Transportation Program Expenditures Fiscal Year 2025

Marc D. Williams P.E., Executive Director Texas Department of Transportation

December 1, 2025



Submitted in Compliance with Section 201.616 of the Texas Transportation Code



TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXPENDITURES – FISCAL YEAR 2025 Texas Department of Transportation

Section 201.616 of the Texas Transportation Code requires an annual report to the Legislature on certain matters. Under this law, the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) provides the following information within this report. Expenditures are reported for the fiscal year ended Aug. 31, 2025.

- Expenditures made by TxDOT in the preceding fiscal year in connection with:
 - o The unified transportation program (UTP) of TxDOT
 - Turnpike projects and toll roads of TxDOT
 - o Rail facilities described in Chapter 91 of the Texas Transportation Code
- The amount of bonds or other public securities issued for transportation projects by TxDOT as of Aug. 31, 2025.
- The direction of money by TxDOT to a regional mobility authority (RMA) in Texas for the fiscal year ended Aug. 31, 2025.

This report demonstrates how TxDOT is meeting its goals to deliver the right projects; focus on the customer; foster stewardship; optimize system performance; preserve our assets; promote safety; and value our employees.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (UTP)

The UTP is TxDOT's ten-year plan to guide transportation project development and construction. The UTP includes distribution of funding in the following project categories for the maintenance of the existing transportation system and for all highway construction programs:

- Category 1 Preventive Maintenance and Rehabilitation
- Category 2 Metropolitan and Urban Area Corridor Projects
- Category 3 Non-Traditionally Funded Transportation Projects
- Category 4 Statewide Connectivity Corridor Projects
- Category 5 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement
- Category 6 Structures Replacement and Rehabilitation
- Category 7 Metropolitan Mobility and Rehabilitation
- Category 8 Safety Projects
- Category 9 Transportation Alternatives
- Category 10 Supplemental Transportation Projects
- Category 11 District Discretionary
- Category 12 Strategic Priority

The UTP document can be found on TxDOT's website: https://www.txdot.gov/projects/planning/utp.html

Within the UTP framework, TxDOT works with elected officials, local planning organizations, and the public to select and fund the state's highest priority transportation projects.

For purposes of this report, fiscal 2025 expenditures related to the UTP are broken out by category and department district in the exhibit starting on page 12.

TURNPIKE PROJECTS AND TOLL ROADS

In fiscal 2025, capital, operating, maintenance, right of way, project development, administrative and financing expenditures, including debt service, on toll roads of the department, from various funding sources including non-appropriated toll revenue and bond proceeds, were as follows:

District	Toll Project Location		To	otal
Austin	Central Texas Turnpike System	SH 45N, Loop 1, SH 130 segments 1-4, and SH 45 SE	\$	285,892,945
Dallas	LBJ Express	I-635 from Luna Rd to east of U.S. 75, I-35E from Loop 12 to I-35	\$	2,060,544
Dallas	I-35E Project	From I-635 in Dallas County to U.S. 380 in Denton County	\$	21,738,499
Dallas	Midtown Express	From east of SH 121 to near I-35 E/ Trinity Pkwy, Loop 12 from SH 183 to I-35E and SH 114 from International Parkway to Loop 12 $$	\$	6,499,882
Fort Worth	DFW Connector	SH 114/SH 121 corridor around the north DFW Airport entrance	\$	1,508,001
Fort Worth	NTE Seg 1 & 2W	Portions of SH 121, SH 183 and I-820 in northern and eastern Tarrant County	\$	6,325,435
Fort Worth	NTE Seg 3A, 3B, and 3C	I-35W from I-30 to I-820-US 81/287, US81/287 to Eagle Parkway	\$	1,978,041
Fort Worth	I-30 Managed Lanes	From Fielder Rd in Tarrant County to E Sylvan Ave	\$	3,423,700
Houston	Grand Parkway Segment I-2B	SH 99 Loop from FM 1405 to SH 146	\$	59,249
Houston	SH 288	State Highway 288 Toll Lanes in Harris County	\$	14,757,387
Houston	SH 249 Extension	From FM 1774/FM 149 in Pinehurst to Montgomery/Grimes County line	\$	1,964,494
San Antonio	SH 130 Segments 5 & 6	From Caldwell/Guadalupe County line to I-10 near Seguin	\$	157,098

