AGENDA
Regional Transportation Council
Thursday, April 12, 2018
North Central Texas Council of Governments

1:00 pm Full RTC Business Agenda
(NCTCOG Guest Secured Wireless Connection Password: rangers!)

1:00 – 1:05 1. Approval of March 8, 2018, Minutes
☑ Action ☐ Possible Action ☐ Information Minutes: 5
Presenter: Rob Franke, RTC Chair
Item Summary: Approval of the March 8, 2018, minutes contained in Reference Item 1 will be requested.
Background: N/A

1:05 – 1:10 2. Orientation to Agenda/Director of Transportation Report
☐ Action ☐ Possible Action ☑ Information Minutes: 5
Presenter: Michael Morris, NCTCOG

1. Regional Transportation Council (RTC) Subcommittees (RTC Chair Rob Franke)
   • Legislation and Finance Subcommittee – Committee of the Whole
   • Bylaws Revision Subcommittee
2. Format for Today's RTC Meeting
3. RTC Member Representation at Events
   • B. Adam McGough, Councilmember, City of Dallas-Texas Transportation Commission Workshop, March 28, 2018
4. April Public Meeting Notice (Electronic Item 2.1)
5. March Online Input Opportunity Minutes (Electronic Item 2.2)
6. Mobility Matters (Handout)
7. Traffic Incident Management Executive Level Course, May 3, 2018 (Electronic Item 2.3)
8. Mobility 2045
   • Draft Mobility 2045 Plan Available for Review at www.nctcog.org/Mobility2045
   • Upcoming Public Meetings Schedule Available at www.nctcog.org/trans/outreach/involve/input.asp
9. Public Comments Report (Electronic Item 2.4)
10. Recent Correspondence (Electronic Item 2.5)
11. Recent News Articles (Electronic Item 2.6)
12. Recent Press Releases (Electronic Item 2.7)
13. Transportation Partners Progress Reports
3. **Consent Agenda**

- **Action**
- **Possible Action**
- **Information**

**Minutes:** 0

### 3.1. 2017-2018 CMAQ/STBG Funding Program: Safety, Innovative Construction, and Emergency Projects

**Presenter:** Adam Beckom, NCTCOG  
**Item Summary:** Staff seeks Regional Transportation Council (RTC) approval of the proposed projects to be funded under the Safety, Innovative Construction, and Emergency Projects Program in the 2017-2018 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)/Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) Funding Program.  
**Background:** In April 2017, staff introduced the process to select projects using CMAQ and STBG funding through several funding programs. Staff has received requests from local agencies that have projects addressing safety issues, utilize innovative construction methods, or emergency projects that will improve system resilience. The list of projects that staff is proposing to fund can be found in Electronic Item 3.1.1. Additional details on the overall funding program can be found in Electronic Item 3.1.2.

**Performance Measure(s) Addressed:**
- Safety
- Pavement and Bridge Condition
- Transit Asset
- System Performance/Freight/CMAQ

### 3.2. Regional Traffic Signal Retiming Program and Minor Improvement Program Call for Projects

**Presenter:** Natalie Bettger, NCTCOG  
**Item Summary:** Staff seeks approval for projects recommended for funding in the Regional Traffic Signal Retiming Program and Minor Improvement Program Calls for Projects.  
**Background:** The North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) opened a Call for Projects on September 15, 2017. Applications were due on October 13, 2017. Approximately $2 million and $2.9 million, respectively, was available to fund Regional Traffic Signal Retiming Program and Minor Improvement Program projects within the 10-county air quality nonattainment area. The Regional Transportation Council (RTC) previously approved the eligible and ineligible project types and a methodology for project evaluation and scoring criteria. Projects are now provided to the RTC for approval. Electronic Item 3.2.1 and Electronic Item 3.2.2 reflect NCTCOG.
Staff project recommendations. Further information is provided as Electronic Item 3.2.3.

Performance Measure(s) Addressed:
☑ Safety  ☐ Pavement and Bridge Condition
☐ Transit Asset  ☑ System Performance/Freight/CMAQ

3.3. **Next Steps on High-Speed Rail**
Presenter: Michael Morris, NCTCOG

Item Summary: Staff seeks Regional Transportation Council (RTC) approval on advancing high-speed rail from:
- Houston to Dallas (previously approved)
- Dallas/Arlington/Fort Worth
- Fort Worth/Waco/ Temple-Killeen/Austin/ San Antonio/Laredo

Background: Houston to Dallas high-speed rail is in the environmental process. The RTC requests that this project advance to construction. The RTC reaffirms that North Central Texas Council of Governments staff take the lead on advancing the three-station concept and environmentally clearing high-speed rail between Dallas/Arlington/Fort Worth. RTC approval is also sought for $300,000 in Surface Transportation Block Grant Program funds to be matched with $200,000 in non-Dallas-Fort Worth funding for the conceptual evaluation of high-speed rail between Fort Worth and Laredo. High-speed rail west of Dallas will include the evaluation of next generation magnetic levitation.

Performance Measure(s) Addressed:
☐ Safety  ☐ Pavement and Bridge Condition
☑ Transit Asset  ☐ System Performance/Freight/CMAQ

1:10 – 2:30  4. **IH 635 East Phase 3: Proposed Partnership Tolling Certain Hours of the Day**
☑ Action  ☐ Possible Action  ☐ Information Minutes: 80
Presenter: Michael Morris, NCTCOG

Item Summary: Staff will present potential options to close the funding gap on IH 635 East Phase 3 as requested by the Chair of the Texas Transportation Commission (TTC) in January 2018. Action will be requested on a proposal to the TTC that the IH 635 East project proceed to procurement from US 75 to and including the IH 30 Interchange.

Background: Funding for IH 635 East has been discussed regularly over the past several months. Regional Transportation Council (RTC) members and staff attended the January 25, 2018, Texas Transportation Commission meeting to present the importance of the IH 635 East project proceeding to procurement. The following items lay out the recommendation to advance IH 635 East as soon as possible:
• **Electronic Item 4.1** contains proposed correspondence and an RTC resolution outlining the RTC’s action
• **Electronic Item 4.2** contains potential options to close the funding gap for the project
• **Electronic Item 4.3** identifies the legal/risk assessment for each option
• **Electronic Item 4.4** contains a graphic representation of the options
• **Electronic Item 4.5** contains a copy of RTC Policy P17-01
• **Electronic Item 4.6** provides additional details and the specific recommendations

This level of detail provides transparency into the process resulting in the recommendation contained in **Electronic Item 4.1** and **Electronic Item 4.6**.

**Performance Measure(s) Addressed:**
- ☑ Safety
- ☑ Pavement and Bridge Condition
- ☑ Transit Asset
- ☑ System Performance/Freight/CMAQ

5. **Progress Reports**
   - □ Action  □ Possible Action  ☑ Information
   
   **Item Summary:** Progress Reports are provided in the items below.
   
   - RTC Attendance (**Electronic Item 5.1**)
   - STTC Attendance and Minutes (**Electronic Item 5.2**)
   - Local Motion (**Electronic Item 5.3**)

6. **Other Business (Old or New):** This item provides an opportunity for members to bring items of interest before the group.

7. **Future Agenda Items:** This item provides an opportunity for members to bring items of future interest before the Council.

8. **Next Meeting:** The next meeting of the Regional Transportation Council is scheduled for **1:00 pm, Thursday, May 10, 2018, at the North Central Texas Council of Governments.**
MINUTES
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

The Regional Transportation Council (RTC) met on Thursday, March 8, 2018, at 1:00 pm in the Transportation Council Room of the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG). The following members or representatives were present: Douglas Athas, Sara Bagheri, Sue S. Bauman, Loyl C. Bussell, David L. Cook, Rudy Durham, Andy Eads, Charles Emery, Kevin Falconer, Gary Fickes, Sandy Greyson, Mojay Haddad, Clay Lewis Jenkins, Ron Jensen, Jungus Jordan, Harry LaRosiliere, David Magness, Scott Mahaffey, Steve Mitchell, Stan Pickett, Mark Riley, Mohamed Bur (representing Kelly Selman), Ray Smith (representing Will Sowell), Mike Taylor, Stephen Terrell, T. Oscar Trevino Jr., William Tsao, Oscar Ward, Duncan Webb, B. Glen Whitley, Kathryn Wilemon, W. Jeff Williams, and Ann Zadeh.


1. **Approval of February 8, 2018, Minutes:** The minutes of the February 8, 2018, meeting were approved as submitted in Reference Item 1. Jungus Jordan (M); Charles Emery (S). The motion passed unanimously.

2. **Consent Agenda:** The following items were included on the Consent Agenda.

   2.1. **Transportation Improvement Program Modifications:** Regional Transportation Council approval of revisions to the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), provided in Electronic item 2.1, was requested. The modifications have been reviewed for consistency with the Mobility Plan, the air quality conformity determination, and financial constraint of the TIP.
2.2. FY2018 and FY2019 Unified Planning Work Program Modifications: Regional Transportation Council approval of modifications to the FY2018 and FY2019 Unified Planning Work Program, provided in Electronic Item 2.2.1, was requested. Action to direct staff to also amend other administrative/planning documents, as appropriate, to reflect the approved modifications was also sought. Additional information was provided in Electronic Item 2.2.2.

2.3. Waze/Traffic Signal Grants: Approval to Advance Second Round: Regional Transportation Council approval for the second round of Waze/511 DFW and Traffic Signal Data Sharing grants was requested. In 2017, the RTC approved $250,000 each for the two programs. Some of the approved funding was not awarded initially or full amounts were not needed. In light of renewed interest, staff proposed a second round of grants using substantially the same approach as in the first round.

A motion was made to approve the items on the Consent Agenda. Kathryn Wilemon (M); Jungus Jordan (S). The motion passed unanimously.

3. Orientation to Agenda/Director of Transportation Report: Michael Morris provided an overview of items on the Director of Transportation Report. He flagged to members the new agenda format to help track the federal performance measures addressed by agenda items. In addition, he noted that a reception for Victor Vandergriff will be scheduled and that staff will email details to Regional Transportation Council (RTC) members. Members representing the RTC at the recent IH 635 Community Meeting on February 15, 2018, were noted and included B. Adam McGough, Lee M. Kleinman, and Douglas Athas. Mr. Morris noted that RTC New Member Orientation will be held at 10:30 am on April 12, 2018. Interested RTC primary and alternate members were encouraged to attend. He also noted that Agenda Items 4 and 5 were postponed from the February 8, 2018, RTC meeting due to extended IH 635 East discussion and were proposed for action at this meeting. Regarding bicycle share, cities that have bicycle shares are meeting on best ways to address associated issues. Information on Car Care Clinics was provided in Electronic Item 3.1, and air quality funding opportunities for vehicles were provided in Electronic Item 3.2. Details on Dallas-Fort Worth Clean Cities events were provided in Electronic Item 3.3. Volkswagen settlement information was available in Electronic Item 3.4. Electronic Item 3.5 contained information on an AirCheckTexas outreach assistance request, and SolSmart recognition details were provided in Electronic Item 3.6. He highlighted the Metropolitan Transportation Plan Policy Bundle, provided in Electronic Item 3.7, and noted that staff will potentially be adding a new policy on the development of a regional tire recycling program. An Eno Transportation Weekly article that noted the Dallas-Fort Worth Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) as one of the top MPOs in the country was provided in Electronic Item 3.8. The high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) subsidy report was provided in Electronic Item 3.9. The report provides details on the discount paid for HOV users to help reduce vehicle miles of travel in a nonattainment region. He added that staff is working on a related technology and will provide an update to members in the future. The March online comment opportunity notice was provided in Electronic Item 3.10. February public meeting minutes were provided in Electronic Item 3.11, and the public comments report was provided in Electronic Item 3.12. Recent correspondence was provided in Electronic Item 3.13, recent news articles in Electronic Item 3.14, and recent press releases in Electronic Item 3.15. Transportation partner progress reports were distributed at the meeting.

Mr. Morris provided a status report on "Big Projects." IH 35W 3C is moving ahead to consensus. Regarding IH 635 East Phase 3, he noted that focus should be on the outcome
which is implementation of the project. Details of recent correspondence was distributed at the meeting in Reference Item 3.16. Included is March 1 correspondence from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), RTC staff’s response on March 2, TxDOT correspondence on March 6, and RTC Chair Rob Franke’s response. He noted recent conversations between RTC members and State and federal elected officials and suggested that RTC members continue those conversations. RTC staff will work to develop several funding options to close the funding gap for consideration by the RTC on a schedule determined by Chair Rob Franke. Several communities have weighed in regarding the desire not to use the funding from other projects to close the funding gap, and the RTC will take this into consideration when moving forward. In addition, answers have been requested to the questions in Reference Item 3.16. Staff is going through a risk assessment regarding cost inflation, construction delay, legal risk, and others. Staff will have answers to the questions when the RTC is ready to move forward with RTC action. Sara Bagheri discussed the letter sent by TTC Chair Bruce Bugg and asked exactly what authority was TxDOT operating under in terms of a policy directive. She noted she was not aware of any related legislative action. Ms. Bagheri requested that staff provide, for the next related RTC vote, a legal memo that can identify under what authority TxDOT is acting. Mr. Morris encouraged members to read Reference Item 3.16 that contained a list of questions to TxDOT that laid out the responsibilities of each organization. He added that internal legal counsel is reviewing the legal risk associated with the TTC’s proposal in Reference Item 3.16. Sandy Greyson noted that Dallas City Councilmember Adam McGough requested she note that the City of Dallas is opposed to moving forward with IH 635, the procurement or construction, without the inclusion of tolled managed lanes. Mr. Morris noted that members will see related questions being asked. The region is in a nonattainment area and under federal rule cannot build without an aggressive travel demand management strategy in a corridor, especially in a corridor where that type of strategy already exists. RTC Secretary Andy Eads noted concern that he cannot recall a time when the RTC has had a project ready to proceed, with funding options, that was then held and other projects placed at risk. He added this was discouraging and that he hopes there is positive movement in the near future. B. Glen Whitley noted that Tarrant County has made requests to its representatives and senators to reconsider the decision not to allow tolled managed lanes or toll lanes in the state, and at a minimum to honor those commitments made previous to the current position, especially in light of the President’s proposal to leverage projects through a national infrastructure plan.

4. **Access North Texas:** Sarah Chadderdon presented Access North Texas, the regional public transportation coordination plan covering the 16-county region that focuses on the transportation needs of older adults, individuals with disabilities, individuals with lower incomes and others with transportation challenges. The plan outlines specific strategies that will address needs that were identified during the planning process. In addition, the plan supports the efficient operation of public transportation by avoiding duplicated transit service and eliminating gaps in service in the region. Access North Texas was first adopted in 2013. Since that time, regional partners have implemented many of the strategies from the plan. Examples of strategies recommended in the 2013 plan were highlighted, as well as the programs implemented to address the recommendations. Details were provided in Electronic Item 4.1. Even with all of the successful projects since 2013, challenges remain. Staff began outreach in 2016 in an effort to update Access North Texas. Since that time, staff has reached out directly to over 2,000 individuals. This outreach also included elected officials and local government staff, transit riders, health and human service agencies, educational institutions, and businesses. Over 600 people attended 14 outreach meetings. Staff conducted numerous conference calls, sent follow-up emails and had one-on-one
conversations. A transportation poll for individuals and agencies to provide their personal and professional feedback on public transportation needs was also available online and in paper format. In total, 1,000 responses were received. Staff supplemented outreach activities with data collection and technical analysis. The Transit Accessibility Improvement Tool was updated. Staff also collected and analyzed demographic information about population growth, Limited English Proficiency status, and commute statistics and worked with existing transportation providers to identify possible gaps in service. After review, staff identified four areas to be addressed region wide: availability, affordability, complexity, and advocacy. As in the previous plan, citizens were concerned with geography where there is no public transportation service. In addition, there was interest in opportunities to implement non-traditional transit, including public-private partnerships or even transit service that does not require a traditional bus. Regarding affordability, Ms. Chadderdon thanked the RTC for its recent action approving $1 million to create a program that addresses the affordability of fares for those most in need. Because the region is large, staff focused on the importance of reducing the complexity of the user’s experience and champions who will advocate for improved transit service. In addition to the regional strategies outlined, members were encouraged to review the draft strategies contained in the document, available at Electronic Item 4.2. Next steps were outlined. Upon RTC approval, staff will request Executive Board endorsement and provide the finalized document to the Texas Department of Transportation. Regional transit partners, nonprofits and private agencies will then begin to implement strategies identified in the plan. Ms. Chadderdon noted projects that seek funds through the RTC’s transit Call for Projects must be included in this plan, specifically those that seek funding under the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program. The schedule for the effort was reviewed. Additional details were provided in Electronic Item 4.1. A motion to approve Access North Texas, the region’s locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan provided at Electronic Item 4.2. Oscar Ward (M); B. Glen Whitley (S). The motion passed unanimously.

5. **2017-2018 CMAQ/STBG Funding Program: Sustainable Development Phase 4**: Adam Beckom presented proposed projects for funding through the Sustainable Development Phase 4 of the 2017-2018 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)/Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) Funding Program. The status of the 11 related funding programs were highlighted. The goal of this program is to support sustainable development initiatives by providing funds for Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Turnback partnerships, context sensitive design, and transit oriented development projects. Selection criteria for projects includes partnership in TxDOT’s Turnback program, opportunities for redevelopment, payback mechanisms such as a tax increment finance district or public improvement district, inclusion of context-sensitive design elements, inclusion of transit-oriented development elements, and inclusion of pedestrian-friendly streetscape elements. The proposed list of projects that staff proposed to fund was provided in Electronic Item 5.1. Additional details on the overall funding program were provided in Electronic Item 5.2. Proposed projects included: 1) $12 million for SH 356/Irving Boulevard in partnership with the City of Irving, 2) $11.552 million for US 180 (Northern Loop) in partnership with the City of Weatherford, 3) $11.301 million for a DCTA Intermodal Transit Center in partnership with DCTA, 4) $10 million for Business 287/Ennis Avenue at UP Railroad in partnership with the City of Ennis, 5) $4.5 million for Main Street in partnership with the City of Crowley, and $3 million for the redevelopment of College Street in partnership with the City of Lewisville. Proposed RTC funding for projects totals approximately $52.35 million. A motion was made to approve the proposed list of projects to fund through the 2017-2018 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program/Surface Transportation Block Grant Program: Sustainable Development Phase 4.
Program provided Electronic Item 5.1. Action also included approval for staff to administratively amend the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program /Statewide Transportation Improvement Program and other planning/administrative documents to incorporate the associated changes. David L. Cook (M); B. Glen Whitley (S). The motion passed unanimously.

6. **Mobility 2045 Update:** Kevin Feldt provided an overview of current development efforts for the region’s next long-range transportation plan, Mobility 2045. Currently, staff has identified approximately $135.4 billion that is reasonably expected to be available between 2018 and 2045. He noted major roadway recommendations have not changed substantially since last presented at the February 8, 2018, Mobility 2045 Plan Workshop. As in the past, staff looks at asset optimization projects and facilities before any major reconstruction or new construction projects are recommended. Asset optimization projects were highlighted, as well as proposed arterial capacity improvements in the region. Mr. Feldt also noted the priced facility recommendations which include both new and additional managed lanes and toll road capacity, and also noted the non-priced freeway facility recommendations. Each of these aspects of the document together create the major roadway recommendations. He noted project recommendation maps and associated tables, with details of each project were available for review at [www.nctcog.org/mobility2045](http://www.nctcog.org/mobility2045). In addition to project recommendations, the roadway corridors for future evaluation were also highlighted. He noted an additional area of study near Downtown Fort Worth where a future connection between the Butler Housing Area may be a consideration for future development. Mr. Feldt also reviewed financial elements of the plan. Currently, estimates indicate approximately $52 million of roadway projects that include toll and tolled managed lane projects. Regional needs total approximately $389 billion, leaving a $337 billion shortfall for Mobility 2045.

Transit corridor recommendations were also presented and were unchanged since presented in February 2018. Additional Mobility 2045 components include sustainable development, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, people mover projects, freight, aviation, Transportation Demand Management, Transportation System Management, and transportation system safety and security. Other components include environmental considerations, high-speed rail, social considerations, technology, policies, programs, and others. Selected proposed policy additions include support for the ability to modify the Mobility Plan for emergency operational improvements such as technology lanes, managed lanes, access ramps, and auxiliary lanes. An additional policy recommended is support for the implementation of managed toll lanes within a tolled managed lane policy area. The proposed boundary encompasses 13 percent of the land area in the region and includes 67 percent of the congested roadway facilities. The goal is to focus these types of facilities in areas where congestion management is needed the most. Comments received in recent public meetings were highlighted and include comments on eminent domain, the Lake Corridor Project in Collin County, funding, the Hyperloop and bullet train, availability of the draft Plan, alternate roads, and no expansion of other non-roadway transportation modes. At the latest public meetings, comments were received on the policy foundation for Mobility 2045, transportation assistance for south Dallas County, and transit funding. Regarding the availability of the full draft Mobility 2045 document, Mr. Feldt noted the draft will be available April 2. The schedule for the effort was reviewed. The official 60-day public comment period will begin in April 2018, with Regional Transportation Council (RTC) action requested in June 2018. The schedule for upcoming public meetings was reviewed. A motion was made to approve staff presentation of the draft Mobility 2045 draft recommendations at upcoming public meetings. B. Glen Whitley (M); T. Oscar Trevino Jr. (S). Discussion continued.
Mark Riley noted concerns regarding the expansion of FM 730 from Wise County to IH 20 and the proposed arterial just north of Lake Weatherford. Due to the impact to Parker County and potentially the lake area, he requested that staff schedule a public meeting in Parker County to give citizens an opportunity to be more informed and gain consensus. Michael Morris suggested that staff meet with those interested in receiving additional information prior to April 2 to resolve any issues in advance of the official 60-day public comment period. Mike Taylor asked if Mobility 2045 will reflect new tolling capacity. Mr. Morris noted there is no change to what has been requested in the past. Mr. Taylor noted the City of Dallas' opposition to IH 635 East proceeding with no tolled managed lanes. He added that Texas is too large and diverse for a one-size fits all, the importance of local control, and that he was concerned staff was developing a Mobility Plan that would be totally at the discretion of the State government. Mr. Morris noted staff is implementing elements the RTC and citizens have directed and are not removing tolled managed lanes. Duncan Webb referenced the illustrative map of projects for future study and noted the Collin County Commissioners' Court would like for the arrow that is currently shown to the east side of Lake Lavon to be moved over the lake. Mr. Morris noted that the map indicated discussions are underway regarding planning for a north/south controlled access route within the proximity of Lake Lavon. Mr. Webb noted he would like to see the arrow placed down the center of the lake and then an east/west arrow placed between the two lakes. He clarified that the arrow is currently over the outer loop that is another corridor and some are viewing this as a position that the outer loop is the only area of study. Mr. Morris discussed the areas where consensus is needed and suggested that the request be included in the motion. Sandy Greyson asked about the small area for study in Dallas County. Mr. Feldt noted that both arrows in Dallas County represent additional study for capacity needs between IH 35E and US 75 north of Downtown Dallas. Ms. Greyson also asked if the measuring of alternative modes of transportation requested several months ago has been included. Mr. Feldt noted that staff has included the information.

Mark Riley asked that the motion be amended to request that staff hold a meeting in Parker County prior to April 2 to provide citizens in that area with more information about the expansion of FM 730 and a proposed arterial just north of Lake Weatherford. Duncan Webb also requested that the motion be amended to request that staff move the north/south arrow on the map of projects for future considerations/studies over Lake Lavon and add a second arrow east/west between the lakes. B. Glen Whitley and T. Oscar Trevino Jr. accepted the amendments made by both Mark Riley and Duncan Webb. The motion passed unanimously.

7. **Next Steps on High-Speed Rail:** Michael Morris provided an update on efforts related to high-speed rail. He noted the latest correspondence from the City of Arlington was distributed at the meeting in Reference Item 7. For the Houston to Dallas section, he discussed the environmental clearance and the March 16 deadline for public comment. He noted the project is included in the draft Mobility 2045 Plan and that there is an interagency agreement with the implementers of the corridor. For the Dallas/Arlington/Fort Worth section of high-speed rail, the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) took the lead on the environmental clearance, which was not completed. Staff will likely suggest to the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) that the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) reinitiate the environmental clearance of high-speed rail between Dallas, Arlington, and Fort Worth. Staff has met with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and William Meadows (Chair of the DFW Commission for High Speed Rail) about the proposal and are planning to meet with TxDOT. The proposal is for NCTCOG to take the lead on the environmental clearance. Funding has been allocated for some time, but an additional
amount may be needed. Staff is trying to determine in which phase of the current environmental review that work must begin. Due to the interest in the Hyperloop, staff will suggest that the environmental clearance for the Dallas/Arlington/Fort Worth section include next generation magnetic levitation technology, as well as traditional high-speed rail. This type of technology is believed to have a significant benefit when it comes to potentially funding the project. Mr. Morris noted there is interest by those producing the magnetic levitation technology to have a 30 mile test track, which is also the distance between Fort Worth and Dallas. If the environmental clearance includes this technology, there is potential for the test track becoming the permanent implementation of the technology similar to the General Motors test track becoming the permanent connection to load vehicles directly at the rail head. Mr. Morris discussed plans to meet with the engineers designing the Hyperloop and to visit the full test track. A group is being put together to develop a final recommendation on the technologies to the RTC. He also discussed high-speed rail from Fort Worth to Laredo. Metropolitan Planning Organization directors from Laredo, San Antonio, Austin, Temple-Killeen, and Waco met with NCTCOG staff on a strategy to explore Hyperloop and high-speed rail technologies between Laredo and Fort Worth. A $500,000 study is proposed to evaluate the interest of the impacted communities in high-speed rail and next generation magnetic levitation technology. The recommendation will then be provided to TxDOT. The high-speed rail map proposed in the draft Mobility 2045 plan was highlighted. If the region is supportive of the three high-speed rail elements identified on the map, Mr. Morris noted he believes the RTC should take action to help the three elements proceed. Elements include supporting the environmental documentation for the Dallas to Houston project, supporting NCTCOG staff take the lead (with the assistance of a consultant) on the environmental clearance of the Dallas/Arlington/Fort Worth high-speed rail section, and leading the strategic conceptual effort with NCTCOG paying a portion of the cost to advance efforts from Fort Worth to Laredo. Kathryn Wilemon asked when staff anticipated completion of the environmental clearance for the Dallas/Arlington/Fort Worth section of high-speed rail if NCTCOG were to take the lead. Mr. Morris noted that staff would not expect environmental clearance completion to be less than two years. Gary Fickes asked the status of the $15 million in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds that were allocated for environmental clearance. Mr. Morris noted that of the $15 million in ARRA funds, FRA used approximately $7 million. The ARRA deadline has passed and funds are no longer available. In addition, the RTC approved approximately $5 million which remains available. If the RTC were to approve NCTCOG to take the lead, there may be some additional cost. Staff will be working on a cost estimate to environmentally clear two types of technologies for the Dallas/Arlington/Fort Worth portion of high-speed rail. Action is anticipated at the April 12, 2018, RTC meeting. Sandy Greyson noted, in response to the City of Arlington's letter in Reference Item 7, the City of Dallas' position is that no city would be a member of the Local Government Corporation unless it is currently a member of a transit authority. She added this item was brought before the City of Dallas Transportation Committee and was a unanimous position. Mr. Morris noted that NCTCOG would seek some clarification on the position following the meeting.

8. **2017-2018 CMAQ/STBG Funding Program: Safety, Innovative Construction, and Emergency Projects:** Adam Beckom presented proposed projects to be funded through the Safety, Innovative Construction, and Emergency Projects Program of the 2017-2018 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)/Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) Funding Program. The status of the 11 CMAQ/STBG funding programs were highlighted. The purpose of this effort is to support operations, safety, innovative construction, and emergency improvements throughout the region. When evaluating projects, staff reviewed to determine if a project: addresses a
safety issue, involves an innovative construction element, addresses an emergency situation, includes incident management/first responders safety benefits, and/or implements recommendations from the Regional Safety Program. Details on the projects staff proposed for funding were provided in Electronic Item 8.1. Projects include: 1) North Central Texas Council of Governments Regional Safety Program 50/50 partnership for $15 million to address wrong way driving and intersection safety improvements, 2) South Shady Shores Road for $10 million for flood improvements in partnership with Denton County, City of Lake Dallas, and Town of Shady Shores, 3) Wycliff Avenue for $5 million for drainage issues in partnership with the Town of Highland Park, 4) IH 30 managed lanes access gates for $1.2 million for emergency vehicle and first responder access in partnership with the Texas Department of Transportation Dallas District, and 5) Meacham Airport area intersection improvements for $380,800 in partnership with the City of Fort Worth. The proposed Regional Transportation Council (RTC) funding for the projects total approximately $31.58 million. Additional details on the overall funding program were provided in Electronic Item 8.2. Surface Transportation Technical Committee action is proposed at the March 23 meeting and RTC action at the April 12 meeting.

