA Request
Old Highway 90	Suzette	Acme	CoSA	VIA Request
San Pedro Ave	Downtown	Loop 410	CoSA	PMAC discussion
Zarzamora	French Place	Cincinnati	CoSA	VIA Request (gaps)
Zarzamora	Nogalitos	Fredericksburg Rd	CoSA	PMAC discussion
Benrus	Ridge Dr	Blessing St	CoSA	Walkable Community Workshop
Bulverde Rd	Evans	Marshall	Bexar County	PMAC discussion/sidewalks entire length
Commerce St	New Braunfels Ave	IH 10	CoSA	PMAC discussion
Eckert	Huebner	Babcock	CoSA	PMAC discussion
Frio City Road	Brazos	Zarzamora	CoSA	VIA Request
Hwy 16	Loop 410		TxDOT	PMAC discussion
Probandt	S Flores	S Alamo	CoSA	PMAC discussion
SW Loop 410 Access Rd	Marbach	Timbercreek Dr	TxDOT	Walkable Community Workshop
West Ave	Military Dr	Bitters Rd	CoSA	PMAC discussion
Zarzamora	Woodlawn	French Place	CoSA	VIA Request/fill gaps
Aransas	Palmetto	Denver	CoSA	Walkable Community Workshop

Street Name	From	To	Owner	Requested By
Evers Rd	Forest Meadow	Forest Way	City of Leon Valley	Walkable Community Workshop
N St Mary's	Tuleta	Commerce	CoSA	PMAC discussion or VIA Request
NW 36th	Culebra	Bandera Rd	CoSA	PMAC discussion
Stardust	Ingram	Ebony	CoSA	Walkable Community Workshop
El Sendero	Thousand Oaks	Las Cruces	CoSA	VIA Request
Lynhaven	E. Houston	320' South of Houston	CoSA	VIA Request

DRAFT

DRAFT