No other districts had expenditures related to TxDOT turnpike projects or toll roads in fiscal 2025. See RMA section on page 11 for expenditures on toll projects developed by RMAs.

RAIL FACILITIES DESCRIBED IN CHAPTER 91

Chapter 91 of the Transportation Code describes the Commission's powers in relation to rail facilities. In fiscal 2025, the following district expenditures were incurred on the construction and other upgrades to the Custom & Border Protection Facility in Presidio:

El Paso (Presidio	o)	\$9,859,935

The following district expenditures were incurred for studies of freight and passenger rail, excluding indirect costs. These expenditures totaled \$3,196,947, divided accordingly among the following districts:

Amarillo	\$323,303
Austin/San Antonio	\$161,319
Dallas/Fort Worth	\$94,184
Dallas/Houston/San Antonio	\$67,889
El Paso	\$483,137
Houston	\$127,364
Odessa-Midland	\$185,811
Paris	\$196,864
San Antonio	\$114,130
Statewide Studies	\$1,442,944

Note: Construction portion reported in this section is also in the UTP Exhibit below. The studies portion is not.

BONDS OR OTHER PUBLIC SECURITIES ISSUED FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

As discussed more fully in the sections that follow, the Texas Transportation Commission (Commission) is authorized through various statutory and constitutional provisions to issue general obligation and revenue bonds. In addition, the Commission entered into secured loan agreement with the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) through the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 1998 (TIFIA).

Total TxDOT bonds and other public securities are detailed below by bond type and fund. Other than toll revenue bonds, TxDOT does not issue bonds for all contractor payments at one time; therefore, it is not known at the time of issuance which specific projects will be funded by a particular bond issuance.

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BONDS ISSUED

For the Fiscal Year Ended August 31, 2025

Description of Issue	Bonds Issued to Date***	Bonds Outstanding***
Governmental Activities		
General Obligation Bonds:		
Texas Mobility Fund	8,209,000,000	5,152,205,000
Texas Highway Improvement	4,215,205,000	2,804,845,000
Revenue Bonds:		
State Highway Fund	3,781,475,000	2,308,890,000
Total Governmental Activities	16,205,680,000	10,265,940,000
Desirona Tema Astinitia		
Business-Type Activities		
Revenue Bonds:		
Central Texas Turnpike System*	3,260,036,204	2,473,453,125
Grand Parkway Transportation Corporation**	5,271,290,000	4,059,790,000
State Highway 249 System	282,889,453	282,889,453
Total Business-Type Activities	8,814,215,657	6,816,132,577

^{*} Central Texas Turnpike System bonds are not obligations of the State.

^{***} Bonds Issued to Date and Bonds Outstanding columns include refunding bonds and excludes bond premiums and discounts.

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION							
TIFIA LOAN							
For the	ne Fiscal Year Ended August 31, 2025						
Description	Issued to Date	Loan/Notes Outstanding*					
TIFIA LOAN							
IH 35E Project Loan	\$285,000,000	\$323,295,968 *					
GPTC Project Loan**	\$605,330,000	\$637,818,594					
*TIFIA Loans Outstanding column includes accreted interest.							
**TIFIA GPTC Loans Outstanding are not obligations	**TIFIA GPTC Loans Outstanding are not obligations of the State.						

^{**} Grand Parkway Transportation Corporation bonds are not obligations of the State.