9. **2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program Draft Listings:** Christie Gotti provided the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) with an update on the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) development process and presented a draft listing of current RTC commitments that would be included within the TIP. Staff has met with local agencies on active projects and made revisions to the existing project listings. The revised project listings were provided to the Surface Transportation Technical Committee (STTC) in late February and to RTC members at Electronic Item 9.2. Staff has financially constrained project programming based on estimated future revenue and will continue to revise the listings as comments are received and projects go through the traditional review for Mobility Plan consistency, as well as public review. Ms. Gotti highlighted TIP development focus areas. In April 2016, the RTC approved the Metropolitan Planning Organization Milestone Policy. Through this process, staff asked agencies to look at projects that were ten years old or older that were not proceeding to implementation. At the time of the meeting, staff did not believe any projects were at risk for deletion through TIP Development and will continue to monitor. Typical updates to projects include changes to scopes, funding years, cost overruns, and cost savings. TIP listings are constrained to the FY2018 Unified Transportation Plan funding levels. If those funding levels are updated by the Texas Transportation Commission, staff will revisit project constraints. Agencies have also been asked to complete surveys for projects proposed for FY2019, the first year of the new TIP. Many times the first year of the TIP is over-programmed, so the survey asked questions about project readiness. If there is doubt about the proposed project schedule, staff will coordinate with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and work with the implementing agencies to ensure that agencies have an accurate expectation for projects. Staff is also reviewing Regional Toll Revenue (RTR) funded projects, and adjustments are being made as projects are closed out and cost savings are identified. In addition, Mobility 2045 is being developed concurrently and staff is working closely to ensure that projects in the TIP are consistent with the new Mobility Plan. Staff is also continuing to track and update projects approved by the RTC as part of the Regional 10-Year Plan initiative. Currently, approximately $5.3 billion is included in roadway and transit improvements in the draft 2019-2022 TIP, which includes over 1,000 active projects. The timeline for this effort was reviewed. Ms. Gotti noted that STTC members were asked to provide comments on the draft listings to staff by March 16 in order that the comments are able to be included in the public meeting material for April public meetings. Action on the final listings will be requested at the April 27, 2018, STTC meeting and the May 10, 2018, RTC meeting. Staff anticipates
transmitting the final document to TxDOT in June, with approval anticipated by the Texas Transportation Commission in August and federal approval possibly in the October/November timeframe. Staff encouraged agencies to review listings and to communicate with North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) staff to ensure projects are listed correctly. Sandy Greyson noted two instances in the draft listings that refer to the Trinity Parkway, on pages 113 and 134. She requested that NCTCOG staff clarify the references with City of Dallas staff because all references to the Trinity Parkway are requested to be removed. Ms. Gotti noted the two references to the Trinity Parkway project. One is to the engineering phase and the other is the construction phase. The engineering project cannot be canceled because funds have been spent. Staff will reduce the funding to match the final expenditures once known. For the construction project, staff plans to cancel the project through the TIP development process.

10. **Progress Reports:** Regional Transportation Council attendance was provided in Electronic Item 10.1, Surface Transportation Technical Committee attendance and minutes in Electronic Item 10.2, and the current Local Motion in Electronic Item 10.3.

11. **Other Business (Old or New):** There was no discussion on this item.

12. **Future Agenda Items:** There was no discussion on this item.

13. **Next Meeting:** The next meeting of the Regional Transportation Council is scheduled for Thursday, April 12, 2018, 1:00 pm, at the North Central Texas Council of Governments.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.
PRESENTATIONS

Mobility 2045: Metropolitan Transportation Plan for North Central Texas
Mobility 2045 will define a long-term vision for the region's transportation system and guide spending of federal and state transportation funds. This includes funding for highways, transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and other programs that can reduce congestion and improve air quality. Draft recommendations will be presented. More information, www.nctcog.org/mobility2045.

Work Program Modifications
The Unified Planning Work Program for regional transportation planning provides a summary of the transportation and related air quality planning tasks to be conducted by the metropolitan planning organization. Proposed modifications to the FY 2018 and FY 2019 UPWP will be presented.

2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program
The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a federally and state-mandated list of projects with committed funding for construction or implementation within a four-year period. Staff will present the draft list of projects to be funded between 2019 and 2022.

Air Quality Update
Ten counties in the Dallas-Fort Worth area are designated as nonattainment for the pollutant ozone, and the transportation sector is a major pollution source. Staff will present an overview of air quality improvements, recent ozone standard changes and a summary of local programs anyone can join to help improve air quality.

Regional Bicycle Opinion Survey Results
The 2017 bicycle opinion survey captures the general public's views on bicycling, including frequency of bicycling, perceived barriers to bicycling, access to bicycle facilities and helmet use. Staff will present an overview of the survey results.

RESOURCES AND INFORMATION

- ACT Now! You could be eligible for up to $3,500 for your older vehicle!
  AirCheckTexas: www.airchecktexas.org
- Clean Air Action Day—June 22, 2018: www.airnorthtexas.org/cleanairactionday
- April Car Care Clinics: www.ntxcarcare.org
- Spring Outreach Events: www.airnorthtexas.org

The Arlington meeting will be live streamed at www.nctcog.org/video (click on the “live” tab). A video recording of this meeting will also be posted online at www.nctcog.org/input.
MINUTES

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL ONLINE INPUT OPPORTUNITY

Funding Program: Safety, Innovative & Emergency Projects

Online Public Input Opportunity Dates

Monday, March 12 - Tuesday, April 10, 2018 - The North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) posted information at www.nctcog.org/input for public review and comment.

Purpose and Topics

The online public input opportunity was provided in accordance with the NCTCOG Transportation Department Public Participation Plan, which became effective June 1, 1994, as approved by the Regional Transportation Council (RTC), the transportation policy board for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and amended on February 12, 2015. Staff posted information regarding:

1. Funding Program: Safety, Innovative & Emergency Projects

The NCTCOG online public input opportunity was provided to inform and seek comments from the public. Comments and questions could be submitted by email at transinfo@nctcog.org, online at www.nctcog.org/input, by mail at P.O. Box 5888, Arlington, TX 76005 and by fax at 817-640-3028. Printed copies of the online materials were also made available by calling 817-608-2365 or emailing cbaylor@nctcog.org.

Summary of Presentation

Summary of Funding Program: Safety, Innovative & Emergency Projects:


In April 2017, a process to select projects via several funding programs was presented to the Regional Transportation Council. Projects were categorized into 11 programs, and project selection is proposed to occur in stages throughout 2017 and into early 2018.

The purpose of the Safety, Innovative and Emergency Projects Program is to support operations, safety, innovative construction and emergency improvements.

Staff is proposing to allocate more than $32 million in RTC funding to various projects, including the Regional Safety Program, South Shady Shores Road, Wycliff Avenue, the IH 30 Managed Lanes and Meacham Airport.

All partnership details will be finalized before the RTC takes action on the Safety, Innovative and Emergency Projects Program in April 2018.
WRITTEN COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY WEBSITE, EMAIL & SOCIAL MEDIA

Shady Shores Project

Email

1. John Smith, Town Administrator of Hickory Creek

The potential new bridge would link fire, police, and rescue through the south end of Shady Shores Road. During the flooding of Lake Lewisville, all police assist had to travel via I35 thus taking more time to arrive on scene. Any bridge improvements would help dramatically during flooding. Thank you for your time.

2. Jennifer Gwinn

I am in favor of a new bridge. S. Shady Shores Road is prone to flooding at this location and is a key emergency response pathway to the three (3) schools in our Town's limits which consists of approximately 1600 students, teaching and support staff.

3. Lynda Avon

Shady Shores rd often floods when it rains, making it difficult to get anywhere. It is imperative that the SS project be a priority as it affects our Security (police/ambulance/fire). Our community keeps growing and our roads are in terrible shape as well as the flooding. I would like to see our tax dollars put to work on the roads.

4. Steve Horstman

I am writing to emphasize the importance of the effort to raise the bridge that boarders Lake Lewisville on S. Shady Shores Lane in Shady Shores, TX. This bridge has been flooded and disabled for months at a time. Each time there are substantial repair costs after the flooding. While impassable, the travel time from Fire Station #1 in Lake Dallas to Shady Shores and the three schools within it is more than doubled. Please prioritize funding for this critical effort.

5. Bob Kersten

I support the shady shores bridge initiative. It is highly needed and would be of great benefit to the community. thanks

6. Mike Personius

As a property owner in the Town of Shady Shores, I want to strongly encourage the funding of the upgrades to Shady Shores Road. This road has become a primary traffic artery in this area over the last several years. It is no longer a country backwater road, only used by a few residents. Having the roadway subject to extensive closure due to flooding seriously impacts not only the residents, but also through-traffic and emergency services. As the owner of a mobile home community here in the town, I speak for dozens of residents in requesting these improvements to be funded. The impact of these improvements will be dramatic, significantly improving the safety, well-being, and environment of the broader community. Thank you for your sensible consideration of this matter. Mike Personius

7. Jerry Adams
S. Shady Shore road is prone to flooding at this location and is a critical link to Fire Station #1 in Lake Dallas that supports the Town of Shady Shores a town of over 2600 residents. S. Shady Shores Road is prone to flooding at this location and is a key emergency response pathway to the three (3) schools in our Town’s limits which consists of approximately 1600 students, teaching and support staff.

8. Mary Ingles
I am in favor of this project. I vote YES!

9. Jorge & Erin Pesante
We have been inconvenienced too many times with S.Shady Shores Rd flooding, not to mention being cut-off from Fire Dept - Please allow us this money to fix this. S. Shady Shore road is prone to flooding at this location and is a critical link to Fire Station #1 in Lake Dallas that supports the Town of Shady Shores a town of over 2600 residents. S. Shady Shores Road is prone to flooding at this location and is a key emergency response pathway to the three (3) schools in our Town's limits which consists of approximately 1600 students, teaching and support staff.

10. Robert Patrick Fort
SS Bridges Project, a joint project between the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Denton County, the City of Lake Dallas and the Town of Shady Shore to raise S. Shady Shores Bridge.million in federal funds. S. Shady Shore road is prone to flooding at this location and is a critical link to Fire Station #1 in Lake Dallas that supports the Town of Shady Shores a town of over 2600 residents. S. Shady Shores Road is prone to flooding at this location and is a key emergency response pathway to the three (3) schools in our Town's limits which consists of approximately 1600 students, teaching and support staff.

11. Steve Falldine
Hello, we are residents of Shady Shores in Denton County. We would like to ask PLEASE appropriate the funds necessary for the road/bridge project - not only is it wildly inconvenient when the road floods, but it causes a real danger when that route is cut off - emergency vehicles' response time to our community is drastically and dangerously lengthened. Also, when the road floods and it is shut down for weeks/months, that forces traffic to be re-routed to the only other road leading in and out of Shady Shores, and that increased traffic is now, slowly but surely, deteriorating that other road to the point that it has become very beat up. We really NEED this project approved. - - - - Thank you for helping fix Shady Shores Rd!!

12. Brian Tomlin
I am writing this note to suggest that the Shady Shores Bridges project in Shady Shores Texas move forward with bridge improvements for the following reasons: S. Shady Shore road is prone to flooding at this location and is a critical link to Fire Station #1 in Lake Dallas that supports the Town of Shady Shores a town of over 2600 residents. S. Shady Shores Road is prone to flooding at this location and is a key emergency response pathway to the three (3) schools in our Town's limits which consists of approximately 1600 students, teaching and support staff.

13. William Bailey
S. Shady Shores Road is prone to flooding whose frequency has increased in recent years. The loss of this road for extended periods of time limits access to our community as well as delays emergency access to parts of our town. The road becomes inaccessible for weeks at a time when flooded.

14. Joe Kessler

S. Shady Shore road is prone to flooding at this location and is a critical link to Fire Station #1 in Lake Dallas that supports the Town of Shady Shores a town of over 2600 residents. S. Shady Shores Road is prone to flooding at this location and is a key emergency response pathway to the three (3) schools in our Town's limits which consists of approximately 1600 students, teaching and support staff.

15. Frank Graham

For obvious public safety reasons, the stretch of Shady Shores Road including the bridge needs immediate "reconstruction". Years ago in an area of Hickory Creek that was unreachable during flooding, the Lake Cities Volunteer Fire Dept. would literally leave emergency vehicles in the affected neighborhood when flooding was forecasted and show several residents how to operate the trucks. Today that would be impossible, as several neighborhood are affected and the equipment is very sophisticated. The previous method, though, shows how much importance should be placed on public safety.

16. Matt Michel

We have recently purchased a home in Shady Shores and are about to move in. We couldn't help but not the flood barriers across South Shady Shores Road and with recent rains, it is apparent why they are in place. This road floods. With all of the infrastructure improvements in Denton County, how can improving this road be missed? It serves thousands of people, including access to several schools. When, not if the road flood, fire trucks and paramedics cannot access the town or the schools. Are you kidding me? This needs to be addressed immediately. If not and if worse comes to worst, things will not be pretty for those who had the ability to prevent a disaster, but failed to act.

17. Kyle Peteet

For the proposed project of raising Shady Shores bridge - S. Shady Shores Road in Shady Shores, TX is prone to flooding at the bridge location and is a key emergency response pathway to the three (3) schools in our Town's limits which consists of approximately 1600 students, teaching and support staff. I am in support of approving this project.


This comment is in regard to the much needed Shady Shores bridges project. South Shady Shores road is very prone to flooding at this location and is a critical link to Fire Station #1 in Lake Dallas that supports the Town of Shady Shores a town of over 2600 residents. This location is also a key emergency response pathway to the three (3) schools in our Town's limits which consists of approximately 1600 students, teaching and support staff. As a Shady Shores resident, I would sincerely appreciate NCTCOG’s support for the much needed bridges.
19. Darlene Covich

I support the SS Bridges Project to raise South Shady Shores Bridge! I have been inconvenienced too many times by its flooding. Thank you.

20. Beth Bergeron

Please raise the S. Shady Shores Bridge! S. Shady Shore road is prone to flooding at this location and is a critical link to Fire Station #1 in Lake Dallas that supports the Town of Shady Shores a town of over 2600 residents. S. Shady Shores Road is prone to flooding at this location and is a key emergency response pathway to the three (3) schools in our Town's limits which consists of approximately 1600 students, teaching and support staff.

21. Maggie Preston

This artery is critical to the residents of Shady Shores. Many of us use South Shady Shores road as a means to commute back and forth to work. Some of us have mission critical careers such as law enforcement, firefighters, and hospital employees. The portion of the road in discussion has been flooded several times, thereby preventing our residents, as well as the fire department from an efficient means to travel between Lake Dallas and Shady Shores. A few years back it was closed for 5 months, which is unacceptable for those of use who use this road. The population of this area has grown tremendously, which furthers the cause for the repair and raising of the road. The funds should be appropriated as soon as possible to raise the road to an level which will not deter our transportation. I have lived in Shady Shores for 30 years, and would hope that the funding would be approved without question. Thank you for hearing my comments.

22. David Nielsen

I am a Shady Shores resident and back the S. Shady Shores Bridge project 100%. I have lived here through many closures of this bridge to heavy rains and flooding. When it is closed it limits the accessibility to schools, homes, churches, etc. and increases response time to emergencies. When flooded it cuts off the fastest route for Fire Dept. #1 to respond to emergencies. If there were every an emergency at Olive Stephens Elementary or Bettye Myers Middle Schools while the bridge was flooded out, it could be catastrophic. Rainy season is coming!! If we get rain like last year, it will flood, close for months, and make emergency response times greater, which again, could be catastrophic.

23. Susan Krnic

To whom it may concern: As a resident of Shady Shores, Texas for over 17 years, S. Shady Shore road has flooded on numerous occasions. The road is a critical link to Fire Station #1 in Lake Dallas that supports the Town of Shady Shores (a town of over 2600 resident). The road is also a key emergency response pathway to the three (3) schools in our Town's limits which consists of approximately 1600 students, teaching and support staff. I urge you to consider funding and supporting a new bridge on S. Shady Shores Road.

24. July Linett

This is regarding the proposed correction to the South Shady Shores Road. This area was flooded for weeks and caused dangerous conditions for local residents as well as limiting
access out of the area and into the area for safety, including fire response vehicles. It must be fixed.

25. Gary Brown

Need for improvements to raise S. Shady Shores Road out of the floodplain. In recent years this road has been closed several times for extended periods due to flooding from Lake Lewisville. This leaves very limited access to several neighborhoods and schools and is a critical link to Fire Station #1 in Lake Dallas that supports the Town of Shady Shores with over 2600 residents. Shady Shores Road is a key emergency response pathway to the three (3) schools in our Town's limits which consists of approximately 1600 students, teaching and support staff.

26. Ashley Hagen

S. Shady Shores road is prone to flooding at this location and is a critical link to Fire Station #1 in Lake Dallas that supports the Town of Shady Shores a town of over 2600 residents (including myself). I moved to the area in October of 2017 and fully support MUCH NEEDED improvements to S. Shady Shores road.

27. Matthew Haines

Dear NCTCOG, I am writing you to express my support of the South Shady Shores Project. South Shady Shore road is prone to flooding at the locations that this project would address and is a critical roadway link to Fire Station #1 in Lake Dallas that supports the Town of Shady Shores a town of over 2600 residents. This road is also a key emergency response pathway to the three (3) schools in our Town's limits which consists of approximately 1600 students, teaching and support staff. Thank you for your consideration and support!

28. Linda and Lucien Duplantie

SS Bridges Project In support of the above project, we would like to mention, flooding is a major concern and this project is the right solution instead of having to close Shady Shores road, restricting access to not only local residents but emergency vehicles having to provide services to schools and residents. It will also help the growth of Shady Shores welcoming new property owners in this beautiful community. Thanking for your attention and consideration. Residents of Cielo Ranch

29. John T. Williams

We support the raising of South Shady Shores Rd higher than its current level in the low lying areas, which are prone to flooding. The flooding shuts down access to the South and prevents emergency vehicles from getting to us from that direction. The bridge should be raised to prevent this from happening.

30. Leslie Rogers

Concerning the raising of s. Shady Shores above flood level. My husband and I live in Cielo Ranch. We bought the house days before the 2015 flood began. We watched as the water ate up to our back steps which is 100 yards or so from normal full lakeshore. That was the least of our concern. We moved in just days before they closed s. Shady Shores. We had no idea how to get into and out of our neighborhood. Then they tore down post oak over pass which was the way we would go to head south on 35. Now we were completely lost. We were extremely
concerned on how emergency services like fire and rescue would reach our home. This all was very alarming and we wondered if we had made a mistake. There are many older and retired residence in our neighborhood and we had great concern for their needs. It may not seem like it if you don't live out here, THIS IS A MAJOR ISSUE FOR RESIDENTS!

31. Eric

Please ensure north-south access to our town of Shady Shores by helping raise S Shady Shores Bridge above flood levels. Thank you for considering. Eric Schulz "S. Shady Shore road is prone to flooding at this location and is a critical link to Fire Station #1 in Lake Dallas that supports the Town of Shady Shores a town of over 2600 residents." "S. Shady Shores Road is prone to flooding at this location and is a key emergency response pathway to the three (3) schools in our Town's limits which consists of approximately 1600 students, teaching and support staff."

32. Doyle Clemmons

Please help us with funding to elevate the bridge on Shady Shores Rd. Our schools need quick response For emergencies and our residences need fire trucks to be Responsive. This road is so low a couple days of heavy rain Put it under water.

33. Stephanie

About 12 houses in my neighborhood share the exact same address: 104 Brown Terrace, Shady Shores, TX 76208. Despite the multiple house sitting on several different streets, the addresses are only separated by unlabeled lot numbers and accessible by makeshift 10 ft wide gravel "roads". The "roads" have no street names, no street signs, no directions, and managed by the residents because city has neglected them, which has led to personal expenses and property disputes and confusion. Because there's no address or road names, emergency responders (police, fire department, ambulances) can't find my home, nor can they access it because of the road conditions. This is an enormous safety concern for my family, and needs to be remedied. Plats and surveys show the roads as public 30 ft wide right of ways. They should be named, paved and maintained to be accessible to emergency personnel. Additionally, they could use stop signs and a speed limit sign.

34. Bob Hart, City of Corinth

The City of Corinth is supportive of the effort by the Town of Shady Shores, Denton County, and the City of Lake Dallas to raise the Shady Shores Road Bridge. The roadway often floods and when flooded, impedes fire and EMS response from the Corinth managed fire department. In addition, the roadway is an important arterial for police patrol and response. The City of Corinth provides police services to the Town of Shady Shores through an interlocal contract. Thus the roadway is important for the provision of emergency services between the City of Corinth and the Town of Shady Shores; therefore, the Corinth City Council is supportive of the effort to raise the roadway and bridge to reduce the danger of flooding

35. Doug Busey

Since the Army Corp changed, raised, the floodplain of Lake Lewisville they should be responsible for funding the repair of roads that flood.
36. Rebecca Morgan

I respectfully ask that the project to raise the bridge on S. Shady Shores Road proceed. South Shady Shore Road is a critical link to the Fire Station [located in Lake Dallas] that services our community. This road has spent far too much time underwater. When the road is flooded emergency response time goes down as the Fire Trucks and Ambulances have to take alternate routes putting our 2600 residents and approximately 1600 students, teaching and support staff of the 3 schools located in our town at risk.

Response to all comments by Carli Baylor, NCTCOG

Good afternoon,

Thank you for your comment. The Shady Shores project is recommended for RTC approval on April 12, 2018.
Increase Incident Response
Decrease Driver Delay

Executive Level Incident Management Training Opportunity

Join us for the Traffic Incident Management Executive Level Course hosted by the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG). The course is designed to educate decision and policy makers on the importance and benefits of effective incident management. It also encourages a common, coordinated response to traffic incidents—a source of significant delays in our rapidly growing region.

Goals of the Traffic Incident Management Executive Level Course focus on:
- building partnerships with local emergency response agencies
- enhancing safety for emergency personnel
- reducing upstream traffic accidents
- improving the efficiency of the transportation system
- improving air quality in the Dallas-Fort Worth region

Space is limited. Register today. 817.695.9245 / bwalsh@nctcog.org

Thursday, May 3, 2018
10 am—noon
NCTCOG
Transportation Council Room
616 Six Flags Drive, Centerpoint II
Arlington, Texas 76011

North Central Texas Council of Governments
Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENTS REPORT

WRITTEN COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY WEBSITE, EMAIL & SOCIAL MEDIA

Purpose

The public comments report is in accordance with the NCTCOG Transportation Department Public Participation Plan, which became effective June 1, 1994, as approved by the Regional Transportation Council (RTC), the transportation policy board for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and amended on February 12, 2015.

This report is a compilation of general public comments submitted by members of the public from Tuesday, February 20, 2018, through Monday, March 19, 2018. Comments and questions are submitted for the record and can be submitted via Facebook, Twitter, fax, email and online.

Summary

This month, public comments were received on a number of topics across social media platforms and via email. The majority of comments were received regarding the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan, an effort to evaluate north-south and east-west roadway connections in the county. NCTCOG staff has given presentations in the community regarding this project.

Aviation

Twitter

1. RT @DougWil41 @NCTCOGtrans  Coming to the skies of North Texas soon.
#Dallas #FortWorth #Arlington – Marko Sakal (@markosakal)

Bicycle & Pedestrian

Email

1. Lawrence Colvin

The North Texas area has three non-profit, 501c3, citizen volunteer mountain bike clubs. The Dallas Off-Road Bicycle Association (DORBA), the Fort Worth Mountain Bikers’ Association (FWMBA) and the Weatherford Mountain Bike Club (WMBC) work with local municipalities, State Parks and COE land managers to manage 37 area trails and trailhead parking facilities for the benefit of the recreational trail user community. These are some great opportunities for the NCTCOG to partner with these clubs to develop a closer relationship to improve parking
facilities, create new on-street bicycle lanes and generate greater connectivity between the area trails. Thanks! Lawrence Colvin - President Weatherford Mountain Bike Club

**Twitter**

1. Hardwired anti- #dooring

http://www.dutchreach.org

@CityofEvanston @ClubYCD @ColoradoDOT @CompCommunityDE @cta @CTDMV @DCPoliceDept @DDOTDC @DelawareDMV @DelawareDOT @EvanstonPD @MDOT_A2 @MDOT_BWB @MDOT_LanJxn @MDOT_UP @MississippiDOT @my511NY @MyFDOT @myTDOT @NACTO @NCTCOGtrans – Michael Charney (@DutchReach)

2. @NCTCOGtrans @BikeDFW @BikeFriendlyFW @BikeTexas @completestreets @txbornviking – Shawn Eric Gray (@ShawnEricGray)
3. Improve driver #Instruction!

https://www.dutchreach.org/road-sharing-for-all/ …

@myTDOT @NACTO @NCTCOGtrans @nevadadot @NewHavenDOT @NottmTravelwise @NUSDTransDept @OakDOT @ODOT_Statewide @OhioBicycling @PadresTraffic @ParkingatAU @RIDOTNews @TXDF @vopnews @wbikechi @cityofwspolice @Ohio_BMV @NHTSAgov #wsj – Michael Charney (@DutchReach)

4. Where the crosswalk ends. Going from Lincoln Park to NorthPark. Being a pedestrian is fun!
   – Tim Rogers (@timmytyper)
Try surviving a walk across Mockingbird at 75. Car drivers seem to aggressively hate pedestrians in Dallas. A hatred only surpassed by their lethal loathing of cyclists. Sad. – David Hale Smith (@davidhalesmith)

Isn’t that where the pedestrian bridge is now? – Melissa J. Bellan (@BellanMelissa)

Yes, but it’s not convenient for pedestrians not already on the trail. We are implementing a pedestrian safety plan jointly developed by @UnivCrossing, @TxDOT, and @NCTCOGtrans – Philip Kingston (@PhilipTKingston)

Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan

1. Anne Jones

I writing to let you know that I do not think it is in the best interest of all concern that Troy Road should not be used an arterial corridor. It is a one and half lane road with many driveways and homes. The speed limit is 35mph. If you were to change the corridor to 544 and Vinson the right of way is already built in, there are less homes that would be affected, no new road will have to be carved through someone’s property, and the speed limit is already 55mph. I do not feel the bridge connecting from John king in Rockwall to Alanis in Wylie is a good idea. I understand you are planning for the future but the cost to the quality of life for the people living in the neighborhoods affected is too high. The bridge would cause a lot of noise, light, and air pollution. I choose to live in Wylie because of its small town feeling and closeness to work. If people choose to live father away and commute to work, they should have to live with the consequences of their decision. I understand that changes need to be made but it seems to me
that you need to be logical about this and using the road that we already have seem to be the best situation for all those affected.

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Ms. Jones,

Good morning. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

As I’m sure you’re aware, your concerns are shared among many other Wylie residents who’ve contacted me over the last several months. Even with removal of the proposed Renner Road extension segment per the January 2018 City of Murphy Resolution, our year 2040 travel demand model simulations still confirm that the proposed new bridge across Lake Ray Hubbard is a key element to alleviating future traffic congestion along State Highway (SH) 78 between the lakes, and an important strategy to help redistribute traffic among various thoroughfares that travel through the City of Wylie. The proposed Hensley/Alanis/John King Connector will still have essential connections to McCreary Road, Woodbridge Parkway, Sanden Boulevard, Ballard Street, and Vinson Road (all having or planned to have at least 4 lanes of roadway capacity)…and each of these north-south facilities can/will provide alternate paths to/from east-west facilities above and beyond just Farm-to-Market Road (FM) 544 and SH 78. We believe, given the level of traffic predicted for this area, the network as a whole still benefits when we can close any possible gap between major thoroughfares.

Our travel demand model simulations also demonstrate that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across Lake Ray Hubbard. At the same time…I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road, and we’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Other residents along or near Troy Road have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

2. David Ashworth

Please do not put a highway at Troy rd. This will destroy our great neighborhood and ruin the area. We have a wonderful house next to Lake Ray Hubbard and this highway will ruin it.

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG
Mr. Ashworth,

Good morning. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

Your concerns are shared among many other residents along and near Troy Road who’ve spoken or written to me over the last several months. While our year 2040 travel demand model simulations confirm that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across Lake Ray Hubbard...I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road. We’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Quite a few other Wylie residents have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

3. Danny & Virginia Glover

1) Troy Road should not be used an arterial corridor. It is a one and half lane road with many driveways and homes. The speed limit is 35mph. If they were to change the corridor to 544 and Vinson the right of way is already built in, there are less homes that would be affected, no new road will have to be carved through someone’s property, the speed limit is already 55mph. 2) COG is proposing a bridge connecting from John king in Rockwall to Alanis in Wylie. The bridge would come right through Wylie’s ETJ. It will also cause a lot of noise, light, and air pollution. Not to mention they want to put it in the flood plans. This will displace the water to somewhere else, would cost more because they will have to build it up, this will also bring traffic from Rockwall. Please write COG and tell them this is not what we want. We do not want the bridge and they need to come up with something else that includes using existing large roads but modifying them to allow them to handle more traffic. I am writing about the proposed Lake Ray Hubbard which will connect to the flood plains in east Wylie eventually sneaking its way to Beaver Creek. It will bring too much traffic to Troy Rd and definitely does not benefit us. Thank you for your time.

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Mr. and Mrs. Glover,

Good morning. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and your comment will be included for viewing and
consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

As I’m sure you’re aware, your concerns are shared among many other Wylie residents who’ve spoken or written to me over the last several months. Even with removal of the proposed Renner Road extension segment per the January 2018 City of Murphy Resolution, our year 2040 travel demand model simulations still confirm that the proposed new bridge across Lake Ray Hubbard is a key element to alleviating future traffic congestion along State Highway (SH) 78 between the lakes, and an important strategy to help redistribute traffic among various thoroughfares that travel through the City of Wylie. The proposed Hensley/Alanis/John King Connector would still have essential connections to McCreary Road, Woodbridge Parkway, Sanden Boulevard, Ballard Street, and Vinson Road (all having or planned to have at least 4 lanes of roadway capacity)…and each of these north-south facilities can/will provide alternate paths to/from other east-west facilities above and beyond just Farm-to-Market Road (FM) 544 and SH 78. We believe, given the level of traffic predicted for this area, the network as a whole still benefits when we can close any possible gap between major thoroughfares.

Our travel demand model simulations also demonstrate that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across Lake Ray Hubbard. At the same time…I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road, and we’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Other residents along or near Troy Road have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

4. Rod Cory

To our NCTCOG leaders, Out of all due respect, We now have a completed, fully functional 6 lane highway (78) that funnels traffic east / west between Lake Lavon and Lake Ray Hubbard. Adding yet another highway, that would literally be a couple miles South of 78 seems to be not only a waste of money and resources but a potential compounding problem directly impacting our wetlands, the flood management of North Lake Ray Hubbard as well as nature’s habitat that lives within this wetland, which by the way from my understanding supplies water to a vast number of residents in North Texas. Let’s not alter and pollute our natural water source that can and often does already become limited during our summer months. Furthermore those of us whom reside in Wylie, whether in the direct path or not of this proposal made a conscious decision to live out, away from town as far as we could knowing we would add time and dollars spent to our commute. Rockwall residents have obviously done the same. I ask, and beg of you to not take our Natural country side. No highways / No bridge at Lake Lavon nor Lake Ray
Hubbard! If residing in the country or outlying towns is too much, I suggest to those who find the existing roads to congested moving to the city and / or closer to ones employment. I believe it is safe to say those of us who moved out here did not do it for the sake of convince, we moved out here to enjoy God’s gift of Nature, to decompress from the hustle of our careers. To raise children away from concrete, crime, traffic and the dangers that go along with. I ask you to please consider all of these things before pushing this road thought further. The negative impact on our community, our natural flood management, our source of water, our property value, our mental health, our future regarding our children and their well-being are just some of the topics that are literally at your fingertips. Wylie Texas has been ranked extremely high on National stats for living, raising children for many years. As a Wylie resident, I beg you not make us a drive by town. I beg you not to divide our community with major highways. Thank you for your time and consideration on how it impacts us Residents of a nationally recognized town of Wylie Texas.

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Mr. Cory,

Good morning. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

As I’m sure you’re aware, your concerns are shared among many other Wylie residents who’ve spoken or written to me over the last several months. Even with removal of the proposed Renner Road extension segment per the January 2018 City of Murphy Resolution, our year 2040 travel demand model simulations still confirm that the proposed new bridge across Lake Ray Hubbard is a key element to alleviating future traffic congestion along State Highway (SH) 78 between the lakes, and an important strategy to help redistribute traffic among various thoroughfares that travel through the City of Wylie. The proposed Hensley/Alanis/John King Connector would still have essential connections to McCreary Road, Woodbridge Parkway, Sanden Boulevard, Ballard Street, and Vinson Road (all having or planned to have at least 4 lanes of roadway capacity)…and each of these north-south facilities can/will provide alternate paths to/from other east-west facilities above and beyond just Farm-to-Market Road (FM) 544 and SH 78. We believe, given the level of traffic predicted for this area, the network as a whole still benefits when we can close any possible gap between major thoroughfares and work as quickly as possible to implement each city’s ultimate thoroughfare plan vision.

Our travel demand model simulations also demonstrate that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across Lake Ray Hubbard. At the same time… I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road, and we’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Other residents along or near Troy Road have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could
provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts.

On a final note…I want to be sure you’re aware that any CCSRP-proposed roadways (or any major transportation projects regardless of mode) that may be implemented using state and/or Federal funds are required to go through an intensive and interactive environmental assessment process before construction or right-of-way acquisition can be approved…particularly any project that may cross an important asset like Lake Ray Hubbard. The implementing agency (TxDOT, Collin County, etc…) must either demonstrate that no significant impacts are anticipated by the proposed project, or ensure that any identified potential impacts can be appropriately mitigated or avoided. Additionally, the various socio-economic and environmental effects of proposed build alternatives must always be compared to a no-build condition…and a potential decision to build nothing in light of public opinion and/or combination of other factors must always be considered.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

5. Barbara Doucet

As a Troy rd resident, we do not want the proposed new arterial corridor. Please add our name to the object list for this new road.

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Ms. Doucet,

Good morning. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

Your concerns are shared among many other residents along and near Troy Road who’ve spoken or written to me over the last several months. While our year 2040 travel demand model simulations confirm that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across Lake Ray Hubbard…I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road. We’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Quite a few other Wylie residents have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts.
For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

6. David Ashworth

Please do not put a highway at Troy Rd. This will ruin the area. We live right next to Lake Ray Hubbard off of Troy Rd and it will destroy our peaceful neighborhood.

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Mr. Ashworth,

Good morning. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and we continue to appreciate your interest and concern pertaining this study. Your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

As I stated in my previous e-mail to you, we’ve identified that Vinson Road could be a viable alternative for Troy Road as a major north-south thoroughfare east of State Highway (SH) 78 between Alanis Drive and the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT). We’re continuing to study whether or not we can recommend that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update, and we expect to release that update within the next several weeks.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

7. Gwen Poss

I am a resident on Troy Rd. I am against the proposed thoroughfare and the bride over Lake Ray Hubbard. I moved here a year ago to care for my mother when she was diagnosed with alzheimers. This home is less than 20 feet from the existing road already. This project would compromise her mental and physical health as well as jeopardize her safety. Please take this into consideration. I suggest another route FM544 and Vinson.

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Ms. Poss,

Good morning. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

As I’m sure you’re aware, your concerns are shared among many other Wylie residents who’ve spoken or written to me over the last several months. Even with removal of the
proposed Renner Road extension segment per the January 2018 City of Murphy Resolution, our year 2040 travel demand model simulations still confirm that the proposed new bridge across Lake Ray Hubbard is a key element to alleviating future traffic congestion along State Highway (SH) 78 between the lakes, and an important strategy to help redistribute traffic among various thoroughfares that travel through the City of Wylie. The proposed Hensley/Alanis/John King Connector would still have essential connections to McCreary Road, Woodbridge Parkway, Sanden Boulevard, Ballard Street, and Vinson Road (all having or planned to have at least 4 lanes of roadway capacity)…and each of these north-south facilities can/will provide alternate paths to/from other east-west facilities above and beyond just Farm-to-Market Road (FM) 544 and SH 78. We believe, given the level of traffic predicted for this area, the network as a whole still benefits when we can close any possible gap between major thoroughfares and work as quickly as possible to implement each city’s ultimate thoroughfare plan vision.

Our travel demand model simulations also demonstrate that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across Lake Ray Hubbard. At the same time…I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road, and we’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Other residents along or near Troy Road have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts for adjacent property owners.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

8. Sharie Anderson

I live at 2852 Troy Rd in Wylie and I want to express my opinion on a few items. Troy Rd should not be used as arterial corridor. It is a one and half lane road with many driveways and homes on it. The speed limit is 35 MPH. Other options to consider are changing the corridor to FM 44 and Vinson. The right of way is already built in, less homes would be affected, the speed limit is already 55 MPH, and no new road would be necessary and carved through someone's property. There is a proposal of a bridge connecting John King in Rockwall to Alanis in Wylie. This bridge would come right through Wylie's ETJ. It will cause noise, light and air pollution. If it's put in the flood plans, it displaces the water, would cost more to build it up, and bring in more traffic from Rockwall. I do not want this bridge. Please consider another alternative that includes using existing large roads that can be modified to allow more traffic.

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Ms. Anderson,
Good afternoon. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

As I’m sure you’re aware, your concerns are shared among many other Wylie residents who’ve spoken or written to me over the last several months. Even with removal of the proposed Renner Road extension segment per the January 2018 City of Murphy Resolution, our year 2040 travel demand model simulations still confirm that the proposed new bridge across Lake Ray Hubbard is a key element to alleviating future traffic congestion along State Highway (SH) 78 between the lakes, and an important strategy to help redistribute traffic among various thoroughfares that travel through the City of Wylie. The proposed Hensley/Alanis/John King Connector would still have essential connections to McCreary Road, Woodbridge Parkway, Sanden Boulevard, Ballard Street, and Vinson Road (all having or planned to have at least 4 lanes of roadway capacity)…and each of these north-south facilities can/will provide alternate paths to/from other east-west facilities above and beyond just Farm-to-Market Road (FM) 544 and SH 78. We believe, given the level of traffic predicted for this area, the network as a whole still benefits when we can close any possible gap between major thoroughfares and work as quickly as possible to implement each city’s ultimate thoroughfare plan vision.

Our travel demand model simulations also demonstrate that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across Lake Ray Hubbard. At the same time…I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road, and we’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Other residents along or near Troy Road have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts.

On a final note…I want to be sure you’re aware that any CCSRP-proposed roadways (or any major transportation projects regardless of mode) that may be implemented using state and/or Federal funds are required to go through an intensive and interactive environmental assessment process before construction or right-of-way acquisition can be approved…particularly any project that may cross an important asset like Lake Ray Hubbard. The implementing agency (TxDOT, Collin County, etc…) must either demonstrate that no significant impacts are anticipated by the proposed project, or ensure that any identified potential impacts can be appropriately mitigated or avoided. Additionally, the various socio-economic and environmental effects of proposed build alternatives must always be compared to a no-build condition…and a potential decision to build nothing in light of public opinion and/or combination of other factors must always be considered.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following
webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

9. Jeff Hamilton

Hello, We are writing to show our support against Troy becoming an arterial corridor. We are sickened to hear this possibility as it would absolutely crush all aspects of country life and wildlife in our area. A 4/6 lane roadway in this area would cause horrible noise, pollution and crime spikes to our small rural community. We have been homeowners for three years on a small street off of Troy rd and we love the nature in this area. We plan on starting a family here. Our street dead ends to Lake Ray Hubbard and we already have a lot of unwanted traffic with people looking for lake access. With this road being built we can't imagine the nightmare of random people constantly trafficking our street. We have heard the possibility of making 544 to Vinson the arterial corridor instead. We cannot understand why they would not go that route in the first place! Please understand that we are greatly against the Troy Rd construction and Ray Hubbard bridge project. We have many neighbors that are unaware of this project and need to be informed! This will be devastating to so many people if this project passes. We have attached two main points below. Sincerely, Kendra & Jeff Hamilton

1) Troy Road should not be used an arterial corridor. It is a one and half lane road with many driveways and homes. The speed limit is 35mph. If they were to change the corridor to 544 and Vinson the right of way is already built in, there are less homes that would be affected, no new road will have to be carved through someone’s property, the speed limit is already 55mph. 2) COG is proposing a bridge connecting from John king in Rockwall to Alanis in Wylie. The bridge would come right through Wylie’s ETJ. It will also cause a lot of noise, light, and air pollution.

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Mr. Hamilton,

Good afternoon. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

As I’m sure you’re aware, your concerns are shared among many other Wylie residents who’ve spoken or written to me over the last several months. Even with removal of the proposed Renner Road extension segment per the January 2018 City of Murphy Resolution, our year 2040 travel demand model simulations still confirm that the proposed new bridge across Lake Ray Hubbard is a key element to alleviating future traffic congestion along State Highway (SH) 78 between the lakes, and an important strategy to help redistribute traffic among various thoroughfares that travel through the City of Wylie. The proposed Hensley/Alanis/John King Connector would still have essential connections to McCreary Road, Woodbridge Parkway, Sanden Boulevard, Ballard Street, and Vinson Road (all having or planned to have at least 4 lanes of roadway capacity)…and each of these north-south facilities can/will provide alternate paths to/from other east-west facilities above and beyond just Farm-to-Market Road (FM) 544 and SH 78. We believe, given the level of traffic predicted for this area, the network as a whole still benefits when we can close any possible gap between major thoroughfares and work as quickly as possible to implement each city’s ultimate thoroughfare plan vision.
Our travel demand model simulations also demonstrate that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across Lake Ray Hubbard. At the same time… I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road, and we’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Other residents along or near Troy Road have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts.

On a final note… I want to be sure you’re aware that any CCSRP-proposed roadways (or any major transportation projects regardless of mode) that may be implemented using state and/or Federal funds are required to go through an intensive and interactive environmental assessment process before construction or right-of-way acquisition can be approved… particularly any project that may cross an important asset like Lake Ray Hubbard. The implementing agency (TxDOT, Collin County, etc…) must either demonstrate that no significant impacts are anticipated by the proposed project, or ensure that any identified potential impacts can be appropriately mitigated or avoided. Additionally, the various socio-economic and environmental effects of proposed build alternatives must always be compared to a no-build condition…and a potential decision to build nothing in light of public opinion and/or combination of other factors must always be considered.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

10. Joan Lux

To: NCTCOG

Re: Suggested Alternative to Use 544 & Vinson Rd to GBTR instead of Troy Rd & Termination of Bridge Plans over North Lake Ray Hubbard to John King in Rockwall

As a homeowner on Troy Rd just south of Wylie for the past 11 years, we are appalled, frustrated and angered by NCTCOG’s proposal to turn our quiet country road into a high traffic area when other viable alternatives that already have the necessary easements & right-of-ways are available with considerable less costs to taxpayers and little or no infringement onto private property and citizen’s homes. FM544 would be a much more cost effective alternative as the right-of-way and easements to widen this roadway are already in place and could easily be extended down Vinson Rd and then beside the Garland City Dump to tie into the George Bush Toll Road. We would ask that NCTCOG look into this option rather than displacing homeowners & property unnecessarily by trying to use Troy Rd. We would also like to express our concern and dismay of NCTCOG’s proposal to build a bridge across the north end of Lake Ray Hubbard connecting to John King in Rockwall. Now that Wylie’s city council has passed their resolution against the lake corridor highway across Lake Lavon, a new bridge across Lake Ray Hubbard would only increase the congestion on HWY 78 and cause further & future problems of noise,
pollution & increased traffic in areas that are already overloaded and in need of relief. Basically, a bridge across the north end of Lake Ray Hubbard would be a “bridge to nowhere” that only increases traffic problems rather than alleviate them. This could be addressed more effectively with the HWY 78/FM205 corridor and/or the proposed Collin County outer loop. We request that this bridge proposal be terminated and other options explored as well. Sincerely, Joan Lux

**Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG**

Ms. Lux,

Good afternoon. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and we continue to appreciate your interest and concern pertaining to this study. Your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

As I’m sure you’re aware, your concerns are shared among many other Wylie residents who’ve spoken or written to me since the November 2017 City Council Special Session. Even with removal of the proposed Renner Road extension segment per the January 2018 City of Murphy Resolution, our year 2040 travel demand model simulations still confirm that the proposed new bridge across Lake Ray Hubbard is a key element to alleviating future traffic congestion along State Highway (SH) 78 between the lakes, and an important strategy to help redistribute traffic among various thoroughfares that travel through the City of Wylie. The proposed Hensley/Alanis/John King Connector would still have essential connections to McCreary Road, Woodbridge Parkway, Sanden Boulevard, Ballard Street, and Vinson Road (all having or planned to have at least 4 lanes of roadway capacity)...and each of these north-south facilities can/will provide alternate paths to/from other east-west facilities above and beyond just Farm-to-Market Road (FM) 544 and SH 78. We believe, given the level of traffic predicted for this area, the network as a whole still benefits when we can close any possible gap between major thoroughfares and work as quickly as possible to implement each city’s ultimate thoroughfare plan vision.

Our travel demand model simulations also demonstrate that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across Lake Ray Hubbard. At the same time…I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road, and we’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Other residents along or near Troy Road have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.
11. Wayne Chumley

Re: Suggested Alternative to Use 544 & Vinson Rd to GBTR instead of Troy Rd & Termination of Bridge Plans over North Lake Ray Hubbard to John King in Rockwall

As a homeowner on Troy Rd just south of Wylie for the past 11 years, we are appalled, frustrated and angered by NCTCOG’s proposal to turn our quiet country road into a high traffic area when other viable alternatives that already have the necessary easements & right-of-ways are available with considerable less costs to taxpayers and little or no infringement onto private property and citizen’s homes. FM544 would be a much more cost effective alternative as the right-of-way and easements to widen this roadway are already in place and could easily be extended down Vinson Rd and then beside the Garland City Dump to tie into the George Bush Toll Road. We would ask that NCTCOG look into this option rather than displacing homeowners & property unnecessarily by trying to use Troy Rd. We would also like to express our concern and dismay of NCTCOG’s proposal to build a bridge across the north end of Lake Ray Hubbard connecting to John King in Rockwall. Now that Wylie’s city council has passed their resolution against the lake corridor highway across Lake Lavon, a new bridge across Lake Ray Hubbard would only increase the congestion on HWY 78 and cause further & future problems of noise, pollution & increased traffic in areas that are already overloaded and in need of relief. Basically, a bridge across the north end of Lake Ray Hubbard would be a “bridge to nowhere” that only increases traffic problems rather than alleviate them. This could be addressed more effectively with the HWY 78/FM205 corridor and/or the proposed Collin County outer loop. We request that this bridge proposal be terminated and other options explored as well.

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Mr. Chumley,

Good afternoon. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and we continue to appreciate your interest and concern pertaining to this study. Your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

As I’m sure you’re aware, your concerns are shared among many other Wylie residents who’ve spoken or written to me since the November 2017 City Council Special Session. Even with removal of the proposed Renner Road extension segment per the January 2018 City of Murphy Resolution, our year 2040 travel demand model simulations still confirm that the proposed new bridge across Lake Ray Hubbard is a key element to alleviating future traffic congestion along State Highway (SH) 78 between the lakes, and an important strategy to help redistribute traffic among various thoroughfares that travel through the City of Wylie. The proposed Hensley/Alanis/John King Connector would still have essential connections to McCreary Road, Woodbridge Parkway, Sanden Boulevard, Ballard Street, and Vinson Road (all having or planned to have at least 4 lanes of roadway capacity)...and each of these north-south facilities can/will provide alternate paths to/from other east-west facilities above and beyond just Farm-to-Market Road (FM) 544 and SH 78. We believe, given the level of traffic predicted for this area, the network as a whole still benefits when we can close any possible gap between major thoroughfares and work as quickly as possible to implement each city’s ultimate thoroughfare plan vision.
Our travel demand model simulations also demonstrate that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across Lake Ray Hubbard. At the same time…I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road, and we’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Other residents along or near Troy Road have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following webpage:  http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

12. Anthony Byers

I live in Wylie and reside on Troy Rd. I bought my home 2 yrs ago and started my family here. My wife and I travel these roads every day and use 544 for its convenience. PLEASE Do NOT turn our neighborhood into a highway, 544’s zoning is already prepared and as a daily driver you will find it do be the alternative you’re looking for. Thank you

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Mr. Byers,

Good afternoon. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

Your concerns are shared among many other residents along and near Troy Road who’ve spoken or written to me over the last several months. While our year 2040 travel demand model simulations confirm that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across Lake Ray Hubbard…I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road. We’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Quite a few other Wylie residents have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following
webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

13. Robby Neil

I am writing to express concern over consideration of Troy Rd. as a North/South thoroughfare under the above referenced plan. Aside from the negative impact this project would have on the quality of life and value of our home and acreage at 2915 and 2911 Troy Rd., I submit the following points for consideration: 1. Other major thoroughfares running parallel to lakes in Texas typically provide for substantial distances between the roadway and the lake. This setback allows for more of the highly desirable and larger lakefront properties and subdivisions as a buffer zone between the lake and roadway. This larger setback produces higher tax revenue in terms of price and numbers of properties. 2. A pleasant Valley corridor appears to provide a better option in that (a) the roadway already extends for a considerable distance between PGBT and 78, (b) the roadway is already experiencing high traffic and is in need of significant upgrade, (c) much of the route is undeveloped or has larger home setbacks, and (d) it resolves the issue of routing around the Hinton Landfill and Waterview as in the case of the Troy Rd. or Vincent Rd. route. I would also like to express concern over the John King to Alanis connector over Lake Ray Hubbard. It would appear that such an extensive amount of elevated roadway required for this route would be extraordinarily expensive considering the close proximity of a parallel thoroughfare, highway 78, which could be improved to serve the need at less expense. In addition, the combination of these two proposed projects will create a significant “ring of roadways” adjacent to, and over the lake, negatively impacting a valuable local recreational resource.

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Mr. Neill,

Good afternoon. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

As I’m sure you’re aware, your concerns are shared among many other Wylie residents who’ve spoken or written to me over the last several months. Even with removal of the proposed Renner Road extension segment per the January 2018 City of Murphy Resolution, our year 2040 travel demand model simulations still confirm that the proposed new bridge across Lake Ray Hubbard is a key element to alleviating future traffic congestion along State Highway (SH) 78 between the lakes, and an important strategy to help redistribute traffic among various thoroughfares that travel through the City of Wylie. The proposed Hensley/Alanis/John King Connector would still have essential connections to McCreary Road, Woodbridge Parkway, Sanden Boulevard, Ballard Street, and Vinson Road (all having or planned to have at least 4 lanes of roadway capacity)…and each of these north-south facilities can/will provide alternate paths to/from other east-west facilities above and beyond just Farm-to-Market Road (FM) 544 and SH 78. We believe, given the level of traffic predicted for this area, the network as a whole still benefits when we can close any possible gap between major thoroughfares and work as quickly as possible to implement each city’s ultimate thoroughfare plan vision.
Our travel demand model simulations also demonstrate that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across Lake Ray Hubbard. At the same time...I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road, and we’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Other residents along or near Troy Road have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts. I should mention as well that each of these options have included a planned expansion of Pleasant Valley Road between Ballard Street/Sachse Road and Merritt Road to a 4-lane divided facility.

On a final note...I want to be sure you’re aware that any CCSRP-proposed roadways (or any major transportation projects regardless of mode) that may be implemented using state and/or Federal funds are required to go through an intensive and interactive environmental assessment process before construction or right-of-way acquisition can be approved...particularly any project that may cross an important asset like Lake Ray Hubbard. The implementing agency (TxDOT, Collin County, etc...) must either demonstrate that no significant impacts are anticipated by the proposed project, or ensure that any identified potential impacts can be appropriately mitigated or avoided. Additionally, the various socio-economic and environmental effects of proposed build alternatives must always be compared to a no-build condition...and a potential decision to build nothing in light of public opinion and/or combination of other factors must always be considered.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

14. Tina Dickerson

Those of us who live here do NOT want more traffic, or more roads. Please go somewhere you’re wanted.

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Ms. Dickerson,

Good afternoon. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.
15. Ronnie and Vicki O’Donald

My name is Vicki O’Donald. My husband & I built our dream/forever home on Troy Rd. We worked our entire lives for this home & peace of mind. Please put yourself in our shoes........We beg you to LEAVE US ALONE & don’t destroy what we’ve spent a lifetime to build...there are better routes (if you must)....LEAVE TROY ROAD ALONE.... I request you pray before you make decisions that affect OTHER people’s lives

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Ms. O’Donald,

Good afternoon. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

Your concerns are shared among many other residents along and near Troy Road who’ve spoken or written to me over the last several months. While our year 2040 travel demand model simulations confirm that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across Lake Ray Hubbard...I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road. We’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Quite a few other Wylie residents have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following webpage:  http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

16. Erin Larew

First of all I want to thank you for listening. I am going to get a little personal for a minute. I know I have contacted you a lot and you have responded each time. I just want you to understand that this is my home and I am fighting. At times I feel like I will lose this battle and my forever home will be lost. Other times I feel like you all hear us and understand and want to work with us. Not just pick the best road because it will be the best for traffic and forget about everything else. I know you are not the bad guy just a man doing his job. But at the present time I feel as COG is a dragon that I am trying to slay. With that being said here I go again. But once more I am also trying to offer other ideas. I am once again writing to plead my case. Although I understand the need for more roads, I also understand that there are some needs that are just as important. 1. Troy road becoming an arterial corridor is not the best choice. In the
construction of the majority portion of this road and the location of utilities and homes along this road, it is very apparent that this road was never meant to be anything other than a two lane road. Today, most of this road isn’t even two lanes. It would require a tremendous amount of capital and disruption to residences in order to convert this country road into an arterial road. There are a lot of houses are built close to the road and most houses own to the centerline of the road. There are multiple driveways that pull out on to Troy road. Creating a 4+ divided road would become a nuisance for every single person who lives on the road, not to mention having to dodge cars as they try to pull out of their homes. There are a lot of children who live along this road. These children have friends on both sides of the road. An arterial corridor is risking their lives as they try to get to their friends house. The speed limit is 35mph, and those who live on Troy road want it to stay that way. Not only do we want it to stay that way, but we also want stop signs and speed bumps. That is why I am urging you to look more into FM544 to Vinson as becoming the arterial corridor. FM 544 was built with expansion in mind. Homes and utilities are setback from the road to allow for expansion. There are very few driveways that pull out into the road – most are development entrances. The speed limit is already 55MPH. You have said you are looking into how these roadways affect the people. Choosing Troy as a corridor would be devastating to the community who chose this area to call their home. 2. Lake Ray Hubbard Bridge. You are choosing to build on a flood zone area. The city of Dallas would not let us buy this property where the proposed bridge makes landfall on the western side of Lake Ray Hubbard because it is in a flood zone which is part of the management of the lake and connected to the spillway of Lavon Lake. They also do not allow animals to graze on this land due to the pollution they would cause through defecating and urinating and this would get washed into the lake. I am amazed that they would allow a road to be built here. Cars would cause a lot more hazardous chemicals and pollution than animal waste. I am also not thrilled about the idea that East Wylie is being used to ease Rockwall’s traffic. Have you thought of moving the bridge to run southwest and connect into Troy Road when it is in Rockwall county? Basically this bridge would connect Rockwall to Rockwall. There are properties that are currently for sale that make a straight line to Vinson. It could then take the traffic straight to the George Bush leaving East Wylie with less traffic congestion caused by Rockwall traffic. They then could take Vinson to get to 544, Ballard and 78. I sent a picture to Mr. Neal to show you what my idea is. That way instead of taking people’s land and angering all of East Wylie, the road can actually be built in a less impactful way. Also where the bridge starts in Rockwall, it has been slated by Rockwall to become open land preservation. It was actually their number one location. I’m pretty sure building a bridge there ruins that opportunity. My proposed route allows that land to be used the way it was intended. Although there are things that need to be done. I believe that it needs to be thought out some more. I have said it once, and I will say it again: the computer program is not going to be as helpful this time around. Too much time has passed and now you are dealing with people’s lives.

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Erin,

Good afternoon. One of the most important aspects of my work is to try to find win-win solutions whenever and wherever they may be found. Obviously, those solutions may not always be possible...but, working in the government requires us to try to find them because our biggest customer is, first and foremost, the public. And while I can honestly say that I’ve never been faced with the prospect of losing my home or property to a
construction project of any kind…I’ve listened intently throughout my career to many people who have, and I can assure you that their issues become very personal to me as well. I truly appreciate you discussing your concerns with me, remaining vigilant on this study on behalf of yourself and your neighbors, and even offering possible alternatives as opposed to just doing nothing.

Through my recent discussions with other folks up and down the Troy Road corridor, as well as with various staff members from the cities of Rowlett and Wylie…I’m becoming more and more convinced that Vinson Road is a worthy alternative for the needed major north-south thoroughfare east of State Highway (SH) 78 between Alanis Drive and the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT). Widening to 4 lanes divided there is consistent with the City of Wylie’s current thoroughfare plan, and it’s clear through looking at aerial photographs and/or driving along the corridor myself that there are far less potential right-of-way conflicts compared to Troy Road. Although we haven’t officially simulated the Vinson Road alternative within our travel demand model, I feel confident that it will attract similar future traffic volumes as the original Troy Road option and still be successful at relieving traffic congestion along SH 78 and other roadways. So, I think this is an instance where a win-win solution may not only be possible, but probable. We’re currently working with all of our stakeholders to make sure we can finalize this change, and hopefully we’ll release a new map shortly on our website reflecting the new recommendation.

Regarding the proposed new Lake Ray Hubbard bridge…actually, you’ll be interested to know that the City of Rowlett’s current master thoroughfare plan shows a dotted yellow line representing a new thoroughfare crossing the lake very close to the area you suggested in your map: http://gisweb.rowletttx.org/images/Maps/MTplan.pdf. This concept was originally generated back in 2001, but it’s never been given any real serious thought until our CCSRP study got underway last year. While I certainly acknowledge the need to limit property acquisition and potential environmental impacts as much as possible, my primary concern with the potential bridge at this alternate location has to do with network connectivity. In this area, the bridge would simply terminate at Vinson Road, and Vinson Road would be the only reasonable option travelers could use to connect to/from the rest of the thoroughfare network on the west side of the lake. This is the main reason why our proposed connection to an Alanis Drive extension was very attractive…even more so, of course, when we thought that Alanis Drive via Hensley Lane could help penetrate the area as far west as Renner Road. This was critical…because rather than only having a new bridge just connecting Rockwall and Wylie, we now had a continuous long-distance roadway providing numerous thoroughfare network connections beyond just the PGBT all the way to Richardson. And naturally, when the City of Murphy passed their Resolution in January opposing Renner Road extending from Murphy Road to McCreary Road through an existing subdivision…many people, including you I believe, felt then that the new bridge was pointless. However, connecting to Alanis Drive still gives us the ability to connect to Troy Road/Kreymer Lane (to the north), Vinson Road, Ballard Street, SH 78, Sanden Boulevard, Woodbridge Parkway, and McCreary Road…still many opportunities to redistribute traffic and also provide suitable relief to FM 544 and SH 78 over time. Additionally, the new bridge where we’ve identified it crosses over a narrower portion of the lake, and it appears that we can utilize areas east of the lake that are
outside of the 100-year flood zone. And though it’s true that the City of Rockwall has expressed desires to preserve land to the west of where John King Boulevard intersects SH 205, thus far neither the city nor the county has indicated that the crossing at that location would be incompatible with their plans.

I wish there was the ability to answer now some of the questions you’ve raised below regarding possible direct impacts of the new bridge with your property. Unfortunately, it likely won’t be until the formal environmental assessment process is conducted…if this project is able to advance to that stage…when those questions would most thoroughly be addressed. But, I can tell you that it’s absolutely essential for any potential direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts to be identified, analyzed, and appropriately mitigated if necessary as a result of that process. I can also tell you that the process should include evaluation of more than just one build alternative. Maybe there’s one alternative landing area for the bridge on the Troy Road side of the creek, maybe there’s another alternative on the Beaver Creek Road side…it’s even possible that the alternative you suggested (if it may satisfy the overall purpose and need and also be consistent with all other build alternatives in design concept and scope) could be investigated as well. However, there’s one final thing I can also tell you…every environmental assessment must always include an analysis and comparison of possible build alternatives to a no-build condition. The decision to do nothing must always be within the realm of possibility…and in several other studies I’ve been involved with throughout my career, the no-build condition ended up being the selected alternative. However, it seems clear well beyond just what our travel model simulations are telling us…tremendous growth is happening and is projected to continue unabated well into the future, and for the good of all citizens throughout the region it’s important for us to identify bold solutions to help address that growth efficiently. I know that statement probably gives little comfort to you at this point in time…but I have to think that since our collective goal is always to avoid or minimize impacts and reduce costs wherever possible…we will either find a solution to accomplish that goal in the most effective way, or we can’t find a solution and thus should not proceed. I just think we need to get to that study to help us figure that out definitively.