General Obligation Bonds

Texas Mobility Fund (TMF) General Obligation Bond Program

Texas Constitution, Article III, Section 49-k, and Transportation Code, Chapter 201, Subchapter M, authorize the Commission to issue general obligation bonds payable from a pledge of and lien on all or part of the money in the Mobility Fund. The Mobility Fund bonds are designed to be self-supporting, but the full faith and credit of the state is pledged in the event the revenue and money dedicated to the Mobility Fund is insufficient to pay debt service on the bonds. As of August 31, 2025, major sources of pledged revenue to the Mobility Fund include driver license fees, motor vehicle inspection fees, certificate of title fees and driver record information fees.

The issuance of Mobility Fund bonds is subject to debt service coverage requirements. Prior to a Mobility Fund debt issuance, the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts must certify that there will be sufficient future resources on deposit in the Mobility Fund to ensure 110 percent coverage of debt service requirements during the period that the debt will be outstanding. Subject to the debt service coverage requirement, the Mobility Fund constitutional provision does not limit the amount of obligations that may be issued under the program. The Mobility Fund program is currently established in the aggregate principal amount of \$7.5 billion outstanding at any one time. House Bill No. 2219 which was enacted during the regular session of the 87th Legislature and became effective on June 18, 2021, amended the authority to (i) eliminate the ability of the Commission to issue Program obligations for the purpose of providing participation by the State in the payment of part of the costs of constructing and providing publicly owned toll roads and (ii) authorize the Commission to issue Program obligations for certain transportation projects, as described herein, after May 1, 2021 and before January 1, 2027 in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed an amount equal to sixty percent (60%) of the outstanding principal amount of Program obligations existing on May 1, 2021. As of May 1, 2021, the outstanding principal amount of Program obligations (i.e., Parity Debt) was \$5.9 billion. The Commission may issue, other than refunding obligations described herein, no more than \$3.6 billion in aggregate principal amount of Parity Debt prior to January 1, 2027.

Bond proceeds are to be used to refunding existing bonds and related credit agreements, creating reserves for payment of bonds and related credit agreements, paying bond issuance costs and paying interest on the bonds and related credit agreements.

In an event of default in connection with any covenant or in any supplement, or default in the payment of annual debt service requirements due in connection with any parity debt, or other costs and expenses related thereto, any owner of parity debt (which includes all Mobility Fund bondholders) may require the Commission, the Department, its officials and employees, and any appropriate official of the State, to carry out, respect, or enforce the covenants and obligations of the Master Resolution or any Supplement, by all legal and equitable means, including specifically the use and filing of mandamus proceedings in any court of competent jurisdiction in Travis County, Texas against the Commission, the Department, its officials and employees, or any appropriate official of the State.

The Series 2015-B outstanding balance of \$275.0 million is from direct placements.

Texas Highway Improvement General Obligation Bond Program (Proposition 12)

Texas Constitution, Article III, Section 49-p and Transportation Code, Section 222.004, authorizes the Commission to issue general obligation bonds of the state of Texas for the costs of highway improvement projects including construction, reconstruction, design, the acquisition of right-of-way, the costs of administering the highway improvement projects and the costs of issuing the bonds. These bonds are not self-supporting and are

considered a general obligation of the state of Texas. As of August 31, 2024, the Commission had issued the \$5.0 billion authorized under the Texas highway improvement general obligation bond program.