Please continue to contact me at any time if you have any other questions or comments regarding this study or any other transportation issues. I want to continue to work closely with you, your neighbors, and the City of Wylie to make sure we develop the best possible solution that may somehow incorporate all reasonable needs and all points of view. Again, I greatly appreciate your input and concern.

17. Shirley McCarroll

Why are you trying to push more traffic to an area that is less developed? Once you push it to Troy Rd where does the traffic go from there? To neighborhoods, to smaller 2 lane roads, to dead end streets that are 2 lane only? We don’t want it and the rational to it doesn’t make sense. Push the traffic to more developed roads! Leave our quite community alone!!!

18. Dixon Glaze

Leave FM 1827 exactly the way it is right now. It is already hard enough to get cows across. Peacocks get run over. We do not need 6 lanes. 2 lanes is quite enough. Keep your nasty truck
traffic out. Right now we have no trucks but lots of lovely bikes. We have no light pollution so we can see the stars at night. Go away and stay away. Take your road to the land fill.

19. Anna Watson

I oppose the John King/Alanis extension. You are basing the road on a road plan that Wylie has confirmed they will not be spending any money on. The money you are wanting to spend should be spent on improving roads. I know that there will be a road built and that main road should be 544 to Vinson.

20. Jaime Shahan

I am writing as a current citizen of Wylie, currently living at 222 Silver Creek Dr, Wylie, TX, 75098.

I would like to voice my hope for Troy road. I know that currently, the future plans for Troy Road include it becoming an arterial, which has been explained to me as a four to six lane road, possibly with a median.

I feel that since the initial plan for Wylie to use Troy road as an arterial, Wylie has grown in significant ways. I would like for Wylie to re-evaluate this plan with the current and future in mind. This arterial option would be much better served in the area of FM 544 and Vinson Road, where there would be less intervention into personal property. I have examined carefully the satellite view of the map in this area of FM 544 between 78 and Elm Road. Comparing the available area and current positioning of the proposed arterial in this region, I can’t help but notice that the proposed route goes through major residential neighborhoods, including Bozman Farms and Watermark. Also, the proposed route is quite a bit straighter than the existing roads, making it seem likely that in areas the road will go through existing homes and threaten personal property on homeowners' land. The route of FM 544 and Vinson Road, however, follows a more direct route, and some places are already separated into a 4 lane divided road. Additionally, there are larger areas which are not residential property and likely, using this route for the arterial would have less impact on individual property owners.

My husband Randy and I own Lot 5, Amber’s Cove Addition, on Troy Road, where we have plans to build our forever-home. This is the lot directly south of 2671 Troy Road. I do agree that Troy road is currently too narrow in the area in front of our property, not allowing comfortable passage of two full-size pickup trucks. It is admittedly long-overdue for county maintenance in the area in front of our property. However, I favor limiting the potential widening of the road beyond a full two lane road, or possibly, a three lane road if needed in certain places, to accommodate a turn lane. I don’t believe that Troy road is a good option for an arterial route, as it has been populated with new development and many beautiful homes, as well as families with young children who depend on the speed limit being 35 or below. Because of my young family, I would prefer living on an old, poorly kept, country road, than to live on a new, "beautiful," wide, 4 to 6 lane road, whatever the speed limit. I see Ballard / Sachse road, following the recent expansion, with the speed limit at 45, and people often breaking that speed limit going closer to 55 mph.

Please take our thoughts into consideration. I want to thank the Wylie City Council for its efforts against the Lake Corridor in this region, and further voice that I am appreciative that you are listening. We support the COG in its efforts to find reasonable long term solutions for traffic in
this area. We have hope that Troy road can continue as a relatively country road, providing a quiet place for us to raise our family. We favor the expansion of FM 544 and Vinson road as an alternative arterial route.

21. **Mr. and Mrs. Glover**

1) Troy Road should not be used an arterial corridor. It is a one and half lane road with many driveways and homes. The speed limit is 35mph. If they were to change the corridor to 544 and Vinson the right of way is already built in, there are less homes that would be affected, no new road will have to be carved through someone’s property, the speed limit is already 55mph. 2) COG is proposing a bridge connecting from John king in Rockwall to Alanis in Wylie. The bridge would come right through Wylie’s ETJ. It will also cause a lot of noise, light, and air pollution. Not to mention they want to put it in the flood plans. This will displace the water to somewhere else, would cost more because they will have to build it up, this will also bring traffic from Rockwall. Please write COG and tell them this is not what we want. We do not want the bridge and they need to come up with something else that includes using existing large roads but modifying them to allow them to handle more traffic. I am writing about the proposed Lake Ray Hubbard which will connect to the flood plains in east Wylie eventually snaking its way to Beaver Creek. It will bring too much traffic to Troy Rd and definitely does not benefit us. Thank you for your time. Thank you very much. Mr & Mrs Glover

22. **Heather Ward**

When my husband I were deciding 20 years ago to buy a house, we decided that we were not going to live near our jobs. We wanted to live in a bedroom community away from the city. We understood that there was going to be a commute. We did not buy in Wylie thinking that eventually they were going to be bringing the roads to us. We desire the quiet and peacefulness of our urban home. We are proud that we picked Wylie to be our community. We didn't pick other towns because they were to close to the highways and city lights. It is okay to just better our community within then to try and compete with the bigger demands of the city. No bridge over the Lakes. No 6 lane expansion down Troy road.

Adding more roads is not going to fix the problems that currently have. A much better place to start is by fixing many correctable issues that could allow better traffic patterns and much less anger on the roads . Here are 4 suggestions to try before forging ahead and destroying our beautiful bedroom community, property values, homes, neighborhoods, wild life and water front communities.

1. **Take a deeper look at traffic lights, timing and traffic patterns.** There is no reason EVER that there should be NO movement in an intersection during heavy traffic times. Yet I sit at lights with not one car moving for up to a minute during peak travel time. If I have to stop from the beginning of the red light just to get to the next light as it just turns red all the way down 544 and 78, you have a major traffic dysfunction. Traffic lights are intended to easy and move traffic, not be the major case of all traffic slowdowns. I have sat at a red lights for 3 minutes at 7:00am on Sunday mornings with not another car in site. None of these situations are acceptable for a functioning progressive city like Wylie. Keeping this currant problem and adding more roads, bridges and construction is not a fix, it’s a band aid on a knife wound.

2. **There are way too many roads that are 1/2 done.** Finish the expansion on the roads that has already began years ago. East west roads are the worst. Clean up what was started before
you start another project and leave the mess that was started to go unattended for even LONGER. I will send pictures if you are unaware of the unfinished projects.

3. **Remove the grass and trees from the center of the roadways.** We truly need miles of left turn lane much more then we need to maintain, plant, mow and trim grass and trees in the middle of our roads and highways. The impact of removing trees and grass will be a lesser impact on our environment then what is being considered over, around, by, near and through Lake Lavon and Lake Ray Hubbard.

4. **Make the left turn lanes head on not off set.** This causes a huge blind spot. The flashing yellow arrow is ridiculous. Allow the drivers that are turning left to BE ABLE TO SEE THE TRAFFIC THAT THEY ARE TURNING INTO. We also need to designate a right turn lane. By opening up the medians to left turns instead of agriculture, the left hand turn and the right hand turn lane problems will be greatly diminished.

If you are in need of an example of well executed traffic flow patterns, please look at Naperville Illinois. Ogden Ave (Route 34) is a fantastic example of east/west movement with a center turn lane and great flow. If you are looking to see 6 lanes of well-planned traffic patterns then look at Naperville/Aurora Illinois on Highway 59. I spend quite a bit of time in this area. The traffic flows so well that when I get back to Wylie it is disturbingly obvious that we have a MAJOR traffic flow problem. Not because of lack of roads, but because of poor planning and underestimating Wylie’s infrastructure.

We need to address these issues first. Then look into expansion.

23. **Tracey Short**

To whom it may concern,

We live in the subdivision of Watermark. It is located on Troy Road, north of County Line Road. We are very troubled by the recommendations to increase Troy Rd to a 4-6 lane thoroughfare. We moved to this area specifically to be on a beautiful, quite lake. We knew our commute would be longer because of our decision to move out of the city of Plano. We accepted this wholeheartedly! The thought of turning Troy Rd into a major thoroughfare breaks my heart. We have finally found our forever home and don’t want this expansion to happen. There are other viable options that could be considered. FM544 and Vinson road are two I can think of right off the top of my head.

We also would like the bridge connecting Alanis to John King in Rockwall taken off the plan as well. One of the proposed plans puts that bridge practically in the middle of our house. The other site is too close for our comfort.

This proposed bridge and expansion of Troy Road will not do anything for the city of Wylie. It will only increase noise and traffic in our community. I won’t even begin to mention the hardship of all who could potentially lose the way of life they know.

**Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG**

Mr. and Mrs. Short,

Good afternoon. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and your comment will be included for
viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

As I’m sure you’re aware, your concerns are shared among many other Wylie residents who’ve spoken or written to me over the last several months. Even with removal of the proposed Renner Road extension segment per the January 2018 City of Murphy Resolution, our year 2040 travel demand model simulations still confirm that the proposed new bridge across Lake Ray Hubbard is a key element to alleviating future traffic congestion along State Highway (SH) 78 between the lakes, and an important strategy to help redistribute traffic among various thoroughfares that travel through the City of Wylie. The proposed Hensley/Alanis/John King Connector would still have essential connections to McCreary Road, Woodbridge Parkway, Sanden Boulevard, Ballard Street, and Vinson Road (all having or planned to have at least 4 lanes of roadway capacity)…and each of these north-south facilities can/will provide alternate paths to/from other east-west facilities above and beyond just Farm-to-Market Road (FM) 544 and SH 78. We believe, given the level of traffic predicted for this area, the network as a whole still benefits when we can close any possible gap between major thoroughfares and work as quickly as possible to implement each city’s ultimate thoroughfare plan vision.

Our travel demand model simulations also demonstrate that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across Lake Ray Hubbard. At the same time…I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road, and we’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Other residents along or near Troy Road have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts.

On a final note…I want to be sure you’re aware that any CCSRP-proposed roadways (or any major transportation projects regardless of mode) that may be implemented using state and/or Federal funds are required to go through an intensive and interactive environmental assessment process before construction or right-of-way acquisition can be approved…particularly any project that may cross an important asset like Lake Ray Hubbard. The implementing agency (TxDOT, Collin County, etc…) must either demonstrate that no significant impacts are anticipated by the proposed project, or ensure that any identified potential impacts can be appropriately mitigated or avoided. Additionally, the various socio-economic and environmental effects of proposed build alternatives must always be compared to a no-build condition…and a potential decision to build nothing in light of public opinion and/or combination of other factors must always be considered.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following
webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

24. James and Joann Wilson

Please do not put another bridge over Ray Hubbard. We do not want a connection from John King to McCreary Road. This would cause Wylie to be just a bypass. Please be very careful which roads you decide to increase in size. Wylie is quiet—this is the way we like it. While we do know there are roads that need to be enlarged, please do not put large thoroughfares in that destroy the quiet neighborhoods we enjoy. Thank you.

25. Marsha Hamilton

Wylie Tx is NOT IN FAVOR OF the north-south Lake Lavon freeway system that would divide the lake and east Wylie! Nor are we in favor of splitting Wylie with another east-west corridor connecting Wylie and Rockwall across Lake Hubbard. Expand 78 and 205/John King (the roads already there), if you will. It is NOT ACCEPTABLE to take homes and properties by eminent domain!

Thank you for listening!

Response by Jeff Neal, NCTCOG

Ms. Lux,

Good afternoon. Your comment below in regards to the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan (CCSRP) has been received, and we continue to appreciate your interest and concern pertaining to this study. Your comment will be included for viewing and consideration by the members of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) as part of the Public Comments Report in the next RTC meeting agenda.

As I’m sure you’re aware, your concerns are shared among many other Wylie residents who’ve spoken or written to me since the November 2017 City Council Special Session. Even with removal of the proposed Renner Road extension segment per the January 2018 City of Murphy Resolution, our year 2040 travel demand model simulations still confirm that the proposed new bridge across Lake Ray Hubbard is a key element to alleviating future traffic congestion along State Highway (SH) 78 between the lakes, and an important strategy to help redistribute traffic among various thoroughfares that travel through the City of Wylie. The proposed Hensley/Alanis/John King Connector would still have essential connections to McCreary Road, Woodbridge Parkway, Sanden Boulevard, Ballard Street, and Vinson Road (all having or planned to have at least 4 lanes of roadway capacity)…and each of these north-south facilities can/will provide alternate paths to/from other east-west facilities above and beyond just Farm-to-Market Road (FM) 544 and SH 78. We believe, given the level of traffic predicted for this area, the network as a whole still benefits when we can close any possible gap between major thoroughfares and work as quickly as possible to implement each city’s ultimate thoroughfare plan vision.

Our travel demand model simulations also demonstrate that it’s critical for there to be a major north-south arterial facility east of SH 78 that can provide an alternate direct route between the President George Bush Turnpike (PGBT) and areas near and/or across
Lake Ray Hubbard. At the same time…I want to let you know we’re aware that Vinson Road (which is already identified in Wylie’s master thoroughfare plan as a 4-lane divided roadway south of Alanis Drive) may provide an alternative opportunity for that thoroughfare as opposed to Troy Road, and we’re currently studying whether or not we should suggest that shift as part of our next CCSRP Recommendations Map update. Other residents along or near Troy Road have also suggested Vinson Road as a possible option, and it certainly would be prudent to determine whether or not it could provide similar mobility and/or congestion relief benefits rather than a corridor that would assuredly have greater right-of-way and quality of life conflicts.

For further information about this study, including presentation materials and notification of upcoming meetings, please be sure to visit the following webpage: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/thoroughfare/CCSRP.asp. If you have any other comments or questions, please know that you may contact me at any time.

**Innovative Vehicles & Technology**

**Twitter**

1. Thanks, @JamesBMcGuire! It was a great day for #ElectricVehicles and #AirQuality in the DFW metroplex. Check out our report at http://texpirgedfund.org . Many thanks to @LeeforDallas and Gary Thomas from @dartmedia along with Chris Klause from @NCTCOGtrans and @AECOM for joining. – Bay Scoggin (@Bay_Scoggin)

2. Awesome conversation on #ElectricVehicles @CityOfDallas this morning with key thought leaders in transportation including @dartmedia, @NCTCOGtrans and @LeeforDallas along with @AECOM’s @suzannemurtha #Buildingabetterworld – Katie Venhaus (@Katie_Venhaus)
Mobility 2045 Comments

Email

1. Michael Veale

I would like to better understand the work plan and anticipate work products for the Mobility 2045 effort which I understand is coming to completion mid-year.

1. The Mobility 2040 reports I found on your website are quite voluminous; therefore providing a lot of traceability back to the context that informed the plan’s specifics, proposed investments, etc. I could not find dates on the documents so not sure when completed but noted that a 24 year planning horizon to 2040. So I assume it was completed in/near 2016.

2. Mobility 2045 is underway, however, I could find a similar level of detail (to the 2040 plan) on the Mobility 2045 page, yet the effort is projected to complete sometime mid-year. Is the Mobility 2045 an interim plan (which level required content)? I would like to better understand the purpose, objectives and use of the 2045 effort. With there be further phases of Mobility 2045 planning subsequent to this current effort?

3. Part of the reason I am somewhat confused is that the SF Bay Area recently completed their Plan Bay Area 2040 plan last July – yet you are working on a 2045?

A phone conversation on the above is preferable. Please advise who/who I contact relevant parties.

Response by Carli Baylor, NCTCOG

Mr. Veale,

Thank you for contacting the NCTCOG Transportation Department. Answers to your questions are enclosed below.

Additionally, please feel free to reach out to Kevin Feldt, our program manager for the Mobility 2045 Plan. He can be reached at 817-704-2529.

I would like to better understand the work plan and anticipate work products for the Mobility 2045 effort which I understand is coming to completion mid-year. Mobility 2045 is scheduled to have action taken by the Regional Transportation Council on June 14.

1. The Mobility 2040 reports I found on your website are quite voluminous; therefore providing a lot of traceability back to the context that informed the plan’s specifics, proposed investments, etc. I could not find dates on the documents so not sure when completed but noted that a 24 year planning horizon to 2040. So I assume it was completed in/near 2016. Yes, Mobility 2040 was adopted by the Regional Transportation Council in March 2016.

2. Mobility 2045 is underway, however, I could find a similar level of detail (to the 2040 plan) on the Mobility 2045 page, yet the effort is projected to complete sometime mid-year. Is the Mobility 2045 an interim plan (which level required content)? I would
like to better understand the purpose, objectives and use of the 2045 effort. With their be further phases of Mobility 2045 planning subsequent to this current effort? NCTCOG staff is currently finalizing a Mobility 2045 draft. The document will be posted to our website on or before April 9. The final document will be available after the Regional Transportation Council takes action on June 14. Public meetings to solicit input regarding the draft Mobility 2045 document will be on April 9, 10 and 11 and in May on the 15, 17 and 22.

3. Part of the reason I am somewhat confused is that the SF Bay Area recently completed their Plan Bay Area 2040 plan last July – yet you are working on a 2045? Yes, due to federal transportation planning and air quality conformity rules, we are planning to the horizon year 2045.

Twitter
1. #Dallas #FortWorth @NCTCOGtrans is required to maintain a long-term transportation plan that defines a vision for the region’s multimodal Transportation system and guides expenditures of state and federal transportation funds during the next 20 plus years http://www.nctcog.org/trans/mtp/2040/ – Marko Sakal (@markosakal)

Programs

Twitter
1. @NCTCOGtrans offers no-strings financial aid for car repairs, new purchases http://via.cw33.com/Go5Qb – CW3 TV (@CW33)

2. FREE MONEY! Now that I have your attention, if you live in DFW region & own a car/truck you can get up to $600 for emissions repair and up to $3500 to buy a newer vehicle if yours is
Email

1. Mike Harris

The toll lanes added to northeast loop 820 in Fort Worth are the most inefficient use of right of way I have ever seen. Fully 30% is dedicated to servicing the toll lanes by duplicating the entrance and exit ramps and providing drainage. Moreover, the costs associated with this duplication would undoubtedly be similar to that of increasing the roadway’s capacity by 50%. An aerial view of the intersection of this roadway with that of I-35W and its toll lanes looks like someone dropped a plate of spaghetti. Please look into hiring a civil engineer before designing another roadway. This is not something that is amenable to the do it yourself approach. Thank you.

2. Kenneth Koonsman

I’m against this pro corridor program completely many problems with idea, first and most important, why should my tax paying dollars go for something I can’t afford nor can this County if doubling my tax’s last year is supporting this program and all the schools how are we gonna afford to live here,I feel like the County is pushing the lower income folks out, how is that fair after we busted our chops to buy a piece of ground?

3. John Donaghey
A lot more thought needs to be given to how the quality of the lives of those being displaced and affected directly everyday vs providing temporary convenience and access for people not being directly affected by freeways, new ROW, noise, pollution, etc. At some point, "progress" becomes "recess." More is not necessarily more desirable. There is something to the old quote, "Less is More." Maybe, propose large lot (1+ acre) developments vs building out maximum density. Lucas is an example.

Any available metrics on the above? It is a proven fact that more access (concrete on the ground) creates more congestion. One couple from Virginia, at the Wylie work shop, testified that while they lived in VA and worked in DC, they watched the greater access add many more cars traveling into DC and increase their travel time dramatically. This is why they moved to Texas.

4. Tony Powell

Is there any funding for electric streetcar upgrades or line improvements?

5. Chuck Erwin

More money needs to go for roads, and less for transit. Fund each mode in exact proportion to it's tripshare. Start to construct the outer loop around the entire metroplex. Don't need new rail lines. Alternate roads, not modes.

If you have proposals for new freeways, how do you submit them?

Response by Carli Baylor, NCTCOG

Mr. Erwin,

Thank you for contacting the NCTCOG Transportation Department.

The best method to submit a proposed transportation project is through our website comment section, during our public meetings or during our official public comment period.
To submit an online comment, please visit www.nctcog.org/input or email transinfo@nctcog.org.

Additionally, my contact information is enclosed below, and I can forward your input to the appropriate staff member.

**Twitter**

1. #ShowMeTheMoney @SenatorBobHall @DonHuffines @DanPatrick #WhoRepresentsMe @LBJ_Now @TML_Texas @DouglasAthas @GovAbbott https://www.whoownstexas.com/ – Lee M. Kleinman (@LeeforDallas)

You support a Tollroad that’s not even in your district. How much are you getting? – Adam Vanek (@adamvaneklaw)

Zero $.💰 Take a look: campfin.dallascityhall.com/search.aspx But as Chair of the @CityOfDallas Mobility and Infrastructure Committee, Chair of Dallas Regional Mobility Coalition and a member of @NCTCOGtrans RTC I have an obligation to deliver projects. What are your credentials? – Lee M. Kleinman (@LeeforDallas)

2. I am proud to work with various Chambers of Commerce, businesses, city leaders of Dallas, Garland, & Mesquite, residents, @NCTCOGtrans, & TXDot to help move #635East project forward. 🚗🚗 #Mesquite #HD107 #blege #Infrastructure #Transportation #EconomicDevelopment @LBJ_Now https://twitter.com/mesquitetxnews/status/968078294443806720 …– Victoria Neave (@Victoria4Texas)
Mesquite News @MesquiteTxNews
City Council approves resolution in support of LBJ East Project
starlocalmedia.com/mesquitenews/c...

We are thankful for your leadership! – LBJNow (@LBJ_Now)

Ride Share

Twitter
1. @Danwhite7912Dan @uber @lyft @RideshareGeek @T4America @MomLyft @UltraLyft @UberManYouTube @UberLyftChat @txbornviking @UrbanFortWorth @Wylie_H_Dallas @NCTCOGtrans – Shawn Eric Gray (@ShawnEricGray)

Texas A&M Transportation Institute @TII
TII is conducting a survey investigating how individuals that are blind or visually impaired perceive the safety of ride sharing companies relative to other travel modes. Go to this link for the survey: goo.gl/JSBbtE.

Transit Comments

Email
1. Tamara Haywarf

I love using the train and bus systems in large cities when I travel. I wish riding the bus or train daily was a viable option for me in Fort Worth

2. Ann Zadeh

I support passenger rail specifically and a multimodal transit system overall. We cannot rely on single passenger vehicles and widening roads.

3. Thomas Simmons

WE NEED A TRAIN THAT GOES BETWEEN DALLAS AND FORT WORTH THAT REACHES A SPEED OF LEAST 200 MPH. MUST BEAT A AUTO DOWN I 30. THAT WILL MAKE THE FEEBLE TRANSSIT SYSTEMS (DART & FART) WORK. A TRAIN BETWEEN DALLAS & SAY HOUSTON WILL NOT BEAT AN AIRPLANE.

4. Phil Waigand
When Tex Rail (direct rail from FW to DFW) is completed. It should be a "Major Celebration" of how Air & Rail have come together. Nowhere, but here to do have two rail systems paralleling with DFW Airport. Also, the combination of DFW Airport and DFW Rail are two of the most collaborative entities between the two anchor cities.

5. Wayne Owen

What is the TexRail project plan for getting passengers to and from the Stockyards Historic District? Thanks.

Response by Sarah Chadderdon, NCTCOG

Mr. Owen,

Thank you for contacting the NCTCOG Transportation Department.

The best source of information for details about local connections from TEXRail stations is Trinity Metro (the Fort Worth Transportation Authority).

Please visit http://www.texrail.com/contact/ for contact information.

6. Daniel Triche

The suburbs of Frisco and Prosper and McKinney are growing at a massive rate and buckling under population pressure. Is there any chance that they will be connected to the Dart line?

Response by Sarah Chadderdon, NCTCOG

Mr. Triche,

Thank you for contacting the NCTCOG Transportation Department.

Long-range plans, including proposed projects in Mobility 2045, include 2 rail lines (the Frisco Line and the McKinney Line) that would connect suburbs of Collin County to the DART light rail system.
Other Comments

Email

1. A Freeman

I think driving should be a “right” and not a privilege.

Why do I have to have a drivers' license to travel on a road to the grocery store to get food?

Do I need a license to buy food?

Twitter

1. @CityOfFriscoTx Staff from Traffic Engineering, IT, @FriscoPD & @FriscoFFD presenting today at @NCTCOGtrans on #ClosestToDispatch - #ImprovingIncidentResponse – David Shilson (@FPDShilson)
2. Pursuing PhD in Urban Planning & Public Policy @UTAcappa @utarlington w/ .@C__TEDD supports for the top notch applicants .@txplanning .@NCTCOGtrans .@The_ACSP – IUStudies (@lofUrbanStudies)

3. Hello @DanielAndrewsMP and @MatthewGuyMP this is exactly what will happen in @melbourne. It’s called induced demand. – Dr Gavin Doolan (@anaestricks)
I'd like to cc @TxDOT & @NCTCOGtrans on this too.

Texans don't need more lanes, we need more #TransitAlternatives! – Loren S. (@txbornviking)

4. @theButcher_st @WalkableDFW @RideDCTA @NCTCOGtrans – Shawn Eric Gray (@ShawnEricGray)

Kevin Roden ✔️ @KevinRoden
While cities across the nation are moving to do away with parking minimums in order to encourage less car-centric policies, Denton is moving in the exact opposite direction. This is bad for Denton. (THREAD) dentonrc.com/news/news/2018...
Show this thread
TO: Bill Hale, P.E., Chief Engineer  
Texas Department of Transportation  
Brian Barth, P.E., Transportation Program Officer  
Texas Department of Transportation

FROM: Michael Morris, P.E.  
Director of Transportation

DATE: March 29, 2018

SUBJECT: Auto Occupancy Detection and Verification Technology

As you know, the Regional Transportation Council Toll Managed Lane Policy includes a provision to explore a technology solution for the verification of auto occupancy rather than relying on manual enforcement. The North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG), acting in response to a request received from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) in February 2016 (see attached), issued a Request for Proposals in April 2016 seeking qualified firms to implement an automated occupancy verification technology solution for managed lanes in the Dallas-Fort Worth region that would also be expandable statewide. As a result of the procurement, NCTCOG contracted with a vendor, CARMA Technology Corporation, to perform a pilot test on the DFW Connector corridor for the proposed automated occupancy verification technology solution.

Currently, high occupancy vehicle (HOV) drivers wishing to receive the discount must register their trip as an HOV trip in advance of taking that trip. Enforcement is achieved through a manual process where an officer verifies that a declared HOV has at least two occupants. This is a dangerous situation for the police officers, as well as a disruption to traffic flow when potential violators are pulled over on the side of the road. Working with our regional managed lane partners, TxDOT, NTTA, and CINTRA, we have been working with CARMA to implement the chosen system. The pilot test was completed in December 2017 and the results of the pilot have been presented to the partner agencies. Based on the results of the pilot, the region is ready to move forward with additional tasks and integration activities associated with this technology. The vision is to implement a technology solution on all tolled managed lanes within the region, with provisions that it could also be employed statewide through TxDOT.

NCTCOG would like to meet with TxDOT to confirm TxDOT's continued support and partnership in this initiative. During the meeting, NCTCOG would like to discuss the results of the pilot, current status of the implementation, and potential statewide deployment. NCTCOG staff has identified the following individuals from TxDOT to include in this meeting. Please confirm that these are appropriate individuals to invite to an in-person meeting in Austin for this discussion.

Director of Toll Operations, Richard Nelson  
Director of Strategy and Innovation, Darran Anderson  
Director of Project Finance, Debt and Strategic Contract, Benjamin Asher  
TxDOT – Dallas District Engineer, Kelly Selman  
TxDOT – Fort Worth District Engineer, Loyl Bussell
These individuals should be invited, along with possible inclusion of Executive Director Bass. The two of you would be valuable as well.

As always, we look forward to our continued partnership with TxDOT on this initiative. Do not hesitate to contact me at (817) 695-9241 or MMorris@nctcog.org should you have questions or wish to discuss further.

Michael Morris, P.E.

NB:Ik
cc: Kelly Selman, P.E., District Engineer, TxDOT Dallas District
    Loyl Bussell, P.E. Acting District Engineer, TxDOT Fort Worth

Attachment
February 18, 2016

Mr. Michael Morris, P.E., Director of Transportation  
North Central Texas Council of Governments  
616 Six Flags Drive P.O. Box 5888  
Arlington, TX 76005-5888  

RE: Search for Automated Occupancy Detection Solution  

Dear Mr. Morris:

The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) has worked closely for a number of years with the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) on finding a solution that will bring automated occupancy detection to managed lanes in the DFW area and around the state. These efforts included the NCTCOG-led Request for Information (RFI) efforts on Vehicle Occupancy Verification Technology in May 2012 and May 2013.

In 2015, TxDOT Toll Operations worked closely with the NCTCOG and TxDOT Dallas District in the development of a Request for Offer (RFO) solicitation trying to find a solution in the market. This RFO heavily leveraged the previous RFI work. In this TxDOT-led effort, there were a number of respondents, but none were able to meet the requirements. It was agreed that the technology for the solution appears to be on the cusp of meeting the needed requirements. With that in mind, TxDOT would like to request that the NCTCOG take the lead on the next effort to find a solution in the marketplace that meets the needs of Texas with respect to automated occupancy detection on managed lane projects. Attached is the Advanced Vehicle Occupation Detection (AVOD) Solicitation RFO Document that was posted on the Electronic State Business Daily. We believe this mutually created document is a good starting point.

Our team is ready to work with yours in the search for this solution. Attached is the RFO Statement of Work. If further discussion is required, I can be reached at 512-874-9704.

Regards,

Rick

Richard Nelson  
Director, Toll Operations Division  
Texas Department of Transportation  

Enclosure  

cc: Linda Sexton, TOD  
    Brian Smallwood, TOD  
    Marcy Saenz, TOD
March 19, 2018

Michael Morris, Director of Transportation
North Central Texas Council of Governments
P. O. Box 5888
Arlington, TX 76005-5888

Re: Transit-Oriented Development in Fort Worth

Dear Mr. Morris:

Fort Worth Housing Solutions and the Fort Worth Transportation Authority are partnering to construct a Transit-Oriented Development (Development) in the southern edge of downtown Fort Worth. The site is located at the terminus of the TRE rail line and the soon to be TexRail rail line to DFW Airport. Several Trinity Metro bus routes also near of this location.

The Development will be designed and constructed to address the need for workforce housing and parking facilities for current and future commuters that utilize the different public transportation lines that are near the Development site.

The Development will include approximately 236 mixed income residential units. The residential building will be 10 -12 floors. The first floor includes space for retail operations. Also included n the Development will be a six-level parking facility with 598 parking spaces and a surface parking area that will have approximately 290 additional parking spaces.

The projected total cost of the Development is $69,232,294.00. The parking facility is estimated to cost $11,362,000.00 and the surface parking area with a pedestrian bridge over South Main Street is estimated to cost $4,000,000.00.

The development team has identified funding sources for the construction of the residential building and the surface parking. The funding gap that exists today is the cost of the parking facility. Fort Worth Housing Solutions requests consideration from the North Central Texas Council of Government to fund the construction of the parking facility ($11,362,000).

In addition to the mixed use and parking facilities, the development team is considering the construction of a small hotel on the western part of the land. The team has yet to estimate to cost of the construction of the hotel, but the cost of the hotel is expected to be self-funded.

Should you have any questions, we will be happy to provide addition information. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mary-Margaret Lemons,
President
March 19, 2018

The Honorable Eddie Bernice Johnson  
United States House of Representatives  
2468 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Johnson:

On behalf of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC), which serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Dallas-Fort Worth (DFW) area, thank you for your service and leadership on transportation and air quality issues in the United States Congress.

The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit recently decided case No. 15-1115 South Coast Air Quality Management District v. Environmental Protection Agency, et al., vacating portions of the 2008 Ozone Implementation Rule (80 FR 12264), revoking the 1997 ozone standard and associated requirements. The RTC respectfully requests you work with the EPA to investigate the potential implications of the decision and its impact on the region’s ability to keep multi-modal transportation projects moving forward. The RTC takes environmental compliance seriously to ensure a safe and reliable transportation system. Depending on findings, the RTC stands ready to assist in ensuring our efforts are not jeopardized.

The DFW region is in the process of developing Mobility 2045: The Metropolitan Transportation Plan for North Central Texas (Mobility 2045), including $135.4 billion in transportation system advancements. Since the DFW region is designated nonattainment for ozone, a conformity determination must be granted before Mobility 2045 can be adopted, allowing its transportation projects to move forward. Mobility 2045 is scheduled to be adopted by the RTC in June 2018, with a US Department of Transportation air quality conformity determination to follow by November 2018. It is our understanding, other portions of the State and country are also developing transportation plans requiring conformity determinations and may also be impacted.

Your attention to this request is important due to the pending effective date pivoting off of the court’s entry of judgement, February 16, 2018. If needed, feel free to contact Michael Morris, P.E., Director of Transportation for the North Central Texas Council of Governments at (817) 695-9241 or mmorris@nctcog.org.

Sincerely,

Rob Franke, P.E., Chair  
Regional Transportation Council  
Mayor, City of Cedar Hill

JPL:ch

cc: Michael Morris, P.E., Director of Transportation, NCTCOG
Mr. Rob Franke, P.E.
Chair
Regional Transportation Council
P.O. Box 5888
Arlington, TX 76005

Dear Mr. Franke:

Thank you for your letter supporting funding for the Fort Worth Transportation Authority’s Trinity Railway Express Trinity River Bridge Replacement and Double Tracking project under the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Discretionary Grant Program funded by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017.

Over the last eight years, under the TIGER program, the Department has awarded more than $5.1 billion to support road, rail, transit, port, and multimodal projects. The Department issued a Notice of Funding Opportunity in the Federal Register on September 7, 2017, announcing the funding opportunity for a ninth round of TIGER discretionary grants, project selection criteria, and application requirements. The deadline for submitting final applications was 8:00 pm EST on October 16, 2017. Please be assured that all properly submitted applications will receive full and careful consideration.

Your knowledge of the transportation needs in your area is valuable and your interest in the TIGER program is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Finch Fulton
Deputy Assistant Secretary
March 8, 2018

The Honorable J. Bruce Bugg, Jr.
Chairman
Texas Transportation Commission
125 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

Dear Chairman Bugg:

Thank you for your letter of March 6, 2018. As you know, we are working on multiple options to close the funding gap on IH 635 East as you requested and to ensure transparency in the path moving forward. This project is the highest priority in the eastern subregion and is receiving significant commitment in time from both Regional Transportation Council (RTC) members and staff.

TxDOT does not need RTC action to begin procurement on a design-build contractor but we appreciate that you are partnering so closely with us. At your request at the Commission Meeting in January, 2018, you requested assistance in closing the financial gap in order for all parties to have a clear, transparent vision on how this project was going to be delivered. Since your request also includes a non-tolled express lane which is contrary to previous RTC actions and policy positions, the RTC needs to ensure there are no unintended consequences. The questions you have been sent outline the process we are going through to eliminate unintended consequences. Our staff is completing that risk assessment regarding funding to already committed projects, as well as any risks related to project delay, inflation costs or legal challenges. The work of the design-build contractor is identical regardless on how the express lanes are operated.

RTC action is not scheduled for the March 8, 2018 meeting for several reasons. First, I have had a long scheduled time conflict with this meeting date and since you talked to me personally there is no other person to interpret your request. Second, the National League of Cities meeting is going on in Washington, DC and several of our RTC members have presentations, committee chair assignments and other responsibilities that require them to not be in RTC attendance. This includes critical elected officials that represent the corridor in question. Third, the RTC action would have been transmitted previous to Tuesday’s voting and we have a long history of not taking action that may have a direct impact on the election of local, State or federal elected officials. And last, several RTC members are engaged in conversations with State elected officials requesting restraint until more deliberation on their part can occur.
Staff has requested answers to a series of questions to develop the best path forward. If we have the benefit of those answers we will take those under consideration. I will seek RTC consensus on IH 635 East as soon as possible. Thank you for your commitment to this corridor and your desire for timely action.

Sincerely,

Rob Franke, P.E., Chair,
Regional Transportation Council
Mayor, City of Cedar Hill

cc: The Honorable Greg Abbott, Governor, State of Texas
    The Honorable Dan Patrick, Lieutenant Governor, State of Texas
    The Honorable Joe Strauss, Speaker, Texas House of Representatives
    The Regional Transportation Council
    Texas Transportation Commission Members
    Mr. James Bass, Executive Director, TxDOT
    Mr. Michael Morris, P.E., Director of Transportation, NCTCOG
Mr. Kevin Wright  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
Federal Railroad Administration  
1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, MS-20  
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Mr. Wright:

Congratulations on achieving this milestone in the development of high-speed passenger rail in Texas. The North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) supports implementing a high-speed passenger rail service between Dallas and Houston. Connectivity to other planned high-speed passenger rail services and other transit modes within the Dallas-Fort Worth region will be important to the success of a high-speed rail system. As such, NCTCOG supports the design of a station in Dallas that is flexible regarding the connection to the planned high-speed rail service from Fort Worth to Dallas and Dallas Area Rapid Transit light rail.

NCTCOG staff has reviewed the Dallas to Houston High-Speed Rail Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) dated December 2017 and offer the enclosed comments. The proposed Dallas to Houston High-Speed Rail line is consistent with Mobility 2040: The Metropolitan Transportation Plan for North Central Texas.

I strongly encourage continued development of high-speed passenger rail service in Texas. NCTCOG staff will continue to provide any information or services necessary to support this effort in the Dallas-Fort Worth region.

Sincerely,

Michael Morris, P.E.  
Director of Transportation

SW:cg  
Enclosure

cc: Kevin Feldt, Program Manager, NCTCOG  
Sandy Wesch, P.E., AICP, Project Engineer, NCTCOG
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Dallas to Houston DEIS and supporting drawings in Appendices A thru F describe the project from Dallas to Houston. The engineering drawings are inconsistent with this description and show the project from Houston to Dallas. This compounds the complexity of the project and the review of the document.</td>
<td>Page xxvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In the list of acronyms, DFW is listed as meaning Dallas Fort Worth Airport. However, within the document DFW is used as meaning Dallas-Fort Worth (see page 1-2).</td>
<td>Executive Summary, Page ES-4, last paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Suggest including a table in the executive summary (such as Table 2-13) to more clearly identify the eight segments included in each build alternative.</td>
<td>Executive Summary, Page ES-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Suggest adding a reference to the website with the alignment alternatives report.</td>
<td>Executive Summary, Page ES-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Please clarify the source of the SO₂ increase. The document states that the trains will cause a reduction.</td>
<td>Executive Summary, Page ES-9, 4th paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The no build is only mentioned in this one statement in addressing MSATs. Because this is not discussed in the previous paragraphs, suggest remove for consistency.</td>
<td>Executive Summary, Page ES-10, 1st paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Suggest deleting the statement that terminal impacts will not impact species habitat because of their urban environments. The Least Interior Tern is known to nest in urban environments in Dallas-Fort Worth as well as other species. Being urban does not preclude impacts to species habitat.</td>
<td>Executive Summary, Page ES-13, 2nd paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is not clear what the difference is between &quot;Structure Displacements (within LOD)&quot; and &quot;Estimated Total Structure Acquisitions *&quot;. Also, what does the asterisk after &quot;Estimated Total Structure Acquisitions&quot; denote?</td>
<td>Executive Summary, Page ES-21, Table 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What do the asterisks behind &quot;Economic Impacts&quot; and &quot;Children's Health and Safety&quot; denote?</td>
<td>Executive Summary, Page ES-23, Table 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Explaining the types of eligibility of a historic resource seems too detailed for an executive summary. Suggest just discussing the results.</td>
<td>Executive Summary, Page ES-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Suggest revising the text. The Preferred Alternative (one alternative) is discussed along with the three Build Alternatives without the preferred being identified. If all three build alternatives would result in the same impacts, suggest referring to them as such (build alternatives) or identify the Preferred Alternative first in the section instead of at the end.</td>
<td>Executive Summary, Section ES.10, Pages ES-30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The Texas Triangle is identified as Dallas-Houston-Austin in Figure 1-1 and page 1-7. However, on page 1-11, the Texas Triangle is identified as Dallas-Houston-San Antonio. Please clarify.</td>
<td>Section 1.2.2.3, Pages 1-7 and 1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. NOₓ is not a criteria pollutant; it is a precursor to ozone. NO₂ is the specific criteria pollutant listed in the Clean Air Act (CAA). Please revise.</td>
<td>Section 3.2.1, Page 3.2-1, 2nd paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Suggest adding a table explaining which counties are nonattainment for ozone and which areas of a county are nonattainment for SO₂.</td>
<td>Section 3.2.1, Page 3.2-1, 3rd paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Update the penultimate sentence; October 1, 2017 has passed and nonattainment designations were not made.</td>
<td>Section 3.2.1, Page 3.2-1, 3rd paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The CAA did identify 188 HAPS, but the current list is 187. Suggest clarifying this in the text.</td>
<td>Section 3.2.2, Page 3.2-4, 1st paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The first version of MOVES2014a was released on November 4, 2015. With this release, the EPA requires NONROAD modeling to be done with MOVES2014a non-road component. Previous to this release, the NONROAD2008 model could be used to calculate non-road emissions. It is unclear when the emissions were calculated; however, the terminology should be consistent with the EPA model requirements. <a href="https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi?Dockey=P100NNR0.txt">https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi?Dockey=P100NNR0.txt</a> (see pg. 2, 3rd question.)</td>
<td>Section 3.2.3.1.2, Page 3.2-5, 1st paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Second sentence is difficult to understand. Suggest rephrasing as &quot;As shown, the only air quality study area counties which are nonattainment for the 2008 8-hour O₃ standard are the counties associated with the terminating ends of the Build Alternatives.&quot;</td>
<td>Section 3.2.4.1, Page 3.2-17, 3rd paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Considering moving this table to the beginning of Section 3.2.</td>
<td>Section 3.2.4.1, Page 3.2-18, Table 3.2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Suggest listing the dates of the ozone season, which are January 1 - December 31 for Houston and March 1 - November 30 for Dallas-Fort Worth.</td>
<td>Section 3.2.4.2, Page 3.2-19, 1st paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The document indicates that buses serving the stations will be fueled by a mixture of diesel and natural gas. However, DART will be piloting use of electric buses in 2018. Suggest rephrasing to acknowledge the possibility of other fuel types in the future.</td>
<td>Section 3.2.5.2.5, Page 3.2-29, 2nd paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Recommend expanding Mitigation Measure #AQ-MM#5 to include a requirement that TCP and its construction contractor utilize equipment that complies with EPA Tier 4 final emissions standards when possible. A similar commitment to use the latest available construction equipment is mentioned in the first paragraph of page 3.2-29 with reference to minimizing MSAT emissions. NCTCOG recommends that TCP include contract language that requires use of such equipment. Sample contract language is available from NCTCOG at <a href="http://www.nctcog.org/construction">www.nctcog.org/construction</a>, which also addresses requirements to minimize idling (AQ-MM#5) and utilize TxECD-compliant fuel (AQ-MC#1).</td>
<td>Section 3.2.6.2, Page 3.2-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Suggest removing table notes for Category 5 and 5b because neither of these are used in the main table.</td>
<td>Section 3.3.4.1.6, Page 3.3-12, Table 3.3-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Discussions of most of the major and minor aquifers include a description of the current health status (declining, etc.). However, no description is provided for the Trinity, Woodbine, Nacaloch, and Yeugia Jackson. Add for consistency.</td>
<td>Section 3.3.4.2.1, Pages 3.3-14-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. For clarity, suggest converting the table notes to text/bullets.</td>
<td>Section 3.5.3.1, Page 3.5-5, Table 3.5-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The Least Interior Tern have been known to nest on flat gravel rooftops in industrial areas in Dallas County. Because the proposed Dallas Station location is in an industrial area near the Trinity River, this species needs to be discussed (and investigated if it has not).</td>
<td>Section 3.6.4.4.2, Page 3.6-45, 1st paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Suggest the amount of construction energy should be calculated using the BTU content of diesel and the narrative updated accordingly. The document indicates the amount of construction phase energy consumption was estimated by multiplying the gallons of fuel consumption by the BTU content of a gallon of gasoline. Typically, the heavy trucks and construction equipment are diesel-powered, not gasoline-powered. Recommend re-evaluating the methodology to more comprehensively incorporate the vehicle and equipment inventory and activity rates used for the air quality analysis. Recommend that the fuel usage should be calculated using the total number of working hours or miles and the estimates of energy consumption for construction equipment default values found in the Air Quality Technical Memorandum from Appendix E, to be consistent with the approach to estimating pollutant emissions.</td>
<td>Section 3.9.3.2, Page 3.9-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Suggest replacing this graph with the more recent 2015 data, which is now available on EIA (<a href="https://www.eia.gov/state/?sid=TX#tabs-3">https://www.eia.gov/state/?sid=TX#tabs-3</a>).</td>
<td>Section 3.9.4.2.1, Page 3.9-21, Figure 3.9-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The document does not mention additional operations water demand associated with additional power generation, which is particularly water-intensive. Suggest that some acknowledgement and discussion of this water demand be added.</td>
<td>Section 3.9.5.2.1, Page 3.9-28 6th paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The document does not mention additional operations wastewater generation associated with additional power generation, which is particularly water-intensive and generates substantial volumes of wastewater. Suggest that some acknowledgement and discussion of this impact be added.</td>
<td>Section 3.9.5.2.1, Page 3.9-30, 3rd paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. There seems to be a missing explanation/table, or detail which could be added to Table 3.9-19, that summarizes key inputs for HSR operation energy consumed in a manner similar to the detail provided for HSR construction energy and the passenger vehicle travel energy. In addition, net energy saved should be calculated by subtracting both the HSR operation energy consumption and the HSR construction energy consumption from the passenger vehicle travel energy. As currently published, HSR construction energy is not factored into the net calculation.</td>
<td>Section 3.9.5.2.3, Pages 3.9-35 - 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The &quot;Notes: BTU-British&quot; appears to be incomplete.</td>
<td>Section 3.9.5.2.3, Page 3.9-36, Table 3.9-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. In addition to water saving devices, recommend broadening mitigation measures EU-MM#7 to include energy-saving strategies (e.g., light-emitting diode lighting and other strategies consistent with energy efficient buildings, such as those listed by EnergyStar, LEED, or Better Buildings programs) that would help minimize power needs at the facilities during operations. Alternatively, an additional mitigation measure specific to energy efficiency could be added.</td>
<td>Section 3.9.6.2, Page 3.9-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. What does the asterisk on the number of lanes denote for Illinois Avenue?</td>
<td>Section 3.11.4.1.2, Table 3.11-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. It appears that traffic volumes were taken while IH 30/IH 35E (Horseshoe Project), Riverfront Boulevard, and Cadiz Street were under construction. If so, these counts may be skewed because of traffic seeking alternate routes.</td>
<td>Section 3.11.4.1.3, Page 3.11-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Future plans to widen Pleasant Run Road will include an off-street trail. The relocated road must include a four-lane bridge with a trail.</td>
<td>Section 3.11.4.1.17, Page 3.11-15, Table 3.11-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. There are future plans to widen both Pleasant Run Road and Wintergreen Road from two to four lanes. Future plans for N. Lancaster Hutchins Road will expand the facility from two to six lanes. Sufficient clearance must be provided for the roadway and sidewalks.</td>
<td>Section 3.11.4.1.17, Page 3.11-15, Table 3.11-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Delete Trinity Parkway</td>
<td>Section 3.11.4.1.7, Page 3.11-15, Table 3.11-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. For Loop 9, the project should not be classified as a freeway. The initial six lanes to be built by 2035 are frontage roads only but include a wide median for future mainlanes which may or may not be tolled.</td>
<td>Section 3.11.4.1.7, Page 3.11-15, Table 3.11-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Please add the planned widening of SH 34 from two to four lanes. The shoulders will accommodate bicycles.</td>
<td>Section 3.11.4.2.6, Page 3.11-17, Table 3.11-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The proposed design has Belt Line Road and Pleasant Run Road going over the HSR in South Dallas. This area has and will have more freight-oriented developments built which will have a large number of trucks traveling through the area. The design of the overpasses need to provide appropriate horizontal and vertical geometry for an intermodal area.</td>
<td>Section 3.11.5.2.1, Page 3.11-38, Table 3.11-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The document should include a discussion on the impacts to bicycle and pedestrian movements around the Dallas station. Per the DEIS, 19 percent of access to the Dallas Terminal Station option would occur via non-motorized modes. Some of the intersection recommendations could impact bicycles and pedestrians by increasing the width of already large intersections and/or reducing sidewalk widths.</td>
<td>Section 3.11.5.2.1, Page 3.11-38, Table 3.11-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Not sure if the proposed intersection improvements are possible at Lamar Street/Cadiz Street because of the grades and the historic eligibility of the Cadiz underpass.</td>
<td>Section 3.11.5.2.1, Page 3.11-38, Table 3.11-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Need to consider all modes, not just motor vehicles. The closure of sidewalks and bicycle facilities (if applicable) should also be coordinated with local governments, DART, local businesses, and property owners.</td>
<td>Section 3.11.6.2, Page 3.11-74, TR-MM#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The &quot;Notes&quot; do not consistently list all acronyms/abbreviations.</td>
<td>Section 3.15.4.1.1, Page 3.15-7, Tables 3.15-4 and 3.15-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. The city of Dallas has recently completed The Cedars Planning Study. Additionally, HSR is under study between Dallas and Fort Worth. Recommend adding these studies to the discussion and address how HSR would impact these plan.</td>
<td>Section 4.3.1.1, Page 4-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Passenger rail stations can induce growth. This area could experience gentrification due to the current nature of the existing development and should be addressed.</td>
<td>Section 4.3.2.2.2, Page 4-8, 4th paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Because the Dallas Station location is adjacent and near the original location of the Trinity River; numerous wetlands and other low areas are adjacent to and around the proposed station. Any additional growth from the station could result in impacts and should be discussed.</td>
<td>Section 4.3.2.3.2, Page 4-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Recommend rewording the first sentence. There are no areas in Dallas or Harris counties in nonattainment; the whole county is in nonattainment.</td>
<td>Section 4.4.6.1, Page 4-27, 1st paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Recommend adding a statement that the USACE requires mitigation greater than 1:1 for impacts, further helping the overall health of Waters of the US.</td>
<td>Section 4.4.7.3, Page 4-32, 6th paragraph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 51. The list of temporary impacts from construction equipment and construction activities should include increases in air pollutant emissions. | Section 5.2, Page 5-1, 4th bullet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52. The tables inventorying non-road engines for construction emissions estimates appear to assume use of Tier 3 equipment exclusively. While Tier 3 is a good emissions standard, NCTCOG suggests that TCP strive to employ Tier 4 interim and/or Tier 4 final equipment to the greatest extent possible, as equipment meeting these EPA standards has been available across all horsepower classes for several years.</td>
<td>Appendix E Technical Memorandum: Air Quality 12-15 n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. E. Belt Line Road future plans expands from two to four lanes. Relocated road must include a four-lane bridge. All bridges should include sidewalks. The design of the overpasses need to provide appropriate horizontal and vertical geometry for an intermodal area.</td>
<td>Appendix G Segment 2-8 Dwg 01905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Pleasant Run Road future plans expands from two to four lanes with an off-street trail. Relocated road must include a four-lane bridge with trail. The design of the overpasses need to provide appropriate horizontal and vertical geometry for an intermodal area.</td>
<td>Appendix G Segment 2-8 Dwg 01906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Wintergreen Road future plans expands from two to four lanes. Sufficient clearance must be provided for the roadway and sidewalks.</td>
<td>Appendix G Segment 2-8 Dwg 01907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. N. Lancaster Hutchins Road future plans expands from two to six lanes. Sufficient clearance must be provided for the roadway and sidewalks.</td>
<td>Appendix G Segment 2-8 Dwg 01907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With traffic nightmare looming, Seattle embraces the telecommute

Feb. 25, 2018
BY DAVID GUTMAN
The Seattle Times

SEATTLE – Five years ago, as tunnel-boring Bertha was about to arrive in Seattle, local transportation officials huddled together to talk about what they could do to ease the traffic disruptions that would inevitably come during the tunnel’s construction.

One of the ideas they came up with: Make it easier for workers to work without going to work. Each person working from home is one less person driving through downtown or taking up space on a crowded bus.

For the last five years, King County Metro has run what it calls Work-Smart, a free consulting service to help businesses set up telecommuting programs for their employees.

“Even though we’re primarily a transit agency, telework is just another way we can support people in getting the work that they need to get done,” said Sunny Knott, Metro’s program manager for WorkSmart. “It supports our interest in mitigating congestion and encouraging people to get to work in ways other than driving alone.”

There is room for improvement. Telecommuting accounted for just over 3 percent of morning commutes to downtown Seattle in 2016, according to a survey of businesses from nonprofit Commute Seattle. Nearly 10 times as many people drove to work alone.

Telework is obviously useless for some people. Woe to the construction worker who tries to telework. And a teleworking cook won’t have a job for long.

But as Seattle increasingly becomes a technology hub, with jobs that are less site-specific, telework provides benefits to businesses, workers and the city at large.

“It’s nice to have the flexibility of working in between appointments,” said Chyann Jackson, who works in human resources for Delta Dental of Washington. “And not to have to focus on how I’m going to get home then grab my car to go to the doctor.”

Now, as downtown Seattle prepares to enter its so-called “period of maximum constraint,” with construction projects from modest to mega about to bring traffic to a near standstill, telecommuting is gaining traction among policymakers as a way to help keep commerce – if not necessarily traffic – moving.

Already, King County Metro’s program has helped about 100 businesses set up telecommuting programs over the past five years.

In Olympia, a new proposal in the Legislature would offer businesses tax credits for boosting their telecommuting numbers.

In Seattle, Mayor Jenny Durkan spoke both during her campaign and after taking office about working with businesses to increase telecommuting – and of doing similar things with the city’s own workforce.
And nationwide, a little-noticed Obama-era law encouraging telecommuting in the federal workforce has led to significant increases in government employees who don’t drive to the office every day.

More flex time, Skype-During her campaign last fall, Durkan said she would talk with employers, Amazon in particular, about ways to keep people from commuting downtown during the next few years as a variety of construction projects are going to make it all but impassable.

“You take 20 percent of your workforce and they work from home on Mondays and 20 percent stay home on Tuesdays,” Durkan said last fall. “And I want to do that with the city. I want to say, how do we start having more four-10s or more flex time or work from homes; more Skype meetings to literally have people not get in the cars at all and also relieve some pressure on transit?”

Since taking office, Durkan said she’s talked with “some of our top companies” about the issue but did not respond when asked which ones.

“In the upcoming months I will continue this conversation,” Durkan said. “This isn’t new technology – companies and cities around our country have been doing this for decades. We need to do more than catch up; we should lead the way by defining new and creative ways for people to work.”

A bill in Olympia would offer employers a tax credit to offset money spent setting up a telework program, and a $250 credit per employee who teleworks at least 12 days per month.

The program would be quite limited initially – no employer could get more than $10,000 in tax credits, and the total number of credits given out couldn’t be more than $250,000.

Sen. Kevin Van De Wege, D-Sequim, touts working from home as a win for everyone – employers save money on office space, employees can skip the commute and work more comfortably and flexibly, and it gets cars off the road, meaning more room for those who still commute.

“It’s probably one of the cheaper things the state could do to decrease traffic congestion,” Van De Wege said.

His bill (SB 6016) passed out of committee last month but has stalled since.

Cultural changes

Delta Dental of Washington recently moved its Seattle offices from the relative solitude of Northgate to booming South Lake Union, as the company decided it preferred to lease a new space rather than own and manage its building.

At the same time, the company started working with Metro’s WorkSmart, to set up a programme to give its employees the option to work from home.

Before the move, teleworking had been a bit of a haphazard affair at Delta Dental, done only sporadically by scattered employees.
But, since the company set up its telework programme, they're seeing, on average, each of their 200 Seattle employees work from home about once a week. The company is currently working to set up a similar programme in its Spokane office.

"Especially in the Seattle area, the traffic is horrible, so it's just giving people more options," said Becky Masters, Delta Dental's director of compensation and benefits. "It's a good thing to offer from a recruiting and retention standpoint; employees really value having more flexibility."

Delta Dental gave every employee a laptop and did training on relevant software like Office and Skype in preparation for increasing teleworking.

There were also cultural changes to get used to. Rolling out the telework programme took nearly a year.

"Teams had to go back and talk about what their norms are," said Jackson, the Delta Dental employee. "Figure out what works best for them. When I work from home I'm always updating my calendar, making sure to update my Skype, send a note out. We like to over-communicate."

Jackson works from home one day a week, usually in the kitchen of her Westlake apartment, sometimes in the apartment building's common room, and sometimes at a nearby coffee shop.

"Being surrounded by people is nice, even though they're all working on different things for different companies," she said.

WorkSmart has an annual budget of about US$50,000 (RM195,500) that it's used to help companies set up telework programmes over the last five years.

There are technological issues to work out – laptops and Internet – but there are also structural issues, many surrounding trust, to work through.

It's important to set up a formalised programme, so you don't have individual managers giving ad hoc permission to individual employees to work from home, said Elham Shirazi, a national telework consultant who contracts with King County Metro.

"It's not as simple as just 'go home and work,'" Shirazi said. "We have to get past some employers' misconceptions about 'if I don't see you, I don't know you're working.'"

At the forefront

Some of the Seattle workplaces that are among telecommuting leaders have another thing in common: They're part of the federal government.

The Seattle offices of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Social Security Administration, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the US Department of Labour and the Environmental Protection Agency all have telecommuting rates of higher than 12%, putting them among the city's leaders.

All have higher shares of workers who telecommute than who drive alone to work, according to state data.

That wasn't the case just a few years ago.
In 2010, HUD offices in Seattle saw employees eliminate 6% of their trips by telecommuting. In 2016, it was 20%.

In 2010, Social Security Administration offices in Seattle had employees teleworking just 1% of the time. In 2016, it was nearly 16%.

Other local branches of federal agencies saw similarly drastic increases.

The changes didn't happen by accident.

In 2010, Congress passed and President Barack Obama signed the Telework Enhancement Act, which required federal agencies to set up policies for teleworking and tell all eligible employees that teleworking was an option. Agencies have to set goals for participation and report back on their progress.

The rate of teleworking among federal employees nationally has risen steadily from 14% in 2012 to 22% in 2016, according to the most recent report.

The Department of Labour estimated that teleworking by its employees nationally reduced car commutes by more than 8 million miles in 2016.
Boom elbowing out farmland

Families fight to hold on to last little bits of unpaved acreage

March 1, 2018
By NANETTE LIGHT Staff Writer
Dallas Morning News

COLLIN COUNTY — A one-mile running track through a hay field outlines the Blake family’s property.

To outsiders, it’s nothing special — just a mowed-down path where Shannon Blake and her kids run.

But it’s here — running along this piece of dirt — where Blake finds peace.

Before the Blakes moved to unincorporated Collin County less than two years ago, they lived in a typical two-story, suburban Frisco home. But that fast-growing community a half-hour north of Dallas had dramatically changed from when the Blakes moved there more than a decade earlier.

Cars raced down high-speed freeways. Apartment buildings stood alongside their neighborhood. Toyota transplants were arriving, and The Star in Frisco — home to the Dallas Cowboys — was coming.

The family traded their suburban life for country living on 33 acres just outside McKinney’s city limits. And it’s this same peaceful patch of land — the place with two creeks and a pond — that she, her husband and six kids have fought for the last year to protect from creeping development in booming Collin County.

They’re fighting against the very growth that made them escape to the country in the first place.

“It’s definitely not what we expected when we were moving out here,” Blake said.

And the battle for people like the Blakes to hold onto some of the last bits of unpaved Collin County is far from over.