In an event of default in connection with (i) failure to make payment of the principal of or interest on any bonds or credit agreements when due or payable or (ii) the performance or observance of any other covenant, agreement or obligation of the Commission or the State, which materially adversely affects the rights of the bond owners, any owner of bonds or credit agreements may require the Commission, the Department, its officials and employees, and any appropriate official of the State, to carry out, respect, or enforce the covenants and obligations of the Mater Resolution or any Supplement, by all legal and equitable means, including specially the use and filing of mandamus proceedings in any court of competent jurisdiction in Travis County, Texas against the Commission, the Department, its officials and employees, or any appropriate official of the State, any covenant or in any supplement, or default in the payment of annual debt service requirements due in connection with any parity debt, or other costs and expenses related thereto, any owner of parity debt (which includes all Mobility Fund bondholders) may require the Commission, the Department, its officials and employees, and any appropriate official of the State, to carry out, respect, or enforce the covenants and obligations of the Master Resolution or any Supplement, by all legal and equitable means, including specifically the use and filing of mandamus proceedings in any court of competent jurisdiction in Travis County, Texas against the Commission, the Department, its officials and employees, or any appropriate official of the State. The State has not waived sovereign immunity with respect to the enforcement of the obligations of the Commission and the State relating to any series of bonds or credit agreements.

Revenue Bonds

State Highway Fund Revenue Bond Program (Proposition 14)

Texas Constitution, Article III, Section 49-n, and Transportation Code, Section 222.003, authorizes the Commission to issue revenue bonds to finance highway improvement projects. The bonds are payable from pledged revenues deposited to the credit of the state highway fund, including dedicated taxes, dedicated federal revenues and amounts collected or received pursuant to other state highway fund revenue laws and any interest or earning from the investment of these funds. As of August 31, 2025, the Commission has issued \$6.0 billion under the state highway fund revenue bond program.

In an event of default, the purchaser may take the following actions:

- (i) Direct the tender agent and the Commission, as applicable, to cause a mandatory tender of the bonds or take such other remedial action as is provided for in the Resolutions;
- (ii) Exercise any and all remedies as it may have under the related documents and as otherwise available at law and equity;
- (iii) Take whatever action at law or in equity may appear necessary or desirable to collect the amounts due and payable by the Commission under the Related Documents (including all outstanding debt service on the 2014-B2 bonds) or to enforce performance or observance of any obligation, agreement or convent of the Commission under the related documents.

In general, in the event of a default in the payment of debt service due to connection with any State Highway Fund bonds or any other costs and expenses relating thereto, or a default by the Commission in the performance of any duty or covenant provided in law or in the Resolution, any owner of State Highway Fund bonds may require the Commission or the Department or its officials and employees to carry out, respect, or enforce the Commissions' covenants and obligations relating to the State Highway Fund bonds by all legal and equitable means, including especially the use and filing of mandamus proceedings in State court.

Central Texas Turnpike System (CTTS) Revenue Bond Program

Transportation Code, Chapter 228 Subchapter C authorizes the Commission to issue revenue bonds to pay a portion of the costs of planning, designing, engineering, developing, and constructing the Central Texas Turnpike System (CTTS) located in the greater Austin metropolitan area in Travis and Williamson counties. The bonds are payable from and secured solely by a first and second lien on, as applicable, and pledge of the trust estate. The trust estate consists of all project revenues and investment earnings. Neither the state, the Commission, TxDOT, nor any other agency or political subdivision of the state, is obligated to pay the debt service on the CTTS revenue bonds.

In an event of default under the terms of the Indenture of Trust dated as of July 15, 2002, the Trustee may take the following actions and upon the written request of the owners of not less than 20 percent in principal amount of outstanding obligations shall proceeds to:

- (i) Protect and enforce its rights and the rights of the owners under the state law and the indenture by such suits, actions or special proceedings in equity or at law, or by proceedings in the office of any board or officer having jurisdiction, either for mandamus or the specific performance of any convent or agreement contained in the Indenture or in aid or execution of any power granted by the Indenture or for the enforcement of any proper legal or equitable remedy as the Trustee, being advised by counsel, shall deem most effectual to protect and enforce such right.
- (ii) In the enforcement of any remedy under the Indenture the Trustee shall be entitled to sue for, enforce payment of and received any, and all amounts then or during any event of default becoming, and at any time remaining, due from the Commission.