Collin County’s population is expected to double before 2030 and surpass the number of people in Dallas and Tarrant counties with a population of more than 3.5 million by 2050.

More recently, the once tiny cotton farming community of McKinney reported a population of nearly 180,000 residents — an almost 7 percent increase from last year and a whopping 365 percent jump from 20 years ago.

By 2040, McKinney’s population is expected to grow by another 100,000 residents to roughly 284,000, according to city estimates.

And that means most of the rural acreage around McKinney’s city limits will ultimately be developed, said Michael Quint, executive director of development services for the city of McKinney.
“I actually had one resident come and ask me ... ‘is all that farmland going to go away eventually? Is every square inch going to be developed?’” he said. “And the simple answer is, yeah, a lot of it is going to be developed. That’s just kind of the price we pay to live in such a high-demand region.

“It’s impossible to think that this stuff is just going to be staying farmland forever.”

**Progress knocking**

A beat-up blacktop road north of the Collin County Courthouse leads to the Blake family’s five-bedroom house built on a slope in the early 1960s.

Blake and her husband, Jason, bought the 33-acre parcel just outside McKinney’s city limits. The couple had dreamed of a place where their kids could roam and explore.

They thought they found it.

They cleared overgrown bush and dead trees. Last year, a friend wed under a 100-year old oak tree in their backyard.

Their oldest son built a fort in the nearby woods with his friends — a shack-like structure with a tin roof. And in the evenings, the family raced each other across the hay bales lined up behind their house.

“I don’t care if the city’s all around me. We have a treeline and a creek that buffers us,” Blake said. “We’re in our happy little world, and we’d like it to stay that way.”

But it’s uncertain if it will.

Markers on their trees show where a developer has tagged them for possible removal for a sewage pipeline.

A year ago, an early study to build a bypass north of U.S. Highway 380 showed a freeway possibly cutting through their property as the Texas Department of Transportation works to tackle the traffic gridlock that comes with explosive growth in the county.

But where exactly that freeway will be and when it will rise up isn’t known yet, said TxDOT spokeswoman Michelle Raglon.

Last year, the Blakes also received word of another possible road running through where the family’s kitchen table sits today.

And in the fall, the family and other county residents fought a McKinney City Council plan to forcibly add thousands of acres outside the city limits before a new state law dealing with annexation went into effect. Blake, her husband, Jason, and others packed meeting after meeting in the weeks-long battle, calling the forced annexation a “land grab.”

In November, McKinney City Council members unanimously voted to drop its annexation push. For now.
During that meeting, Mayor Pro Tem Rainey Rogers warned that probably wouldn’t be the last time rural Collin County residents would have to fight to protect their property.

“One of these days, TxDOT is going to come knocking on people’s doors ready to take your land because of some bypass,” he said. “Ultimately, it’s going to come. The state of Texas didn’t give up the right to eminent domain on a property. Just kind of be aware of that.”

**Lure of Collin County**

This growth isn’t anything new for Collin County, which has been steadily growing at a phenomenal clip for decades, said Clarence Daugherty, director of engineering for Collin County.

Tax incentives, good schools, public safety and the relocation of large corporations — notably Toyota North America’s move to Plano — continue to lure families and businesses to the area. And as more people have come, development has inched farther north from Plano to McKinney.

Beyond McKinney, past where the Dallas North Tollway ends, is Celina. Though its population totals only about 11,000 residents now, that’s almost double what it was in 2010, according to the city. And it’s estimated to eventually reach about 350,000, rivaling Collin County siblings Frisco and McKinney.

Already, Celina is expanding so quickly that city staff can’t keep updated maps on hand.

“Celina has such a large land mass. It’s like playing monopoly, and we don’t want to make a mistake on any step,” Mayor Sean Terry said.

The ONE McKinney 2040 Comprehensive Plan, which is still in the draft phase, plots in its preferred scenario the Blakes’ property and other rural areas in the Honey Creek Entertainment District — a mixed-use development of retail stores, restaurants, office spaces and residences to attract young and retiring professionals.

“These are farms, and none of these people want to move,” Blake said of the plan. “So none of that fits unless we’re all gone.”

**A suburban holdout**

Daugherty predicts pockets of acreage may remain in the county. He pointed to a long holdout of suburbia’s reach in Plano — the Haggard family, one of the city’s founding families who settled in the area in the 1800s and has farmed the land for generations.

The Haggards have parceled off their land slowly but continue to farm on some vacant tracts such as one at the Dallas North Tollway and Spring Creek Parkway.

About eight miles away in the heart of Plano, you can still spot llamas, cows and donkeys grazing on a roughly 60-acre tract of farmland owned by Rodney Haggard. Several years earlier, he sold about half of the family’s historic homestead to be developed into a housing subdivision.
“We still primarily want to keep as much land as we can,” said Haggard, managing partner at
the real estate firm Fairview Farm Land Co., who still owns about 150 acres scattered
throughout the area.

“But when growth comes to our part,” he said, “we try to take advantage of that some, too.”

But Daugherty, the county engineer, said large expanses of acreage like the ones the Haggards
have held on to will be unlikely.

“I guess it’s always possible that something will happen to make development stop before it
engulfs all of the land,” he said.

**The ‘Texas miracle’**

McKinney Mayor George Fuller thinks the state’s new annexation law — which went into effect
Dec. 1 and requires voters’ approval before their land can be annexed — could be that
“something.”

He said development will happen, but it will be different and with less city oversight since the
city no longer has the ability to unilaterally annex property.

The new law limits the ability of cities like McKinney to strategically grow and manage that
growth in terms of overseeing that infrastructure is in place and that safety codes and
ordinances are adhered to, he said.

“When you halt that, you stop managed growth. I would imagine that again in five and 10 years,
we’ll be talking, and the Texas miracle will no longer be the Texas miracle. It will be the Texas
miracle that we’re reading about in history books,” he said.

“And we’ll be able to identify how the growth and how that growth produced the jobs and the
economy it did, and then a law was passed, and that growth slowed and stopped.”

Already, the law has changed the way McKinney thinks about its expansion looking forward.
Previously, Fuller said the city would have extended roads into the extraterritorial jurisdiction
with plans to later annex that property into the city. Now, it won’t.

But Quint, McKinney’s development director, has said the council’s decision to drop its forced
annexation push before the new law went into effect isn’t expected to hurt the city’s expansion
plans.

“Even though we’re not annexing it today, it’s still in our ETJ,” he said of the land just outside
city limits. “So whether that happens 10 years or 100 years from now, we’re still planning for
those areas to be in our city limits.”

Shannon Blake doesn’t understand why cities can’t develop, while also allowing country farms
to remain.

“We knew that the city would grow around us. We just didn’t want them to grow through us,” she
said.
Work begins on $666M redo of I-35E and Highway 67, with a deck park in the plans

Feb. 28, 2018
Written by Tristan Hallman, Dallas City Hall Reporter
Dallas Morning News

Ground was broken Wednesday on the so-called "Southern Gateway" project, a massive $666 million reconstruction of a large section of Interstate 35E and State Highway 67 near downtown through Oak Cliff.

At a harmonious ceremony -- which stood in stark contrast with the acrimonious debate over the future of I-635 East -- state, regional and local officials said they have plenty to like about the highway.

For state officials, the project is about alleviating congestion. For City Council members Scott Griggs and Dwaine Caraway, the project means literally bridging the division the highway created between their two Oak Cliff districts. Mayor Mike Rawlings and State Sen. Royce West, D-Dallas, said the project would be a boon to southern Dallas at large. State Rep. Rafael Anchia, D-Dallas, thought it was important that the highway won't have tolled lanes.

And after years of talks and tweaks, all were happy to see construction begin.

County Commissioner John Wiley Price, who still wants more minority participation on the construction work, said the "project is great" and "long overdue." West said the construction would prove that the city's leaders aren't just talking about growing the city's southern half, they're actually "putting in the infrastructure to get it done."

Rawlings, who has championed a private GrowSouth effort as mayor, said the project would be vital to families in southern Dallas.

"It's important from a pragmatic standpoint," Rawlings said. "But it's also important from a symbolic standpoint. For too long, southern Dallas got bupkis. They got nothing. Nada. We are having these tens and hundreds of millions of dollars spent in southern Dallas. This major metropolitan city deserves this type of infrastructure."

Part of the project includes infrastructure for another deck park, similar to Klyde Warren Park over Woodall Rodgers Freeway. The city is putting $7.1 million in bond money -- approved in the fall as part of a $262 million parks proposition -- toward the initial skeleton of the deck park. The Regional Transportation Commission is paying for the remainder of the $40 million cost. City leaders hope philanthropists will chip in millions to help build out the park.

The deck park had the the support of Griggs and Mayor Pro Tem Dwaine Caraway, who returned to the council last year after defeating deck-park opponent Carolyn King Arnold. Arnold had said the bridge would gentrify an area where poverty is common. Caraway said Wednesday he didn't know how anyone could oppose the deck park.

"Look at the jobs that it's going to bring," Caraway said. "Look at the families that are going to be on the deck park. Look at the enhancement that it's going to be."
It's unclear when the deck park will be finished. But the 11-mile highway project should be done by the end of 2021.

For drivers, that might mean a few years of occasional headaches. Texas Department of Transportation officials say they want to keep disruptions to a minimum, but lanes and frontage road closures are inevitable.

The long-term ends, they believe, will justify any temporary inconveniences. The road will go from four lanes on each side to five. In between those lanes, rather than the current HOV lane, will be two reversible non-tolled express lanes to help drivers bypass traffic and some exits.

Bruce Bugg, Jr., the Transportation Commission Chairman, said tackling the state's top traffic chokepoints is a key priority for Texas officials. Gov. Greg Abbott, in a 2014 campaign ad, famously lamented that "a guy in a wheelchair can move faster than traffic on some roads in Texas."

But state leaders, including Abbott, have also turned on projects that include optional toll lanes. Many residents near Interstate 35E opposed toll lanes, and eventually their sentiment won out.

Anchia said it was important to Oak Cliff that no tolls were included.

"I don't have anything against toll roads" Anchia said. "But when we have an opportunity to do taxpayer supported roads in communities that for a long time have been forgotten and have paid into the system, it's very important they have an opportunity to be on taxpayer-supported free roads, and not toll roads."

But some City Council members, including Adam McGough, and northeastern Dallas residents have been battling to keep optional toll lanes on the 635 East project.

McGough, who attended the groundbreaking Wednesday, said he's excited for the Southern Gateway project to begin. But he wants the state to allow the 635 East project, which he said is important for traffic and safety in the area -- to move forward. And he wants them to allow his constituents to get their say on whether they want toll lanes.

McGough said hearing all the comments about helping improve the area reiterated "what I'm hearing, every single day and every single night ,from the people who live and travel around 635 East."

$105 million Grapevine Main on track to be the coolest place in Texas to catch a train

March 07, 2018
BY NICHOLAS SAKELARIS
FORT WORTH STAR-TELEGRAM

GRAPEVINE – From its 150-foot observation tower to the five-story train station and 121-room hotel all tied together with 19th-century-style architecture, TEXRail passengers won’t need an announcement over the train’s speakers to know where they are.

Grapevine Main, located at the northeast corner of Main and Dallas streets, will be a statement that speaks for itself.

The $105 million mixed-use project could set a new standard for transit-oriented development in North Texas with restaurants, retail and a 38,000-square-foot outdoor plaza. The plaza will feature interactive fountains, a memorial for Native American tribes and room for thousands of people to gather for special events.

About 130 people showed up Wednesday morning to celebrate the groundbreaking, which featured a wine toast before the ceremonial shovel dig. Construction has already started on the 552-space parking garage and the platform where passengers will catch the train.

TEXRail will be a 27-mile passenger train with stops in downtown Fort Worth, Richland Hills, Grapevine and Dallas/Fort Worth Airport. The train is now scheduled to start service the first week of 2019, said Paul Ballard, president and CEO of Trinity Metro and TEXRail. The Grapevine Main station and Hotel Vin are scheduled to open in late 2019.

Through environmental challenges, funding shortages and other delays, Grapevine has been one of the strongest supporters of TEXRail. Voters overwhelmingly approved the sales tax allocation in November 2006.

“When others in the region said, ‘That train will never run,’ our team looked to the citizens and the leaders of this community for support and encouragement that never wavered,” Ballard said.

Mayor William D. Tate had sharp words for skeptics and cities that opposed TEXRail.

“Those that chose not to participate in TEXRail will soon live to regret that decision,” said Tate, who is running unopposed for his 15th term. “We’re glad to offer to all of our neighbors a standing invitation to come to Grapevine to enjoy all of the benefits of TEXRail.”

The remarks were a veiled shot at cities like Colleyville, which passed on the opportunity to have a TEXRail station at John McCain Road and Colleyville Boulevard after a backlash from residents.

Colleyville Mayor Richard Newton later responded to the comments, telling the Star-Telegram: “Colleyville is blessed with an exceptional quality of life and we have a clear vision for our future. Colleyville’s master plan for accomplishing that future does not include a train station, but we congratulate our neighbors who celebrated a groundbreaking today for a project they feel will fit the needs of their city.”

Grapevine Main will be about an 8-minute train ride from Terminal B at DFW Airport where passengers can catch flights at any terminal via Skylink. Riders could also walk over to the Dallas Area Rapid Transit station at Terminal A where they could catch a light-rail train to destinations throughout Dallas and Collin counties.
Access to mass transit will help attract young urbanites who want to live in a walkable environment, Tate said. The Hotel Vin, a play on the French word for "wine," will be a boutique hotel operated by Coury Hospitality under the Marriott International Autograph Collection brand.

The walkability will make it a destination for travelers from the airport, Ballard said.

“This hotel and development will become one of the best U.S. examples of what Americans look for on their European trips,” Ballard said. “That is, a cool train to a cool town with a cool hotel just steps from the station platform.”

Business owners on Main Street are also excited about the increased pedestrian traffic the train station will bring. The management at Chill Sports Bar & Grill just across Main Street has waited years for this to happen.

“It’s going to create a whole new spectrum of guests through Grapevine,” said Chris Packett, general manager for Chill. “It’s a higher-end hotel, not a normal run-of-the-mill Motel 6, so it’s going to bring a good clientele.”

Just north of the station, Perry Leonard, who owns Blagg Tire, said he expects more economic development to come downtown after the station opens.

“It’s going to bring more visitors and more customers to our businesses,” Leonard said. “It’s just another example of how Grapevine really pushes the envelope of bringing business to the community.”

Grapevine resident Charlie Vanzant said he’s been looking forward to this since the sales tax allocation passed in 2006.

“We’re just excited to see Grapevine tie into DFW Airport, which is a transportation hub for all of Texas,” Vanzant said. “It’s going to get vehicles off the highways. We have got to have mass transit.”

Ballard acknowledged that the project has been delayed for years, saying the first time he met Tate, the Grapevine mayor didn’t know if he’d live long enough to see TEXRail.

“You’re looking pretty darn good and the train is looking pretty darn good so we’ve both kept our ends of the bargain,” Ballard said. “I always believed we’d be here today.”

The TEXRail train cars will begin test runs later this month that will continue through the end of the year, Ballard said. Trinity Metro, the transit agency previously known as the Fort Worth Transportation Authority, will run six trains during peak hours.

The first trains will run before 5 a.m. and the last one will leave just after 1 a.m. They will operate 365 days a year. They are built by Stadler, a Swiss company, but will be manufactured in Utah.

Construction on the TEXRail tracks continues with a major road closure on eastbound Texas 114/121 scheduled from 8 p.m. Saturday to 5 a.m. Sunday, said Brian Murnahan, public relations officer for TEXRail. The closure will allow workers to erect beams for the 1,400-foot bridge that will carry trains over the highway and into DFW Airport. More highway closures are expected in the coming weeks.

North Texas, Start Your (Electric) Engines

Estimates show that the city of Dallas is expected to have 39,000 electric vehicles by 2030, and officials want to make it easier to use them.

March 7, 2018
Dave Moore
Dallas Innovates

Political and policy leaders are hoping that some of Texas’ $209 million Volkswagen so-called “Dieselgate” settlement can be used to help move drivers away from internal combustion, and toward electric-powered vehicles.

“We have an opportunity to make a positive change, after more than a century of vehicles spewing pollutants into the area,” said Bay Scoggin, state director of the Texas Public Interest Research Group. “Local and state officials who want to plug into this opportunity need to commit to EV [electric vehicle]-friendly infrastructure as fast as possible.”

TexPIRG held a press conference recently alongside the North Central Texas Council of Governments, Dallas Area Rapid Transit, AECOM, and Dallas City Councilman Lee Kleinman, to announce estimates that the city of Dallas is expected to have 39,000 electric vehicles by 2030, and to kick-start a regional move to make it easier to travel with electric vehicles.

Roughly 704 electric vehicles were registered in the city of Dallas as of last month, according to an analysis by NCTCOG.

“Generally speaking, there’s not a huge percentage of vehicles that are electric at this point, across the board,” said Suzanne Murtha, vice president of connected and automated vehicles at AECOM.

Her firm is helping local, regional, and state agencies plan their advanced transportation systems, including the expanded use of electric vehicles.

“When we talk to major organizations that do the forecasting … it looks right that there’s an exponential, hockey-stick-shaped curve in the growth [of electric vehicles],” Murtha said.

In its report, Plugging In, TexPIRG maintains that technological advances will continue to allow electric vehicles to drive farther, and to charge faster, at a lower cost. These factors already are playing a large role in increasing sales, especially in terms of microeconomics. Kleinman, for example, reports spending about $10 or less to charge his Tesla, which will travel about 265 miles on that charge.

“While the emissions of carbon-based fuel vehicles have come down substantially [in North Texas], they don’t even compare to what you get with an electric vehicle,” Kleinman said at the press conference.

EXPANDING PORTS FOR CHARGING ELECTRIC VEHICLES

Kleinman, who previously drove a Nissan Leaf, said that while he’s able to charge his car at his own single-family home without any problem, he sees the need for expanding access to charging ports, to serve a broader cross-section of the community. The city of Dallas sits in the middle of the pack, based on the number of high-voltage (L-2 and fast charger) ports in the city, per capita.
To encourage communities to prepare for the spike in electric-vehicle use, TexPIRG recommends that:

- a portion of North Texas’ cut of the nationwide $2.7 billion VW “dieselgate” civil settlement be used to install additional electric vehicle charging ports on city streets, where electric cars can charge overnight;

- the settlement and other funds be used to help business owners, parking garage operators, etc., pay the cost of installing shared charging stations in their facilities;

- cities be encouraged to install free or discounted parking and charging for electric vehicles; and,

- communities expand the availability of electric-powered public transit, the shared use of electric vehicles, and promote cycling and walking as well.

Electric vehicle sales nearly doubled between 2015 and 2017, from more than 116,000 to nearly 200,000 according to the Inside EVs website.

TexPIRG’s projection of 39,000 electric vehicles in the city of Dallas by 2030 might sound considerable; yet the figure is dwarfed by the number of motor vehicles registered in Dallas County is 2.1 million, as of 2016.

Statewide, TexPIRG estimates there are 8,500 electric vehicles operating in Texas. Globally, electric vehicles comprise less than 1 percent market share, according to a study by the International Energy Agency. That same agency projects that roughly a third of the world’s passenger cars and light trucks might be electric by 2030.

“While the emissions of carbon-based fuel vehicles have come down substantially (in North Texas), they don’t even compare to what you get with an electric vehicle.”

Lee Kleinman

“Thirty-nine thousand might not sound like a lot, but that’s just [the city of] Dallas,” said NCTCOG’s Chris Klaus, adding that there could be tens of thousands of other electric vehicles that would be in use, in cities surrounding Dallas and beyond by 2030. “I look at the trickle-down, and the vehicle [that] the electric vehicle is replacing. Let’s say they’re replacing a BMW or a Buick. That vehicle goes into a used car lot, and it helps move the pendulum down the road.”

Inroads toward electric-powered mass-transit are expanding in downtown Dallas as well.

At the press conference, DART President and Executive Director Gary C. Thomas announced DART’s downtown bus fleet — known as D-LINK — will be completely electric-powered by the end of March. Thomas said DART will operate seven electric buses through its seven-mile downtown loop, recharging them at Dallas’ convention center.

Currently, all DART buses run on natural gas, Thomas said. He added that DART will observe how the D-LINK electric buses perform before deciding whether to expand their use beyond downtown Dallas.

https://dallasinnovates.com/north-texas-start-your-electric-engines/
WASHINGTON – Drivers could pay a tax based on how many miles their vehicles travel under a plan being pushed by Missouri Rep. Sam Graves, who's vying to become the powerful new chairman of the House Transportation Committee.

While exact plans for such a tax remain vague, the fees could be calculated based on odometer checks, GPS devices, cellular technology or radio-frequency identification devices that would track how far a vehicle travels and charge drivers accordingly.

Graves, R-Mo., is promoting the per-mile tax as an alternative to raising the gasoline tax, a long-discussed way of providing more money for highway construction and repair.

Some states have been experimenting with a tax on miles traveled. A four-month pilot program last year in Colorado included 150 participants from 27 counties. The program let drivers choose how they reported their mileage and compare what they paid to the gas tax.

“Participants reported high satisfaction with all aspects of the pilot program and 91 percent said they would participate in a future pilot,” according Michael Lewis, executive director of the Colorado Department of Transportation.

Lewis cautioned lawmakers, however, that the miles traveled tax is “probably 10 years off before it can be fully implemented.”

Currently, drivers across the country pay an 18.4 cent-per-gallon federal gas tax that is not indexed for inflation and has not been increased for 25 years.

Over the years, anti-tax attitudes among conservatives have hardened, and Republicans who vote for higher taxes often find themselves with primary opposition.

But most in Congress agree money is badly needed to fix the nation's ailing, aging infrastructure. Without additional revenue sources, the federal government’s Highway Trust Fund will see a shortfall of $80 billion by 2026, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

Graves is so pessimistic about Congress raising the gas tax to fund the nation’s highways that he likened colleagues’ efforts to do so to “beating our heads against the wall.”

“There are a lot of members out there who are just philosophically opposed to increasing the tax,” Graves told reporters on Wednesday. “That’s all there is to it.”

Plus, he pointed out, the gas tax will bring in less revenue over the years as more drivers turn to fuel-efficient or alternatively fueled vehicles such as electric cars.

That's why Graves said he’s “a believer” in implementing a fee on vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, as a long-term solution.
“We could implement it in the commercial sector almost immediately,” he said. “In the commercial sector they’re already logging in miles. ... It might be a little farther away in the private sector, and that comes with acceptance and the technology.”

He doesn’t buy critics’ arguments that such a tax would penalize drivers in rural areas.

“They’re already driving farther so they already have to pay more gas tax than somebody who is driving, you know, two miles across town,” Graves said. “Equity is already built into that argument so that doesn’t necessarily worry me.”

Graves’ embrace of the tax on miles traveled separates him from the current chairman of the House Transportation Committee, Bill Shuster, R-Pa., who Wednesday called on President Donald Trump to back a gas tax increase.

“I, for one, think it’s time to do it,” said Shuster, who is retiring this year.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has proposed raising the gas tax by 25 cents per gallon, a plan the group says would raise $394 billion for infrastructure investments over the next decade.

Ed Mortimer, the chamber’s executive director, said he’s open to other alternatives, but said the federal government is far from being able to implement a tax on drivers based on miles traveled.

“Our view is we can’t wait for some other funding mechanism to come out of the woodwork,” Mortimer said. “… We need to raise revenue this year, and in our view, the only one that is ready to go that we know works is the fuel tax.”

Chris Spear, president and CEO of the American Trucking Association, said it’s unclear why a known user fee — the gas tax — would be less politically feasible than the miles traveled tax, an untested fee with significant privacy concerns.

Spear said the trucking industry is still years away from a feasible program to charge drivers based on miles traveled.

It isn’t clear that Republican members of the House would be any more likely to support a new tax on miles traveled than they would be to increase an old one on fuel.

Graves thinks they might. He said Wednesday that Speaker Paul Ryan, R-Wis., “likes the idea” of a miles traveled fee. Ryan’s office did not immediately respond to request for comment.
ARLINGTON — As the public input period comes to a close for a proposed high-speed rail line from Dallas to Houston, North Texas transportation planners are unveiling potential stops for a connector route.

The Regional Transportation Commission on Thursday discussed progress for a connection to Fort Worth and ongoing discussion with other planners for a line south from Fort Worth to Waco, Temple-Killeen, Austin, San Antonio and Laredo.

The RTC will decide in April whether to take on the environmental study to get the Dallas-Fort Worth line in motion. Environmental clearance would be about two years away.

A stop in Arlington remains a point of contention. Officials in Dallas, where a penny of sales tax goes to Dallas Area Rapid Transit, do not want Arlington — which is not a part of DART or the Fort Worth Transportation Authority — to get high-speed rail. Dallas City Council member Sandy Greyson reiterated that point at Thursday's RTC meeting in Arlington.

"It is the city of Dallas' position that no city be included unless they are member of a transit authority," Greyson said.

Arlington Mayor Jeff Williams responded to Greyson that "we certainly want to be regional players and very much want to be part of the regional transportation system."

Public input period ending

Meanwhile, Friday ends the Federal Railroad Administration's public input period on the $15 billion Dallas to Houston line being proposed by Texas Central Partners. The company hopes to break ground on the project next year.

Though it already held public meetings in each of 10 counties affected by the rail line during the impact period, federal railroad authorities added a meeting last Monday in Houston after several requests. Texas Central officials said people in Houston wanted to talk about the location of the station. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement evaluated three Houston terminal station options, including Northwest Mall, which was eventually selected.

The Federal Railroad Administration will look into concerns from the public and include all the comments in a final environmental impact statement.

"We will be notified to incorporate solutions into the designs," said Holly Reed, managing director of external affairs for Texas Central Partners. "That gets put into the action plan for the project."

The company's plan for high-speed rail is not popular with many landowners and leaders in rural counties along the route. Sheriffs from the eight rural counties along the proposed route held a news conference last week to introduce their coalition and voice concerns about the bullet train,
which would take passengers from Dallas to Houston in 90 minutes with a stop near College Station.

'Fraught with faults'

The sheriffs' event was supported by Texans Against High Speed Rail, which is also ramping up its opposition.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement "in and of itself is really a disaster argument, fraught with faults," said Kyle Workman, president of Texans Against High Speed Rail. "It's based on a fundamental they can realign or close roads. Or the assumption they can charge tax on ticket sales. Transportation is not charged sales tax.

"If you're Texas Central and assume you can reroute 15 roads in a county, what happens if that county says you can't do that. And every county is doing that from Ellis to Waller," Workman added. "Look at the major issues that are already there and you can only imagine the depth at which the minor issues go. They are so far from being able get this done, it's not even funny."

Texas Central Partners says the public input process, which began Dec. 22, is designed to address concerns from county leaders, the Texas Department of Transportation and individuals. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement assures that no public roads will be closed, the company said.

"It is a 240-mile project that touches a lot of people's property," Reed said. "That's very important, to take those concerns into the process."

Texans Against High Speed Rail also believes Texas Central needs legislative approval before it can operate as a railroad. The company disagrees.

"The pace is set by the FRA, the environmental statement and a safety permit," Reed said. "We hope that's final by year end, which starts construction next year. The Legislature does not have to take action for the project to go forward."

Did your car fail inspection? This agency will give you money for a new one

March 08, 2018
BY GORDON DICKSON
FORT WORTH STAR-TELEGRAM

Failing a car inspection in Texas can be a bummer.

But, if your car flops the emissions test, there's a local government agency that is eager to give you free money — up to $3,500 to apply to the cost of a new car.

And, you don't have to be dirt poor to qualify for the dough.

The North Central Texas Council of Government operates a program known as AirCheck Texas. The program is part of the Dallas-Fort Worth region's initiative to reduce air pollution.

North Texans who meet the income limits can get up to $3,500 to buy a new car, or $600 to repair their current vehicle.

The income limits are pretty generous. For example, a family of four earning $75,300 or less per year qualifies for the money.

Also, applicants must be a resident of Tarrant, Dallas, Denton, Collin, Johnson, Parker, Ellis, Kaufman or Rockwall counties.

"We have almost $30 million in assistance to help qualifying motorists address their vehicles' emissions problems," Brian Wilson, council of governments spokesman, said in an email. "The money needs to be spent by August 2019, and we're really trying to get the word out."

For information on how to apply, go to the AirCheck Texas website.

Fort Worth declares roundabouts a success, plans to expand them

March 09, 2018
BY SANDRA BAKER
FORT WORTH STAR-TELEGRAM

FORT WORTH – Fort Worth motorists have a hate-love relationship with roundabouts.

Put to use in earnest in the past five years along dozens of Fort Worth streets, roundabouts continue to evoke great passion in neighborhoods that fear they're coming. But once they're in, residents say they've worked.

Rusty Fuller, president of the North Fort Worth Alliance, a group of more than two dozen neighborhood associations in north Fort Worth, chuckles when asked if he fields complaints about roundabouts. The bulk of the city's 28 "modern" roundabouts are in north Fort Worth.

"Once in a great while we hear comments about them. People up here are pretty used to them now," Fuller said. "They're the most enigmatic traffic control device I have ever seen or heard of in my years. People hate them before they're in. People don't comment after they're in."

"Let me tell you that when people understand them, they are tremendously better than four-way stops," Fuller said.

At Bonds Ranch Road and U.S. 287, when the city wanted to put in roundabouts to ease the long backup of cars at that intersection the Texas Department of Transportation said it wasn't a good idea, said District 7 Councilman Dennis Shingleton. Instead, TxDOT put in flashing red lights and when those didn't work, traffic signals were installed, he said.

"If I had one phone call, I had 200" from upset motorists, Shingleton said. When the roundabouts went in a year ago, the complaining stopped, he said.

"People are beginning to realize there is some value to these," said Shingleton, whose district has the most roundabouts. "I'm sure there are people who get confused sometimes on how best to maneuver them. Once you do it once or twice, it's a piece of cake."

Fewer accidents

City policy requires roundabouts to be used at new and upgraded intersections that might otherwise call for a four-way stop, says Douglas Wiersig, the city's transportation and public works director.