Grand Parkway System Toll Revenue Bond Program

Transportation Code, Chapter 431 authorizes the creation of the Grand Parkway Transportation Corporation, a public, non-profit Texas corporation created by the Commission to act on behalf of the Commission to finance, build and operate certain segments of State Highway 99 (the "Grand Parkway Project") in the greater Houston area. In March 2012, the Commission adopted a resolution creating the Grand Parkway Transportation Corporation (GPTC). GPTC is authorized to assist and act on behalf of the Commission in the development, financing, design, construction, reconstruction, expansion, operation and/or maintenance of the Grand Parkway toll project. The bond obligations are payable from tolls and other revenues of the GPTC held by the trustee. Neither the state, the Commission, nor any other agency or political subdivision of the state is obligated to pay the debt service on the GPTC bonds.

In the event of default, and upon the written request of the owners of not less than 20 percent in principal amount of outstanding obligations, the Trustee shall proceed to:

(i) Protect its rights and the rights of the owners under Chapter 431, Transportation Code and under the Trust Agreement, the Toll Rate Agreement or certain sections of the Project Agreement by such suits, actions or special proceedings in equity or at law, or by proceedings in the office of any board or officer having jurisdiction, either for mandamus or the specific performance of any covenant or agreement contained in the Trust Agreement or in aid or execution of any power granted in the Trust Agreement for the enforcement of any proper legal or equitable, remedy, as the Trustee, being advised by counsel, deems most effectual to protect and enforce such rights. Acceleration of principal of or interest on the obligations upon the occurrence of an event of default is not a remedy available under the Trust Agreement.

(ii) In the enforcement of any remedy under the Trust Agreement the Trustee shall be entitled to sue for, enforce payment of and receive any and all amounts then or during any default becoming, and at any time remaining, due from the Corporation and to enforce judgment or decree against the Corporation but solely as provided in the Trust Agreement.

SH 249 System Revenue Bond Program

Transportation Code, Chapter 228 authorizes the Commission to issue toll revenue bonds to finance the cost of construction, improvement, extension, or expansion of a toll project or system in the State. In February 2019, the Commission issued \$249.3 million in toll revenue bonds (2019 SH 249 Bonds) to finance the cost of an approximately 15-mile tolled highway (Segment 1) to serve as a northerly extension of the existing State Highway 249 (SH 249) and to be located between FM 1774 in Pinehurst, Texas (Montgomery County) and FM 1774 near Todd Mission, Texas (Grimes County). The 2019 SH 249 Bonds constitute special, limited obligations of the Commission secured by and payable solely from a first lien on, pledge of, and security interest in the trust estate (Trust Estate) for the 2019 SH 249 Bonds and are payable prior to the payment of operating and maintenance expenses on Segment 1. The Trust Estate consists primarily of toll revenues to be generated by the operation of Segment 1. None of the Commission, TxDOT, or any other agency or political subdivision of the State is obligated to pay debt service on the 2019 SH 249 Bonds except the Commission solely from the Trust Estate and certain funds created under the master trust agreement (Master Trust Agreement) for the 2019 SH 249 Bonds. The Commission has currently designated Segment 1 as comprising the entire "SH 249 System", and Segment 1 will be the first and initially the only segment of the SH 249 System. The Commission may choose to expand or enlarge the SH 249 System, but the Commission currently has no plans for such expansion or enlargement. Subject to the terms of the Master Trust Agreement, the Commission may issue additional bonds or other obligations at any time, secured by a lien on the Trust Estate that is on parity with, or subordinate to, the first lien on the Trust Estate securing payment of the 2019 SH 249 Bonds, in order to finance the expansion or enlargement of the SH 249 System.