There's fewer accidents at roundabouts and they save money because they don't require traffic signals, Wiersig said. They also handle more vehicles and at a faster pace, he said.

"We reduce our costs from the city's perspective because they're more sustainable," Wiersig said. "What happens with a roundabout, all traffic doesn't come to a stop. When you have a traffic signal and the light turns green, the cars go. In a roundabout, the cars are spaced out a little bit, but always moving."

The bigger savings come to the motorists, he said. Not only does air quality improve when vehicles are kept moving, drivers save on fuel by eliminating the many stops and starts they encounter along some of the city's more congested thoroughfares, Wiersig said.
"If we see the need for higher traffic control than just a stop sign at the side street, we're designing for a roundabout," Wiersig said.

One of those is Harmon Road between U.S. 287 and Golden Triangle Boulevard. Roundabouts already exist on the north and south service roads, but others are now planned for Harmon Road north of U.S. 287 at Presidio Vista Drive, Heritage Trace Parkway and Golden Triangle Boulevard.

Engineered to reduce traffic congestion, roundabouts are one-way circular intersections that flow counterclockwise. Motorists enter the roundabout when there is a gap. Head-on and left-turn crashes don't happen at roundabouts. Traffic accidents are reduced by as much as 40 percent at roundabouts and injury accidents by 75 percent, the city says, citing industry data.

Fort Worth has 28 modern roundabouts, or those built in the past five or so years.

In 2017, 49 accidents were recorded at 14 of those roundabouts, a Star-Telegram review of accident reports finds. Fort Worth police say the number is low when compared to the overall number of accidents.

The most roundabout accidents last year, 11, happened at North Riverside Drive and Northern Cross Boulevard, an intersection that was reconstructed into a multi-lane roundabout in 2014 at a cost of $2.9 million.

That second-most accidents, eight, happened at the roundabout at North Riverside Drive and Fossil Creek Boulevard, and, five accidents occurred at Heritage Trace and Tehama Ridge parkways. The total number of accidents at those three roundabouts accounts for half of all the accidents in roundabouts in 2017.

Reviewing some of the accident reports shows most happen when at least one of the drivers tries to exit the roundabout from the wrong lane or doesn't yield to the right-of-way of drivers already in the roundabout.

Some are one-car crashes. In a 1 a.m. accident in June 2017 at the roundabout at Rosedale Street and Mitchell Boulevard on the city's east side, the driver came up on the roundabout and tried to go through it. He collided with a light pole nearby, the report says.

"Roundabouts are slowly becoming more prevalent," Fort Worth Police Sgt. C.A. Gorrie said in an email response to questions. "As more are installed to ease congestion, motorists will become more comfortable with them and learn to navigate them more safely and effectively."

The top two accident prone roundabouts are in District 4 Councilman Cary Moon's district. He said motorists are apprehensive until they see how roundabouts work.

"It's just a busy street," Moon said of North Riverside Drive. "That probably ties more into why there's more accidents there, rather than the design of the things. The challenge is educating the driver. Overall, I'm a fan of them at the right intersection."

Roundabouts in the works
And more will come. In the upcoming $399.5 million bond election May 5, 18 roundabouts are included in planned road projects, primarily in north Fort Worth where most of the city's growth is taking place.

District 2 Councilman Carlos Flores, whose district stretches to north Fort Worth and has the second largest number of roundabouts, said he hasn't fielded any complaints since being elected a year ago. He agrees that drivers get a little anxious about using them.

"They're quick on the throttle to get in and then suddenly they slow down when another person is doing the same thing," Flores said. "They're not sure how to act."

A roundabout proposed at Briarhaven Road, where the water rushes across Bellaire Drive, has residents in the Overton Woods neighborhood steaming, so much so they've formed a special committee to address their concerns with the city.

Craig Barbolla, president of the Overton Woods Homeowners Association, at the end of February sent a letter to city leaders asking them to delay the project to make sure "all potential alternatives" are reviewed before construction begins. The road construction is being done because the city needs to fix drainage issues.

And as part of city policy, the road will be rebuilt using roundabouts and is where the storm water will be collected. Initially, plans called to put in four along Bellaire Drive, but that has been reduced to one because of costs.

The alternative residents are looking for should include a "roundabout-free solution," the letter states.

Barbolla said the city has known about the stormwater drainage issue for at least a decade and that the neighborhood has never been shown roundabout-free options to fix that.

"The roundabout does not provide protection for all residents from a 100-year storm event," Barbolla said. "We have been told a roundabout will cost $1.5 million. However, some question whether the $1.5 million could be used to provide as much storm protection for all residents as possible."

Lee Rodegerdts, with Portland-based transportation engineering firm Kittelson & Associates, recognized internationally for his expertise on roundabouts, said Fort Worth's reaction to roundabouts is not unlike reaction residents have in other cities.

"There's some resistance to them at first," Rodegerdts said. "After that they either accept them or like them. Sometimes a roundabout goes in and it doesn't operate as well as everybody wants it to. Those are more the exception than the rule."

Motorists shouldn't fear roundabouts and the only way to get over that is to go drive one for themselves, he said.

"That should get easier in Fort Worth," Rodegerdts said. "If they can fit ... their safety record is most impressive. That's held true nationally and it's held true worldwide."

How Fort Worth and Arlington plan to avoid Dallas' 'piles of bikes dumped everywhere'

BY BILL HANNA AND SANDRA BAKER
FORT WORTH STAR-TELEGRAM
March 09, 2018

DALLAS – In the heart of Dallas, bicycles are everywhere.

They're parked side-by-side along sidewalks throughout downtown, Uptown and Deep Ellum.

They litter the ground and sidewalks along Lemmon Avenue and Mockingbird Lane and they've been unceremoniously dumped in random places, like an empty lot east of downtown or abandoned near the West Fork of the Trinity River.

Estimates say there are somewhere between 18,000 and 20,000 bikes in Dallas — no one is sure of the exact number — more than the 12,000 in New York City and the 10,000 in Seattle.

And while the benefits of riding bikes — advocates say they're an easy way to get exercise, cut down on pollution and traffic congestion and encourage economic growth (see Amazon) — have not been cast aside, Dallas has become rather dubious with its bicycle dilemma.

It's something that Fort Worth and Arlington want to avoid.

Ofo, one of the bike companies operating in Dallas, has a few bikes scattered around downtown Arlington and is debating whether to start a pilot program in Fort Worth.

In Arlington, the City Council talked last month about whether an ordinance or some type of permitting is needed for bike-share companies. Some council members appeared to support the idea but Mayor Jeff Williams is taking a wait-and-see approach.

"We're going to work with the bike companies here in Arlington," Williams said. "If things go well, they'll take care of the problem. If not, our committee may have to legislate something."

But Williams was clear he doesn't want to see a repeat of the problems that have taken place in Dallas.

"We don't want to see piles of bikes dumped everywhere and laying on the ground," Williams said. "It doesn't help any city."

Nor does Fort Worth Mayor Betsy Price, who's willing to try out the dockless programs, particularly in far north Fort Worth and the southeast side where they're needed. Fort Worth has Bcycle, a station-based bike-share program. Price said both types of bikes can co-exist in the city.

"I'm sure we'll be looking at them," Price said. "We're going to have to figure out how to sort it out. We don't want them littered everywhere. We're not going to have them dropped off in the right-of-way and piled up in parks."

Although Fort Worth is concerned about bicycle dumping, the city is in far better shape than Dallas to accept the bikes.
Everett Weiler, Ofo’s Dallas-Fort Worth general manager, said Fort Worth should respond well to a dockless bike-share program and his company is hopeful one will start before summer.

Dallas didn't respond well at first to the bike-share program because the city is not set up for bike transportation.

Fort Worth is "very bike friendly," Weiler said.

Price, an avid bicyclist, agrees. But, she warns, if the dockless companies can't keep up with their bikes, "then we'll stick with the dockable. We're a city's that's not going to tolerate them being tossed around."

Dallas has received its share of criticism for bicycles being strewn all over the city, from landing in people's yards to being perched in a tree. It has even become fodder for KTCK-The Ticket, where morning drive-time host and cyclist Craig Miller has repeatedly asked why Dallas can't get its act together.

"Dallas went from zero bikes to a lot of bikes. The citizens in Dallas were incredibly disrupted by the bikes," Weiler said.

'I think it's really working'

Despite the criticism, Dallas City Councilman Lee Kleinman, chairman of the city's mobility committee, remains a staunch supporter of bike-share.

"Yeah, I think it's really working," Kleinman said. "No doubt there are challenges. A lot of that has to do with going from no bikes to as many as 20,000 bikes. That's more than New York. That's more than any city in the country."

When Fort Worth began its docked bike-share program in 2013, Kleinman said he was envious, but Dallas wouldn't dedicate funds for a similar program. To get bike companies to operate in Dallas, they took the opposite approach.

"What we have is a competitive market open to all vendors unlike Fort Worth, which is a regulated monopoly," Kleinman said.

Those wanting to rent bikes in Dallas need an app for one of the bike-share companies — Ofo, Spin, Vbikes, Limebike and Z— to locate available bikes through a GPS system. Once you choose and find a bike, you use a phone app to unlock its back tire and away you go, for about $1 an hour. When finished you can park it — or dump it — wherever you like.

At a Feb. 26 committee meeting dealing with bike-share, Dallas did receive some ridership information from two companies, Limebike and Ofo. The other companies did not comply with the request for data, said Jared White, the city's bicycle transportation manager.

Ofo said riders have logged about 100,000 miles since November with nearly 70 percent of rides starting or ending near a transit stop. Twenty percent of their fleet serves southern Dallas with hundreds of trips taken by Paul Quinn College students. There was more than a 50 percent increase in trips from December to January.
Limebike said about 70,000 residents and visitors have used its bikes more than 183,000 times, with more than 6,000 trips in a single day. Twenty percent of all trips start and end near a transit station with 51 percent of riders using the service during the evening rush hour.

Both companies have heat-signature maps that show most of the heavy usage occurring in the city center.

White took issue with the assertion that Dallas won't take action to regulate the bike-share companies until next fall. He said city officials will be meeting with the companies next week and hope to come up with some formal rules in the next 30 days.

"We're talking about a license agreement or franchise agreement," White said. "We're talking about how long a bike can sit before being picked up, how quick must their response times be. Should we be looking at designated areas for bikes in heavy use areas?"

The city also wants to require the companies to share more data about bike usage so officials can analyze it independently.

Most of the bike-share companies have hired more staff to clean up bikes strewn along sidewalks, Kleinman said, noting that conditions have improved.

He acknowledges that "some disgruntled people like to go down streets and push over bikes," creating a mess in some areas.

"I think we'll try to deal with it through policy rather than an ordinance," Kleinman said. "Will there be a fee system for them like a franchise fee for Oncor or the cable company to use our right-of-way? We'll see."

'We can see the problem'

Arlington and Fort Worth are not unlike other cities dealing with whether to regulate, or not, bike-share companies.

Ofo, the Beijing-based bike-share company, is trying a new tact in Florida. There, Ofo wants the state Legislature to regulate the dockless bike-share companies and is lobbying for bills that would push cities out of the regulating business, Governing magazine reports.

The dockless bike industry is getting so big that in 2014 a handful of industry stakeholders formed the North America Bike Share Association that, among other things, provides a code of conduct and a way to report violations.

More than 130 North American cities have bike-share programs, according to the 70-member organization.

"A city can play a role in putting together policies and asking these operators to get permits to make them accountable for maintenance and co-locating the bikes," said Shima Hamidi, director of the University of Texas at Arlington’s Institute of Urban Studies.

San Francisco's bike-share rules are a good example of putting rules in place before allowing dockless bike-share. Hamidi said.
In San Francisco, the permit requires stationless operators to pay start-up fees ranging from $12,208 to $19,558, annual renewals ranging from $9,725 to $17,074, and $2,500 a year to cover potential repairs to public property, according to the San Francisco Chronicle. For every two bikes put into operation, dockless bike companies must pay San Francisco to purchase and install a bike rack that can handle two bikes, at a cost of $90 each.

Hamidi said bike-share can be helpful for people using public transportation for the "last mile" between where they work and live and a transit station.

In Arlington, only a handful of Ofo bikes are usually visible around downtown Arlington. Ofo has been in Arlington since mid-November largely incident free, Weiler said.

But there was an issue with Ofo bikes being left on the UTA campus in November, which caused the university to collect the bikes and issue a cease-and-desist letter to the company, according to the campus newspaper, The Shorthorn.

UTA launched an exclusive bike-share program with Zagster in August that includes 40 bikes at seven docking stations around campus.

Students pay annual membership and can use it "just like a gym card" to pedal from one end of campus to the other, said Meghna Tare, executive director of UTA's Institute for Sustainability and Global Impact. From Aug. 23 to Feb. 26, the bike-share program had a total of 5,184 trips, an average of 195 a week.

So far, 670 students are active in the program.

"We can see the problem if they're not docked," Tare said. "Bikes are so cheap it takes 10 rides to recover the cost of one bike."

'There's a place for dockless'

Fort Worth's bike-share program has been in place for five years and features 350 bicycles that are parked at 46 docking stations across downtown, the Cultural District, the Trinity Trails, the Stockyards, Near Southside and TCU.

And while the program keeps bikes from being discarded wherever the rider likes, it also limits where a rider can go because they can only travel from station to station.

That's why some bike enthusiasts want the city to add a dockless program.

After two presentations on the issue since December, Fort Worth's Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Commission will talk about the topic again at its April meeting. But this time, the group asked for more technical and legal advice.

The commission appears to be leaning toward allowing the dockless bikes as a way to expand the transportation mode to areas of the city where the current bike-share program doesn't operate.

Jason Lamers, the commission's chairman, said at its recent meeting that safety concerns regarding the quality of the bikes and how quickly the dockless companies respond to picking up bikes left where they shouldn’t be, need to be addressed.
“I feel like there’s a place for dockless,” Lamers said. “It needs to be done in a respectful manner and not a free-for-all. We need to talk about expanding the bike-share amenities in Fort Worth.”

The advisory commission was asked to vet a possible bike-share policy after some dockless bike companies came into Fort Worth last summer and dumped bikes on downtown sidewalks without permission. Companies also approached the city about operating here without bringing bikes in. Some Lime bikes recently showed up uninvited in downtown near City Hall.

Kristen Camareno, executive director of the nonprofit Fort Worth Bike Sharing, told the commission they’ve been talking about expanding, but that it will cost money. They’ve also talked about offering a dockless bike, but one with technology letting the rider know they’re leaving a bike where they shouldn’t be.

“We haven’t yet seen a great example of dockless,” she said. “We know where our bikes are all the time.”

Fort Worth Bike Sharing also recently changed its $8, 24-hour memberships to offer unlimited one-hour rides.

Before, the 24-hour membership was unlimited 30-minute rides. The average ride between stations is 42 minutes, Camareno said. If the bikes weren’t docked in 30 minutes, the rider was charged $1.50 usage fee.

**Other cities take action**

Both Plano and Denton have recently enacted ordinances that give specific rules about where and when bikes can be parked.

In Denton, the rules also limit a bike-share company to 150 bikes.

In Plano, bike-sharing bicycles can only be parked on the sidewalk but not on sidewalk corners or near crosswalks, according to the Plano Star Courier. In residential areas, the bike-share bicycles can be parked for 48 hours and must be moved within 24 hours of a notice that they are inoperable.

"Basically, the ordinance allows bike-share by permit," said Peter Braster, director of special projects for the City of Plano.

Highland Park took it a step further, essentially telling bike-share companies that any bikes left overnight in the city would be impounded and it would be costly to recover them, according to WFAA.

Other cities shouldn't wait for the onslaught of bikes to arrive, said White of the City of Dallas. It's only a matter of time, he said, before they start showing up in neighboring cities. And there's some anecdotal evidence that they're spreading out to other cities by DART light rail and the Trinity Railway Express.

"I don't think you need to wait around," White said. "You need to deal with it."
While those cities felt the need to regulate bike share companies. Kleinman, who is also a member of the North Central Texas Council of Governments Regional Transportation Council, said he wants to see North Texas cities take a regional approach to regulating the growing industry.

"Once we determine best practices, I hope our neighbors will follow suit and not take a city-by-city approach," Kleinman said. "Even though Plano put in some regulations, it was very light. We've got to work together. I really believe we cannot build our way out of congestion. We've got to find a way to get people out of their cars."

http://www.star-telegram.com/article202335034.html
North Texas unity showing cracks as LBJ East waits another month — and costs another $5 million

March 12, 2018
Written by Ray Leszcynski, Communities
Dallas Morning News

ARLINGTON — North Texas' elected officials and transportation planners have always stood unified to make improvements to LBJ East, the 10.8 miles of Interstate 635 deemed the region's top highway priority.

But now that the $1.8 billion mega-project seems destined to put three other regional freeway upgrades on hold, that solidarity is starting to show signs of cracking.

Dallas officials this week said they would not back the plan that is on the board for the stretch of LBJ freeway that runs through their city, Garland and Mesquite. That plan has no tolls for LBJ East — instead moving money away from improvements to Interstate 35E, Interstate 30 and U.S. Highway 80.

"At this time, Dallas is opposed to moving forward with 635E without having the managed lanes as a part of it," Dallas City Council member Sandy Greyson told the RTC on Thursday at its meeting here.

Building LBJ East with two tolled, managed lanes in each direction instead of affecting I-35E, I-30 or U.S. Highway 80 was also supported by residents at a community meeting in Lake Highlands last month.

'Heading into troubled waters'

Both the Regional Transportation Commission, which doles out local highway dollars, and the Texas Transportation Commission decided this week to wait until April to vote on LBJ East — knowing that every month without action, the eventual cost of the project rises about $5 million.

A month ago, Lee Kleinman, the Dallas City Council's transportation chairman, told the RTC he didn't like the idea of threatening the projects of regional partners who had faithfully stood unified behind LBJ East. Others echoed that sentiment at Thursday's meeting and to Michael Morris, transportation director for the North Central Texas Council of Governments.

"Lots of communities have weighed in [to say], 'It sure would be nice if you don't cash in the already approved project on Interstate 30, on 80, on 35,'" Morris told the RTC. "In my experience here, we have never cashed in a project to fund another project."

Denton County Commissioner Andy Eads called the idea of shifting money from approved projects "cannibalizing." He said it endangers the RTC's ability to work for the benefit of North Texas as a whole.

"We're heading into troubled waters with this practice. It's a paradigm shift," Eads said. "We are going to have to be a divided region looking out for each individual project."

'This ship is ready to sail'
When pressed by the TTC in Austin in January, Morris did not want to name the highways that might be delayed. The commission oversees the Texas Department of Transportation and passed on LBJ East at that meeting.

Citing a $1 billion gap between available funds and the cost of LBJ East, TTC has continued to ask for the naming of specific projects to be held so that LBJ East can be built.

"I have asked that the RTC address the remaining funding gap and I have asked that the RTC demonstrate alignment with the non-tolled direction for the project," J. Bruce Bugg, Texas Transportation Commission chairman, said in a March 6 letter to RTC chair and Cedar Hill Mayor Rob Franke.

Bugg's letter also took issue with an email sent by Morris on March 2 with "several dozen questions to TxDOT that appear to question the non-tollroad policy of the commission."

Morris said it is at the direction of the RTC and residents that long-term planning continues to incorporate tolled highway lanes and roads to help build projects faster.

Later in Thursday's meeting, RTC members noted a large number of toll-financed projects in the 2045 Mobility Report. The 60-day public input period for the 2045 Mobility Report starts April 2.

"This ship is ready to sail, and there's no way we can design a new ship between now and April 2," Morris said.

Editorial: The annual dash for cash isn’t a long-term transit solution

March 13, 2018
BY THE STAR-TELEGRAM EDITORIAL BOARD
Fort Worth Star-Telegram

For now, Fort Worth’s private sector is riding to the rescue of one public transit service. That’s good news, as far as it goes.

Earlier this month, downtown businesses agreed to subsidize Molly the Trolley, removing an unpopular, short-lived $5 fare, making a ride on the iconic, trolley-style buses free again. The trolley route is bordered by Commerce, Second and Houston streets and Lancaster Avenue.

About 15,000 people rode the shuttle around downtown for free every month until August, when Trinity Metro started charging $5 for an all-day ticket. Ridership was cut in half, so downtown businesses recently donated $136,800, or a year’s worth of fares, to make Molly free again. But Sundance Square, the hotels and others providing the money only gave enough cash for a year.

What happens after that? It’s good to know because Trinity Metro is launching another transit service also receiving short-term funding from businesses.

It’s called the Dash. The business community believes that new bus service will become a vital link between the restaurants, bars and museums along West 7th Street and the central business district.

Set to start later this year, the Dash will use sleek, all-electric buses and run every 15 minutes between downtown and the near west side and the Cultural District, with a focus on late-night service to the restaurants and bars during the week and on weekends. Businesses also hope the buses will be attractive to a younger, hipper, transit-oriented user.

The merchants and museums are raising $200,000 to keep tickets on Dash to about $2 a ride. It will cost about $1 million year for overall operations of the new bus line.

It’s good to see the business community get behind Molly and the Dash. It’s also logical since most public officials agree that mass transit is a driver for any future economic development. The campaign to land Amazon made that abundantly clear.

Both fundraising campaigns are examples of how important the private sector believes mass transit is to Fort Worth’s overall economic health. We applaud their efforts. But the city and Trinity Metro can’t continually rely on merchants’ largesse to subsidize these crucial services a year at a time.

The city and Trinity Metro must develop a plan for expanding and financing transit. In January, City Manager David Cooke presented the Fort Worth City Council with options for coming up with additional dollars. So far, all we’ve heard is talk and not much else.

The annual “dash for cash” isn’t sustainable. It puts us at risk for missing the bus — and other public transportation opportunities.
L.A. Taps the Brakes on Freeway Expansion

March 12, 2018
By Julia Wick
CityLab

After resistance from environmental and community groups, a plan to add lanes to the 710 has been put on hold, but critics remain wary.

A controversial project to widen a heavily trafficked freeway in Los Angeles County sputtered to a surprising halt earlier this month. Transportation officials had been expected to choose between two expansion plans for the 710 freeway in southeast L.A. County. Instead, the board of Metro, the county’s transit agency, voted to move ahead with some improvements while tabling the controversial $6 billion scheme to add an additional lane in each direction from Long Beach to East L.A.

In an (in)famously sprawling metropolis where the freeway network doubles as civic iconography, the 710 expansion had been framed as a referendum of sorts on Southern California’s mobility priorities. The original midcentury creation of L.A.’s freeway system left a bitter legacy of displacement, and the very same (largely minority) communities that were sliced and diced for that construction have been battered by the adverse environmental effects of freeway proximity. The 710 freeway corridor—dubbed the “diesel death zone” for its traffic-related health impacts—stands as Exhibit A for that phenomenon, and community groups had vocally opposed and organized against the expansion plans for many years.

The unanimous vote by Metro’s board of directors doesn’t definitively rule out a future expansion of the 710 freeway; it just punts the decision for what could be years to come. But even that represents a shift in the status quo for a city that has promised to invest more heavily in non-automotive mobility (see the passage in 2016 of Measure M, which will fund some $120 billion in transit projects over the next 40 years). It also speaks to the increasing—and long overdue—volume of environmental justice concerns in policy discussions, and a dawning understanding that adding lanes is rarely a cure-all for a clogged highway. Most foes of highway expansion are now very familiar with the principle of “induced demand,” which has shown that increasing roadway capacity merely invites more drivers to show up.

Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti, who serves as Metro’s board chair, made his take on the issue clear at the meeting: “Widening freeways, we should be past that time unless we are putting vehicles that don’t emit into those lanes. Period.”

Similar freeway struggles are being fought in cities around the country, even in places whose reputation for sprawl and reliance on single-occupancy vehicles rivals that of Los Angeles. In 2016, then-newly elected Houston Mayor Sylvester Turner made headlines when he called for a “paradigm shift” away from highway widening. As proof, he cited the city’s mammoth Katy Freeway, a 26-lane monument to induced demand: Rush-hour travel times actually increased a few years after a multi-billion dollar expansion project. The Katy, Turner said, “clearly demonstrated that the traditional strategy of adding capacity... exacerbates urban congestion problems. These types of projects are not creating the kind of vibrant, economically strong cities that we all desire.”

A few years prior, Los Angeles Times architecture critic Christopher Hawthorne wrote that “Southern California’s great era of highway-building has been over for some time.” The commentary came in a column questioning the necessity of L.A.’s last big freeway widening
project, an expansion of the 405 that cost more than a billion dollars and has had little tangible effect on congestion since its completion.

So why pour billions into expanding the 710 now? In a word, modernization. The 710 was designed and built in the 1950s and ’60s, and it is ill-equipped to handle current usage—let alone the traffic of decades future. The freeway spans a mere 23 miles of Los Angeles County; the 19-mile stretch in question travels north-south from Long Beach to the 60 freeway in East Los Angeles, running roughly parallel to the concrete banks of the Los Angeles River. The 710 carries commuters, but it’s also a vital transportation artery for freight movement, connecting trucks from the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach to the rest of the country. This makes the question of the 710 expansion slightly more complicated than the average freeway-widening equation, with the volume of freight movement creating concerns that extend beyond just moving cars full of people from point A to B.

“Whether widening happens this year or in 20 years, there will still be displacement in the midst of a housing crisis.”

You might not associate Los Angeles with cargo, but the two San Pedro Bay ports are the busiest in the nation: Together, they handle a staggering 40 percent of all goods entering the U.S. by sea. The 710 freeway links the ports to the commercial railroad freight yards in Vernon and Commerce, just southeast of downtown Los Angeles, making it possible for the rest of America to get everything from flat-screen TVs to automobile parts delivered from across the globe. According to Metro’s estimates, daily truck trips through the corridor are expected to increase to approximately 55,000 by 2035, more than a 50 percent increase from the current average of 36,000 trips a day. The 710’s facelift is aimed at both adding capacity and improving traffic safety and other operational issues; more than half of the interchange ramps in the corridor, for example, have higher-than-average accident rates.

But so far, the communities who live in the freeway’s shadow haven’t had much of say in the project, says Laura Cortez, a community organizer with a group called East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice. A string of small cities along the corridor—Compton, Lynwood, Bell Gardens, Downey—have borne the brunt of the freeway’s emissions. In 2011, Scientific American characterized the pollution levels along the 710 “severe,” writing that “[h]ot spots for cancer-causing traffic pollutants have been found throughout the harbor area, particularly along Interstate 710.”

“The folks who live next to the 710 are people of color,” Cortez told CityLab. She’s a lifelong resident of Bell Gardens, a predominantly Latino city sandwiched between Downey and Commerce that hugs the eastern side of the 710. “We are folks who are low-income, working class, people of color. And we’re the folks who are not getting notified about the project.”

Like most projects in Los Angeles, the 710 expansion involves a patchwork of agencies. Metro has spent years developing the plan with Caltrans, the state transportation agency, and Caltrans still needs to certify final plans. The widening option was considered alongside a second (and far more expensive) proposal, known as Alternative 7, which would create a futuristic-looking, elevated four-lane route for low- or no-emission trucks above the existing freeway, at a cost of $10 billion.

At $6 billion, the scheme to expand the 710’s footprint isn’t that much cheaper, and only about a billion of it is currently funded. That plan was met with widespread dismay when it was proposed, particularly from residents and environmental and community groups. “More lanes,”
said StreetsblogLA, “means more traffic, more congestion, more pollution, more asthma, more cancer, more death.” The Los Angeles Times editorial board declared that simply widening the freeway would be “a missed opportunity and a waste of taxpayer money,” calling it a “a solution straight of the 1950s.” The widening would have also displaced hundreds of homes and businesses alongside the freeway. A Caltrans environmental evaluation estimated that more than a hundred homes and 158 businesses would be displaced. KCET reported that any undocumented immigrant residents affected by displacement wouldn’t be eligible for the compensation that is standard practice in these cases.

Although Metro has at least temporarily backed off the widening project, the activist groups who have long organized around environmental justice issues in the southeast L.A. County communities along the freeway are not ready to declare last week’s vote a victory. “Instead of coming up with a cohesive and thoughtful plan... the board is asking communities to take a leap of faith and just blindly trust that the agency will somehow transform this project at some point in the future,” Earthjustice attorney Adrian Martinez said after the vote, according to Curbed LA.

“We are definitely still concerned,” said Cortez, whose group is part of the 710 corridor-focused Coalition for Environmental Health and Justice. “Whether [widening does happen] this year or in 20 years, there will still be displacement in the midst of a housing crisis.”

For organizers like her, the days and years ahead will be focused on educating and involving the community on various aspects of the plan as they move forward. “Even when you’re in the Metro board room, these things aren’t easy to understand,” she said. “A lot folks are frustrated. This is a very emotional process for residents who live here, whose children are affected with health issues because they live next to the 710.”

Did construction technique lead to FIU pedestrian bridge collapse?

March 15, 2018
By Andres Viglucci, Joey Flechas, Jenny Staletovich And Rene Rodriguez
Miami Herald

The unfinished pedestrian overpass that toppled onto the Tamiami Trail on Thursday was being built under a relatively novel approach called accelerated bridge construction — a fast, tested method that carries some risks if not rigorously carried out.

Until it's fully secured, a quick-build structure is unstable and requires the utmost precision as construction continues. Properly shoring up the bridge can take weeks, a period during which even small mistakes can compound and cause a partial or total collapse, said Amjad Aref, a researcher at University at Buffalo's Institute of Bridge Engineering.

Just before the bridge’s concrete main span abruptly gave way on Thursday, crushing four people in cars to death and injuring others, a contractor’s crews were conducting stress tests on the incomplete structure, Miami-Dade Mayor Carlos Gimenez said. The 950-ton span, assembled by the side of the road over a period of months, was hoisted into place in a matter of hours on Saturday morning.

That stress testing typically involves placing carefully calibrated weights on the span and measuring how the structure responds to ensure it’s within safe parameters, Aref said. Crews may also have been adjusting tension cables that provide structural strength for the span’s concrete slabs.

“The loads have to be calculated precisely in the analysis to make sure the partial bridge would be able to carry them safely,” Aref said.