In an event of default, the Trustee may proceed and upon the written request of the owners of not less than 20 percent in principal amount of outstanding obligations, shall proceed to:

- (1) Protect and enforce its rights and the rights of the owners under State law and under the Master Trust Agreement by such suits, actions or special proceedings in equity or at law, or by proceedings in the office of any board or officer having jurisdiction, either for mandamus or the specific performance of any covenant or agreement in the Master Trust Agreement or in aid or execution of any power granted in the Master Trust Agreement or for the enforcement of any proper legal or equitable remedy, as the Trustee, being advised by counsel, shall deem most effectual to protect and enforce such rights. Acceleration of the principal of or interest on the obligations is not a remedy available under the Master Trust Agreement.
- (2) In the enforcement of any remedy under the Master Trust Agreement the Trustee shall be entitled to sue for, enforce payment of and receive any and all amounts then or during any default becoming, and at any time remaining, due from the Corporation.

TIFIA Loan

The Commission entered into a secured loan agreement with the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) through the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 1998 (TIFIA). USDOT agreed to lend the Commission up to \$285.0 million to pay a portion of the eligible project costs related to the initial phase of the IH-35E project. The outstanding direct loan of \$323.3 million contains various provisions resulting from certain events of default with various remedies. In particular, in the case of a payment default, interest is charged on the overdue balance of the note at the default rate (an additional 2 percent) until the payment default is cured (overdue balance repaid). In the case of project abandonment, the default rate is charged

until the note is paid in full. In the case of certain bankruptcy related event defaults, the note becomes secured by a first priority security interest in the trust estate.

Conduit Debt

The Texas Private Activity Bond Surface Transportation Corporation (TxPABST), a blended component unit of TxDOT, had \$3.3 billion of bonds outstanding as of Aug. 31, 2025. The debt service payments associated with the TxPABST bonds are not the responsibility of the state of Texas.

DIRECTION OF MONEY BY THE DEPARTMENT TO REGIONAL MOBILITY AUTHORITIES

A regional mobility authority (RMA) is a political subdivision formed by one or more counties and, in limited instances a city, to finance, acquire, design, construct, operate, maintain, expand, or extend transportation projects. Projects may be tolled or non-tolled. RMAs provide local governments more control in transportation planning, help build transportation projects, relieve congestion, improve mobility, and increase safety for motorists. The following table summarizes all cash disbursements made to or on behalf of RMAs by TxDOT for the year ended August 31, 2025. Cash disbursements include payments directly to the RMA, disbursements of State Infrastructure Bank loans to the RMA, and other TxDOT expenditures considered incurred on behalf of an RMA.

			Pass Through	Other	
District	Name	Grants	Toll Payments	Payments	Total
Austin	Central Texas RMA			\$ 41,091,139	\$ 41,091,139
El Paso	Camino Real RMA			\$ 11,617,784	\$ 11,617,784
Pharr	Cameron County RMA	\$ 18,135		\$ 796,164	\$ 814,299
Pharr	Hidalgo County RMA	\$ 18,613,427			\$ 18,613,427
San Antonio	Alamo RMA			\$ 60,061	\$ 60,061
Laredo	Webb County-City of Laredo RMA			\$ 399,644	\$ 399,644

Exhibit - UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

Explanation of Tables

The listed fiscal 2025 expenditures for UTP Categories 1 through 12 represent expenditures, excluding indirect costs, directly related to contractor payments for highway improvement and maintenance projects.

Aviation expenditures exclude indirect costs and are directly associated with federal and state financial assistance grants to publicly-owned general aviation and reliever airports included in the Texas Airport System Plan. These Aviation Facilities development grants are for capital improvements for items such as pavement improvements, land acquisition, runway extension or relocation, terminal buildings, control towers, weather observing systems, and new facilities.

Public Transportation expenditures exclude indirect costs and are directly associated with federal and state grant programs for public transportation.

Expenditures for Rail Related Projects exclude indirect costs and represent those projects listed in the rail section of the UTP.

Expenditures for Maritime Program include costs associated with purchase of dredge placement areas in management of the gulf intracoastal waterway (GIWW).

Expenditures by Unified Transportation Program Category

	Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4	Category 5	Category 6
TxDOT District	Preventive Maintenance and Rehabilitation	M etropolitan & Urban Corridor Projects	Non-Traditionally Funded Transportation Projects	Statewide Connectivity Corridor Projects (Urban/Regional)	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ)	Structures Replacement and Rehabilitation (Bridge)
Abilene	80,156,140	7,261,909	1,070,899	27,889,657		29,555,885
Amarillo	108,627,300	28,248,685	1,691,895	20,800,843		47,939,045
Atlanta	83,260,329	3,462,705	10,480,685	37,262,072		20,464,226
Austin	120,519,926	155,667,049	59,076,773	101,953,797		7,578,821
Beaumont	81,259,004	27,219,114	13,257,795	76,163,849	4,394,303	30,778,626
Brow nw ood	51,601,753		2,424	27,404,281		19,376,767
Bryan	40,544,637	10,721,721	1,173,293	41,847,661		18,045,138
Childress	24,873,339		158,128	8,339,994		41,068,442
Corpus Christi	78,985,192	20,970,851	1,337,605	93,165,853		8,768,523
Dallas	245,219,527	364,165,078	155,237,790	206,545,031	45,042,958	47,133,144
El Paso	88,867,675	67,919,170	9,546,210	65,682,911	4,181,293	7,759,789
Fort Worth	162,593,585	213,016,636	69,615,374	134,031,330	4,834,421	28,118,156
Houston	213,924,096	364,231,075	57,567,546	367,826,802	29,575,537	18,559,369
Laredo	64,338,351	29,181,268	239,794	21,425,134		7,995,807
Lubbock	84,709,148	43,398,261	12,574,121	31,880,075		14,091,629
Lufkin	69,369,729			81,799,722		22,851,033
Odessa	211,003,884	21,129,339	1,880,262	62,700,261		25,518,947
Paris	89,491,904	59,387,308	7,268,198	24,482,124		22,874,157
Pharr	75,451,451	31,748,973	34,527,008	58,981,717		2,464,849
San Angelo	43,061,422	5,119,283	23,543	21,309,001		8,159,024
San Antonio	128,623,051	177,084,218	147,643,218	150,440,269	9,620,417	15,819,150
Tyler	122,016,242	9,896,550	863,372	66,609,692		20,709,288
Waco	126,637,830	38,466,214	4,782,343	19,064,726		25,561,627
Wichita Falls	62,099,207	10,111,827	11,327,047	165,688,423		9,795,327
Yoakum	82,100,656	16,152,685	6,140,062	279,604,719		81,836,670
Total	\$ 2,539,335,378	\$1,704,559,919	\$ 607,485,385	\$ 2,192,899,944	\$ 97,648,929	\$ 582,823,439

Expenditures by Unified Transportation Program Category, Continued

	Category 7	Category 8	Category 9	Category 10	Category 11	Category 12
TxDOT District	Metropolitan Mobility and Rehabilitation	Safety Projects	Transportation Alternatives	Supplemental Transportation Projects	District Discretionary/ Energy Sector	Strategic Priority
Abilene		23,926,308	499,526	9,704,038	65,936,050	9,668,967
Amarillo		9,651,998	7,302,765	29,692,694	74,130,200	63,151,586
Atlanta		10,131,492	3,627,475	714,225	36,416,745	12,520,677
Austin	33,969,756	36,029,825	3,206,360	13,562,615	23,993,258	180,758,439
Beaumont		25,243,144	1,184,999	823,145	41,018,794	53,227,489
Brow nw ood		3,640,368	3,423	162,554	47,035,387	
Bryan	129,762	32,042,933	2,403,437	282,521	26,208,361	9,672,418
Childress		6,402,998	524,238	391,551	11,398,314	109,780
Corpus Christi	8,269,323	14,278,160	1,213,798	19,088,279	50,953,774	10,583,737
Dallas	90,224,799	43,403,374	5,961,030	16,687,025	54,626,231	294,489,100
目 Paso	14,778,299	14,132,214	6,343,267	17,882,641	47,037,893	33,464,770
Fort Worth	42,027,894	22,078,405	5,025,435	6,564,522	37,042,546	145,345,663
Houston	145,902,101	28,955,059	13,310,587	34,410,681	49,044,678	124,361,333
Laredo	35,886,938	6,270,728	318	12,970,878	39,604,873	29,877,359
Lubbock	14,546,583	6,558,304	404,195	992,996	44,230,302	4,688,233
Lufkin		41,472,127	43,963	4,291,497	29,114,660	35,604,561
Odessa		15,630,848	529,621	8,020,100	118,511,682	59,833,326
Paris	1,791,353	23,311,972	6,409,607	1,113,429	35,842,572	44,589,626
Pharr	10,301,429	12,270,149	3,194,782	20,643,290	11,753,433	17,234,353
San Angelo		5,012,579	804,346	143,005	33,810,073	15,399,657
San Antonio	36,781,787	30,513,808	4,334,240	4,640,318	55,944,634	324,839,222
Tyler		8,202,451	1,135,220	4,194,447	46,623,820	8,589,233
Waco	13,048,575	15,672,261	15,643,615	7,822,728	27,588,998	9,814,315
Wichita Falls		5,478,583		26,312,720	36,760,133	28,854,641
Yoakum		21,091,691	5,572,880	7,806,039	61,213,191	159,262,932
Total	\$ 447,658,599	\$ 461,401,779	\$ 88,679,127	\$ 248,917,938	\$ 1,105,840,602	\$ 1,675,941,417

Expenditures by Unified Transportation Program Category, Concluded.

TxDOT District	Aviation	Public Transportation	Rail Related Projects	Maritime Progam		TOTAL
Abilene	5,778,692	2,025,928			\$	263,473,999
Amarillo	1,075,901	13,523,694			\$	405,836,606
Atlanta	2,314,787	3,113,526			\$	223,768,944
Austin	9,956,420	9,246,202			\$	755,519,241
Beaumont	952,972	3,254,170			\$	358,777,404
Brow nw ood	1,163,641	4,460,657			\$	154,851,255
Bryan	1,696,700	10,428,677			\$	195,197,259
Childress	3,292,433	4,027,321			\$	100,586,538
Corpus Christi	5,780,464	8,274,424			\$	321,669,983
Dallas	20,719,018	8,038,064			\$	1,597,492,169
⊟ Paso	465,085	7,515,719			\$	385,576,936
Fort Worth	4,880,637	4,643,934			\$	879,818,538
Houston	5,577,638	4,745,348			\$	1,457,991,850
Laredo	183,608	3,109,590			\$	251,084,646
Lubbock	1,461,531	4,409,741			\$	263,945,119
Lufkin	1,079,449	30,136			\$	285,656,877
Odessa	4,592,400	7,526,252			\$	536,876,922
Paris	6,375,868	8,891,051			\$	331,829,169
Pharr	4,197,257	6,373,356			\$	289,142,047
San Angelo	4,285,096	2,804,039			\$	139,931,068
San Antonio	14,086,294	8,366,138			\$	1,108,736,764
Tyler	5,006,213	10,866,786			\$	304,713,314
Waco	11,073,474	8,094,583			\$	323,271,289
Wichita Falls	470,473	694,442			\$	357,592,823
Yoakum	2,330,081	4,781,696			\$	727,893,302
Total	\$ 118,796,132	\$ 149,245,474			\$	12,021,234,062
Public Transportation					\vdash	
Admin & Other	3,412,669	8,430,061	4,757,464	1,419,648	\$	18,019,842
Grand Total	\$ 122,208,801	\$ 157,675,535	\$ 4,757,464	\$ 1,419,648	\$	12,039,253,904