That doesn’t mean that testing or tension adjustments caused the structure to fail, he said. Other factors, from heavy wind to design flaws to a crane hitting the structure, can also come into play in a failure. It’s still too early to even guess at a cause, engineers say.

“It might not be one factor,” Aref said. “It could be a combination of things.”

In almost all bridge or building collapses, though, construction errors are to blame, not design, said Ralph Verrastro, a Cornell-trained engineer and principal of Naples-based Bridging Solutions, which is not involved in the FIU project.

Determining what exactly went wrong will likely take months. The National Transportation Safety Board has opened an investigation.

Over the coming weeks, forensic engineers will try to unravel what happened in a complicated analysis that involves picking through debris, looking at designs, and piecing together inspections, said Princeton University civil engineering professor Maria Moreyra Garlock. The construction phase, she noted, is often the most dangerous point in the life of the bridge.

Engineers could sample material at the site to test for strength, she said, and look at the sequence of inspections to determine what happened when. Site inspections might also reveal what caused the sudden collapse.

“Maybe there’s some sign that a support got unseated,” she said.
Thursday’s tragic accident is sure to raise questions over the decision by Florida International University to take the quick-build approach, adopted in large part to minimize the need to interrupt traffic on the busy highway. The decision by its contractors to undertake testing while traffic flowed along the busy roadway below will also be scrutinized. FIU was running the project under an agreement with the state.

Accelerated bridge construction has become more common in the past decade, especially in urban areas with heavy traffic, Verrastro said.

“That’s the driver and why ABC is so popular, because it allows you to keep the road open,” he said. “It’s more expensive to do, but it gains the advantage of keeping traffic moving, and that’s what makes the phone ring at the mayor’s office.”

FIU’s engineering school has become a hub for accelerated bridge construction training and research in recent years.

In 2010, after recognizing the need for more engineers trained in the method, FIU started a center focused on the approach. It has drawn 4,000 people to its webinars since launching in 2011, according to a center website, and in 2016 became one of just 20 programs nationwide to receive federal funding amounting to $10 million over five years.

The center’s director, Atorod Azizinamini, recognized by the White House in 2016 as one of the world’s leading bridge engineers, said the method is safer and more efficient than conventional construction.

“We are able to replace or retrofit bridges without affecting traffic, while providing safety for motorists and workers who are on site,” he said in a 2016 press release about the program. “The result is more durable bridges.”

The FIU center, however, was not formally involved in the pedestrian bridge project, a university spokeswoman said last week when the span was laid lifted into place.

But FIU administered the $12 million bridge project, which was funded by the federal government. Because it has its own building department, the school was also in charge of approving plans, permits and inspections for the bridge. Although the structure spans a state highway, the Florida Department of Transportation was only tangentially involved, the agency said in statement issued Thursday.

FDOT did raise one potential red flag: Under its agreement with the state, FIU was supposed to hire a “pre-qualified” engineering firm to conduct an independent design check — meaning a firm previously approved by the state. FIU used a large international firm, Louis Berger, that was not pre-approved, according to FDOT. The agency also emphasized that FIU is responsible for overseeing all aspects of design and construction for the project.

The bridge was devised to provide FIU students and others a safe way to cross multi-lane Southwest Eighth Street, also known as the Trail, to the small town of Sweetwater, where the school estimates some 4,000 students live. At least one student was hit and killed by a car at that busy crossing, at 109th Avenue, which leads to new apartments built by private developers designed to cater to the university.
FIU selected the contracting team in a competitive process. It consists of MCM Construction, a family owned contractor based in Miami, and Figg Bridge Group, a design and engineering firm based in Tallahassee.

MCM is one of the most influential contractors in Miami-Dade, and a top contributor to county races. Gimenez said he spoke to co-principal Pedro Munilla by telephone from Hong Kong, where the county mayor is leading a county trade mission.

“Obviously, they’re devastated,” Gimenez said, adding that Munilla did not share an explanation as to what might have happened.

MCM has done substantial bridge and highway work for FDOT, including on the massive Palmetto Expressway and Dolphin Expressway intersection reconstruction. That project made use of accelerated bridge construction, U.S. Rep. Carlos Curbelo said Thursday.

“This is a new technology,” Curbelo said. “My understanding is even on major highways like the 836-826 exchange, this type of bridge technology is in place and there's never been any issue with it, so this is just very surprising and we need to figure out what happened.”

Figg has designed bridges all over the world, including the iconic Sunshine Skyway Bridge across Tampa Bay. The firm was chosen to build the replacement to the Interstate 35 bridge in Minneapolis, Minnesota, after an aging and structurally deficient bridge collapsed in 2007. The $233.8 million, 10-lane replacement bridge was heralded for its state-of-the art safety systems, including sensors designed to monitor bridge stress and corrosion.

In 2012, the Virginia Department of Labor cited Figg Bridge for four violations after a 90-ton piece of concrete fell from a bridge under construction near Norfolk, Virginia. The builder did not get the manufacturer’s written consent before it modified a girder that ultimately failed, causing the concrete to crash to the ground, according to the Virginia Pilot Ledger.

Figg designed the FIU bridge as a signature structure. Yet to be installed was a distinctive support mast from which cables would be suspended to hold up the span in an upside-down V shape.

According to documents on the university’s website, a concrete rather than steel structure was chosen for the span to minimize vibrations and provide a comfortable environment for pedestrians. The broad span would have open sides and was also wide enough to accommodate benches. It would also provide Wi-Fi service to users. One reason for the amenities: pedestrians tend to shun confined bridges.

The 175-foot span that collapsed was not the full bridge. Still to be built were stairs and elevators and connectors to take the north end of the bridge across a canal that runs along the Trail into Sweetwater.

The span had undergone testing and tension cables adjusted as it was assembled from precast pieces along the side of the road.

It's possible the cables were over-tightened, causing the bridge to elevate slightly in what's called a camber, said Verrastro, the Naples engineer. Adjusting the cables to address camber would be appropriate, but that would not impact the structural strength.
“So maybe it had too much or not enough. But that’s just a guess. It wouldn’t be because of structural strength,” he said. “If they were adjusting the structural cables, it was to try to put more or less camber.”

However, adjusting the camber, or tuning the bridge, can be tricky. Robert Bea, a University of California Berkeley engineer and catastrophic risk expert, has studied hundreds of structural failings including the BP’s Deepwater Horizon, and said workers adjusting the camber on a bridge in Australia in the 1970s led to a similar collapse.

“The steel buckled while they were attempting to tune this camber, so it’s very plausible,” he said.

Another vulnerability: the span’s weight capacity. At this stage in the accelerated timeline, bridges typically need additional temporary support and engineers need to be exact about how much weight is used during load-bearing tests, Buffalo’s Aref said.

The bridge also had some unusual design features.

The bridge’s superstructure was something Verrastro said he’s not seen in 42 years of designing bridges. Rather than steel trusses, it used heavier concrete trusses. The bridge also had a concrete roof, adding even more weight.

“This was a very long span and then they used very heavy material,” he said. “The majority of pedestrian bridges are steel.” A steel bridge weighs about one-tenth of a concrete one, he said.

Verrastro, an expert in accelerated construction who had spoken at FIU’s bridge engineering program, suspects that using concrete was part of the bridge’s aesthetic, rather than structural, design. The Figg firm that designed the bridge is known for its signature bridges, he said.

“They typically get involved in ones that look fancy, but they’re competent,” he said.

Using the accelerated process doesn’t necessarily change the design, just the construction, he said. However, it does require trained contractors who specialize in the method.

But Bea cautioned that innovative methods sometimes produce new ways for structures to fail.

“Innovations always bring potential ‘failure modes’ that have not been previously experienced,” he said.

Editorial: DART ridership is falling and it will keep falling until DART shifts focus to bus service

March 16, 2018
Dallas Morning News

Two important facts explain much about the crisis of confidence Dallas Area Rapid Transit confronts as it drives into its 35th year. Population in its 13-city service area keeps going up, and yet year after year, the total number of riders who board its buses, trains and vans keeps going down.

The agency desperately needs a course-correction, and we're relieved to see new board members from Dallas regularly insist on service improvements. But a DART report issued Tuesday makes clear current reforms are unlikely to be sufficient.

On Tuesday, DART made its annual disclosure to creditors. Bondholders will find little to fret about, but another set of investors, the taxpayers in 13 cities who have spent billions to sustain DART, should look twice at dispiriting revelations about ridership. (See our July, 2017 special report on how DART has failed the riders who need it most, the working poor.)

DART attracted fewer riders last year than the year before, and there's little reason to believe this year will be any different, despite rising populations and a thriving economy where jobs are plentiful.

It's tempting to excuse this poor report on the fact that cities outside DART's 13-city service area are growing even faster than those within it. Or because jobs, too, are increasingly being located in Dallas' outer suburbs.

But that's nonsense. DART's own cities are growing, too. The Census estimated that the service area added more than 160,000 new residents between 2011 and 2016. And yet, ridership across almost every mode dropped.

Tuesday's report updated the ridership picture with 2017 numbers. Last year, DART's fleet of buses provided 32 million trips, down by more than 5 million trips four years prior in 2014.

In truth, bus ridership has been falling for years, largely because DART has aggressively rejiggered its routes to funnel more riders onto its growing network of trains. Tuesday's report shows how little success that strategy has had.

The 30.1 million light rail rides DART provided last year were only a slight bump from the 29.5 million it provided in 2014.

That means that the loss in bus ridership was nearly nine times greater than the gain in rail ridership.

That's no way to run a transit agency.

Some headwinds against DART are outside its control. But what it can do is increase the service it provides for residents within its boundaries. The most effective way to do that, and the approach that will target riders who need DART most, is to expand its bus system.
But by how much? How soon? And at what costs in terms of delay or reduced ambitions for rail?

We can't know, and neither can DART, until it develops a bus plan that rivals in scope what it already plans to spend on the suburban Cotton Belt line and a second, underground line in downtown Dallas.

These projects are worthy. But they should be subjected to a cost-benefit analysis that compares them to a similarly scaled investment in bus service.

Otherwise, bus plans will keep fighting for scraps as a rail-dominated transit system continues to shed riders like so much exhaust.

https://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/editorials/2018/03/16/dart-ridership-falling-will-keep-falling-dart-shifts-focus-bus-service
Climate change to bring North Texas longer droughts, heavy rains, 120-degree temps within 25 years

Feb. 16, 2018
Written by Anna Kuchment, Science writer
Dallas Morning News

The United States has just come off a record year for weather and climate disasters and, by most accounts, it's only going to get worse.

Last year hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria; the wildfires and floods in California; and tornado outbreaks in the Midwest and the South delivered $306.2 billion in damages, more than any year in history when adjusted for inflation.

Texas is particularly vulnerable to a changing climate. It has had more costly weather-related disasters than any other state, and those events will happen more often as air and ocean temperatures climb, scientists say.

"Climate change is not just about polar bears," said Katharine Hayhoe, a climate scientist at Texas Tech University with an impressive YouTube following. "It will affect North Texas profoundly."

Between 2041 and 2050, Dallas-Fort Worth may see August temperatures rise from a mean of 86 degrees Fahrenheit at the end of the 20th century to 94 degrees, with extremes rising above 120, reports one study by scientists at the University of Texas at Arlington.

Longer droughts and more extreme rainstorms will pose a challenge for those who manage drinking water supplies, those who raise cattle, and those who oversee our roads and railways.

The changes may also have unexpected effects on people's daily lives, including jobs. Intense heat can imperil cars and airplanes, evaporate drinking water supplies, and halt outdoor labor such as farm work and construction.

Adam Smith, a scientist with the federal government's main climate agency, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, calls Texas "the disaster capital of the United States."

As Smith explains, Texas is susceptible to almost every kind of weather and climate hazard, from extreme cold to extreme heat, from severe drought and wildfires to torrential floods. Texas is also home to a booming population and critical infrastructure, including the petrochemical plants that were damaged in Hurricane Harvey.

"Texas is a hot-spot for a wide range of extreme natural events due to its geography," said Smith. "We expect many of these extremes to become more frequent and intense as time moves forward."

While uncertainty is built into climate models, scientists have a high degree of confidence in many of the changes they observe and predict.

The bigger, longer and more common an event is, the greater the accuracy with which scientists can project how climate change will impact it, said Hayhoe, a lead author of a November 2017 climate change report overseen by scientists at 13 federal agencies. Larger events have more data associated with them and can be easier to model.
Researchers are very confident that climate change will increase both average and extreme temperatures. They are also confident that climate change is likely to increase the risk of heavy precipitation in many areas and may bring stronger droughts to the south-central and southwestern parts of the U.S.

Projected impacts on smaller-scale events like tornadoes and hailstorms are less well understood.

One area of consensus is the cause of climate change. "It is extremely likely that human activities, especially emissions of greenhouse gases, are the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century," note the authors of the Fourth National Climate Assessment, a Congressionally mandated review that scientists conduct every four years. They add that there are no convincing alternative explanations.

Here is how these changes will affect our area, the evidence behind the projections, and how confident scientists are in each of these findings.

Heat

More record-setting heat in North Texas is a virtual certainty. Already, we are living through the warmest period in the history of modern civilization, the federal report found, and that warming will accelerate.

Climate science contrarians often attack the models on which climate projections are based. Myron Ebell, who led President Donald Trump's transition team at the Environmental Protection Agency, accepts that humans are most likely responsible for warming, but he says models have exaggerated the outcome. Ebell is director of the Center for Energy and Environment at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, a libertarian advocacy group based in Washington, D.C. He acknowledges that he is not a scientist.

In fact, researchers have used models to predict global temperature changes for more than 50 years, and the models' projections have been fairly accurate over the long term. In the early 21st century, a discrepancy appeared between observed and modeled temperatures -- a period dubbed the "global warming slowdown" or "hiatus."

Scientists have published scores of studies on the mismatch and tied it to several factors that contributed to lower-than-expected observed temperatures. Those factors include a series of small volcanic eruptions, the cooling effects of which scientists had underestimated, and lower than expected solar output.

Findings from those studies are helping to improve climate model simulations and helping scientists better understand why there are differences between simulations and observations in the early 21st century, said Ben Santer, a climate scientist at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

Global average temperatures increased about 1.8 degrees Fahrenheit in the last 115 years. In Dallas, they climbed from about 65 degrees Fahrenheit during the early part of the 20th century to 68 degrees Fahrenheit during the most recent decade. If nothing is done to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, average temperatures in the city may reach the low 70s by 2050 and surpass 75 degrees by the end of the century.
The Dallas area warmed twice as fast as the North Texas region as a whole due to urbanization combined with long-term warming, said John Nielsen-Gammon, Texas' state climatologist and a professor at Texas A&M University.

Rapid development in Dallas accelerates the so-called "urban heat island" effect. Man-made building materials absorb and lock in more heat than soil and natural landscapes, so urban areas are generally warmer than rural areas, especially after sunset.

While some northern areas stand to benefit from warmer weather, that is not the case for Dallas-Fort Worth. "North Texas and a lot of the southern United States are quite close to thresholds where things get really bad," said Amir Jina of the University of Chicago's Harris School of Public Policy.

Earlier this year, he and colleagues published a study in the journal *Science* that estimated economic damage from climate change in each county of the U.S.

Once temperatures reach the high 90s, equal to or above body temperature, fatality rates go up.

And Jina's study predicts 24 extra deaths per 100,000 people each year in Dallas County by the end of the century if global emissions increase at the same rate they have been. That would be 600 extra deaths per year at the county's 2015 population level.

Heat also affects roads. A 2015 study by the University of Texas at Arlington that focused on the impact of climate change on transportation predicted "an increase in wildfires along paved highways, heat-induced stress on bridges and railroads, air-conditioning problems in public transport vehicles and heat-related accidents by failure of individual vehicles and heat-related stress."

Some of these changes are already happening. In January, grass fires in Parker and Denton counties forced evacuations and road closures.

The study concluded, "These impacts can be translated into substantial mobility and economic loss."

**Drought**

Along with heat will come stronger drought, which "has profound economic impacts," said Hayhoe.

The prediction that North Texas will have longer and more severe droughts is based on multiple factors, including the relationship between high temperatures and soil dryness and the presence of more frequent and longer lasting high-pressure systems in summer that suppress rainfall and deflect storms away from our area.

Hayhoe points to Texas' 2010-2013 drought as a probable sign of things to come. Although this drought occurred naturally, as a result of a strong La Niña event that typically brings dry conditions to our area, it was exacerbated by extreme heat. That event created severe hay shortages for cattle farmers and led some ranchers to prematurely slaughter their herds or export them out of state.
"Cotton can be drought-resistant, but not cattle," said Hayhoe.

The 2015 UTA study predicts a reduction in soil moisture of 10 percent to 15 percent in all seasons by 2050, which can also lead to cracked pavement and the premature loss of roads, railways and other infrastructure.

Heat and drought also pose a problem for drinking water supplies, which North Texas sources from surface reservoirs that will be increasingly prone to evaporation. Hayhoe says some water managers are considering pumping the reservoirs underground during exceptionally hot and dry conditions, or covering them with polymer "blankets."

The blankets are an invisible layer of organic molecules that can help reduce evaporation.

**Floods**

While it's not likely that annual precipitation totals will change in North Texas, rainfall patterns likely will. Hayhoe and Nielsen-Gammon both say we will likely see enhanced "feast or famine" cycles with torrential rainstorms in the spring followed by longer than usual dry periods.

These predictions carry a high degree of certainty, because climatologists have already recorded this trend playing out.

"Rainfall becoming more extreme is something we expect because we've observed this not just in North Texas but throughout the U.S., and models consistently predict it will continue to happen," said Nielsen-Gammon.

Warm air holds more water vapor, which feeds rainstorms. If annual rainfall totals do not increase, that translates to longer dry spells in between the downpours.

Severe rainstorms, the UTA scientists predict, will have the capacity to flood highway exit and service roads in the FEMA 100-year flood plain.

"While the state highway system was built above flooding levels, the connector roads may be easily flooded," said Arne Winguth, a climate scientist at UTA who co-authored the report.

**Tornadoes and hail**

Two events climate scientists cannot reliably project are hailstorms and tornadoes. "A lot of the things we care about are too small-scale to predict with more confidence," said Nielsen-Gammon. "The historical record is not large enough for longer-term forecasts."

There is some evidence that tornadoes, like rainstorms, are becoming more concentrated on fewer days and that their season has become less predictable.

The same is true with hail. "One thing we expect to happen with a warming climate is that the average humidity in the lower atmosphere may decrease, and if that happens it's easier for hail to stay frozen," said Nielsen-Gammon. "That factor might increase hailstorms, but that's just one of many factors that do affect hail."

**Economy**
Jina of the University of Chicago predicted in his study that climate change would decrease Dallas County's annual income by 10 percent to 20 percent in the coming decades unless emissions are reduced. "North Texas is one of the worst-affected places in the country," he said. Much of the loss comes from higher mortality rates, soaring air-conditioning costs and reduced labor productivity.

To track labor productivity, Jina and his colleagues examined national time-use surveys -- diaries kept by thousands of volunteers across the country -- and compared them with local weather data. He found that on extremely hot days, people tended to stop working about 30 minutes early.

"There's direct evidence that people concentrate less well, make more mistakes and their brain just functions less efficiently if it's too hot," he said. Heat also disrupts sleep. "The general lack of productivity leads to them saying, 'No more work today.'"

The good news is that many climate-change effects are manageable. They do require local and federal authorities to plan ahead and take action, said Smith of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

"It is important," he said, "to address where we build, how we build and also to build protections for populations already exposed in vulnerable areas."

DART’s $1.1 billion Cotton Belt plan about to come into public view

March 18, 2018
Written by Ray Leszcynski, Communities
Dallas Morning News

Construction on the ballyhooed Cotton Belt Rail Line isn't slated to begin until 2019, but the public will soon get a chance to weigh in on some of the details for the $1.1 billion project.

Among them: plans to move a switching yard from downtown Carrollton to the east, a planned stop at the developing Cypress Waters area of Dallas and 36 quiet zones where trains will cross without sounding horns.

The 45-day public input period begins later this spring when federal transportation officials release an environmental impact study for the line, which will run from Plano to DFW International Airport.

North Texas officials say folks who have thoughts about the project shouldn't be reluctant to speak up.

"This is the time" to weigh in, Carrollton Mayor Kevin Falconer said. "You don't want to wait until the construction starts. That's really too late in the game."

Officials with Dallas Area Rapid Transit hope to have the 26-mile line operating by December 2022, when it will link Plano, Richardson, Addison, Carrollton and Dallas North Lake area to the airport.

"It's not too far off into the future," said Chad Edwards, DART's assistant vice president of capital planning.

DART plans a 6:30 p.m. March 27 meeting at its downtown Dallas headquarters to receive public comments on the alignment, grade separations, station locations and facility locations.

In addition to the opportunity for public comment, a page on the DART website and a Facebook live presentation have also been part of the agency's outreach.

Later this spring, the Federal Railroad Administration will release the draft environmental impact statement, or DEIS, on the Cotton Belt line. DART says the impact statement, which includes input from engineers, scientists and technical experts, will indicate 81,349 people live within a half mile of the line.

Connecting existing destinations

In addition to stops and services to the five cities in DART’s service area, the Cotton Belt goes through — but does not stop in — Coppell and Grapevine on its way to the airport.

In addition to those living near the line, even more are employed near the Cotton Belt — 48,636 in Addison alone, according to the DEIS.

"There's also increased mobility to and from the University of Texas at Dallas," Edwards said, "providing residents some educational opportunities as well."
And at the UTD stop, there are hopes the Cotton Belt will help North Texas land H2, the $5 billion second headquarters for Amazon.

CityLine in Richardson, where the new service will meet DART's existing Red Line light rail, is one of only two places where DART has diverted from the path of the former Cotton Belt freight line. The other is Cypress Waters, an area of Dallas around North Lake and near the airport.

**Working with cities, feds**

Falconer said much of the cities' work with DART has been to minimize the noise impact. The Cotton Belt plan includes sound walls, new track, a rail vehicle with self-propelled technology and three dozen quiet zones where train horns won't sound at crossings.

Reducing noise in downtown Carrollton is a goal of a $7.5 million related project to clear room for the Cotton Belt by moving a small switching yard for freight trains. Carrollton is moving the Mercer Yard a few miles east to an industrial area near Belt Line Road and Kelly Boulevard to improve access to the downtown station, free up land for transit-oriented development and reduce noise.

"We've actually worked on that quite a few years," the mayor said. "We certainly have momentum downtown, but having a switching yard is a bit of a detraction. We knew something that would benefit our downtown area was to find a better home for that."

The city is also working with the Denton County Transportation Authority on a plan to bring the southern endpoint of DCTA A-train service a couple miles south to the downtown area.

"We do also have traffic impacts," Falconer said. "In some cases, we've separated grade crossings, others we're working with signal synchronization. We want to work to minimize the impact."

Edwards said most of the $1.1 billion to pay for the line will come from a $908 million federal railroad reinvestment loan. A Cotton Belt train car will be about the size of two light rail cars and, unlike light rail, will be self-propelled, so there won't be overhead wires.

Editorial: North Texas needs a voice on roads

March 16, 2018
By THE EDITORIAL BOARD
Fort Worth Star-Telegram

As the traffic in North Texas weaves its way through a forest of traffic cones, or sits in a long line waiting for a backup to unclog, it seems even more crucial for the region to have a strong advocate on the powerful Texas Transportation Commission.

Unfortunately, we don’t.

It’s been more than a month since Victor Vandergriff, an Arlington businessman and Fort Worth resident, stepped down from the five-member commission after clashing with Gov. Greg Abbott and Lt. Gov. Dan Patrick over how to pay for highway expansions.

Vandergriff has said he wasn’t forced to step down, but he clearly supported having managed lanes mixed into the freeway system because the tolls those roads raised helped pay for, and speed along, projects that were needed to keep the region’s population going down the road.

But Abbott and Patrick oppose that approach, saying they want to reduce the state’s reliance on toll roads and that voters approved propositions in 2014 and 2015 that pumped billions into new infrastructure, but not paid lanes. Abbott told the commission not to use tolls to pay for projects.

Vandergriff thought it was time for him to exit. “Obviously, I’m frustrated we can’t get projects moving as fast as we could or should. It’s just time for new blood,” Vandergriff told the Texas Tribune when he stepped down.

Which leaves us anxiously waiting for Abbott, who appoints the commission’s members, to pick someone to replace Vandergriff.

Political observers speculated that this region’s next appointee will likely come from the east side of the Metroplex, since someone from Fort Worth has held the seat for years. Before Vandergriff, Dallas/Fort Worth Airport Board Chairman Bill Meadows served on the board.

The governor’s office would only say Friday that they are working quickly to find the best person.

But hopefully, whoever the governor appoints, will recognize that for years this region has used a mixture of toll fees, private investment and state funding to pay for projects that the state alone simply couldn’t afford. This funding formula has already provided more than $4 billion for the entire North Texas Express project.

Losing Vandergriff definitely was a blow. We couldn’t have missed him more as we recently dodged orange cones or endured traffic jams. But it doesn’t have to be crippling if the governor appoints someone who has driven a mile or two on our North Texas roads.
Comptroller: Credit rating at risk

Comptroller's proposal to invest rainy day fund draws interest, scrutiny

March 20, 2018
Written by James Barragán, State government reporter
Dallas Morning News

AUSTIN -- Credit rating agencies have warned Texas: If the state doesn't tackle its expensive obligations to pension systems and funding problems with public education, transportation and health care, it shouldn't be surprised to see its credit downgraded.

That was the alarm Comptroller Glenn Hegar sounded at a Senate Finance Committee hearing Tuesday, where he proposed changing the state's rainy day fund to create a revenue stream for some of the state's most persistent long-term funding needs.

"I am actually very concerned ... that in the very near future, if we don't find creative ways to address these very real pressure issues, Texas can be downgraded," Hegar said. "I want to make sure we avoid that because that is a black eye on Texas."

If the state's credit rating were to take a hit, it would cost Texas more to borrow money, which means less money would flow to the state's budget and economy.

The Texas Economic Stabilization Fund, commonly known as the rainy day fund, has about $11 billion. The account is largely funded by the state's tax on oil and natural gas production, an industry that has boomed in recent years but leaves the state open to swings in its market.

About $7.5 billion of the fund's money is in the state's Treasury Pool, which is readily available to lawmakers in case of an emergency and gathers some interest, though not enough to cover inflation. The remaining money — about $3.2 billion — is in an investment fund, which Hegar created in 2015 to allow a greater rate of return and cover some of the inflation increases.

Since then, he said, the investment fund has netted $85 million for the state — money it would not have accrued if it had remained in the Treasury Pool.

Now, Hegar is trying to do something similar with the rest of the money. Under his proposal outlined Tuesday, the bulk of the $7.5 billion in the rainy day fund would be placed in the investment fund to cover the rate of inflation. The rest would be invested in the new Texas Legacy Fund, an endowment-type fund which would have a more aggressive rate of growth.

Hegar's proposal

The rainy day fund has a "sufficient balance" threshold of $7.5 billion, a number that a committee of lawmakers sets in the fall before the beginning of a legislative session. Half of the remaining money goes to the State Highway Fund, which pays for public transportation infrastructure, and the other half to the rainy day fund.

Under Hegar's proposal, the Texas Legacy Fund would only be funded if there was enough money in the rainy day fund to meet the "sufficient balance" threshold. Then, half the money would go to the State Highway Fund and the rest would go to the Texas Legacy Fund.
The earnings from the Legacy Fund would then be available to pay for the state's long-term obligations, such as pension systems, education, transportation and health care, Hegar said.

Hegar has made this pitch before. In 2015, he asked lawmakers to let him invest the $7.5 billion in the Treasury Pool, but the bill did not pass. Had he received that authority, the comptroller’s office estimates that money would have generated an additional $128 million during the current biennium and an additional $825 million over 10 years. After 20 years, the return would total $2.9 billion.

"Every two years that we wait, is two years that we don't have," Hegar said, reminding lawmakers of the credit rating agency’s warnings.

**Senators express doubts**

But not all were convinced.

Senators including Kel Seliger, R- Amarillo, and Juan "Chuy" Hinojosa, D-McAllen, voiced skepticism of Hegar's plan and asked him to explain what he meant when saying the state had "weak funding practices" and a "structural imbalance" in the budget.

Hegar, perhaps wanting to avoid politically fraught discussions, pointed to the state pension system and added: "How much money you want to put in health care, education, transportation? Those are policy issues."

Sen. Charles Schwertner, R-Georgetown, and Paul Bettencourt, R-Houston, challenged the fiscal soundness of the proposal. Schwertner said the idea was a good one in theory, but it presented some issues when he reviewed it last session.

Investing all the money placed the state's rainy day fund at the whims of the market, Schwertner said, creating the possibility of losing public money.

Bettencourt added that once the money was invested, it would be more difficult to access in case of an emergency, especially the funds tied up in the Texas Legacy Fund, which would be more complex and require an advisory board to oversee its handling. With an all-but-guaranteed withdrawal coming in the next legislative session to help with Hurricane Harvey recovery, Bettencourt questioned how prudent that seemed.

Hegar acknowledged that the money wouldn't be immediately available once it is in a fund.

"That's the truthful answer, so that's what I wanted everybody to hear," Bettencourt said.

Still, Hegar said the proposal was a good option. Though the money in the Legacy Fund would be blocked, and intended to stay that way to generate revenue, the money in the investment fund would be available, though not immediately.

"It's highly unlikely you'll need to draw a check for $7.5 billion," said Paul Ballard, chief executive and chief investment officer for the Texas Treasury Safekeeping Trust, which is under the comptroller's office. "So you'd see that train coming. If there was need, we could begin unwinding investments. I wouldn't call them liquid, but we could plan for that."
Comptroller officials also tried to reassure lawmakers that the money would be safely invested, pointing out that Ballard oversees $60 billion in assets at the office's Trust Company. Though markets would rise and fall, Ballard said, they tend toward an upward slope.

"That's the cost of doing business," he said. "Our approach to investing is very defense-focused."

Several other committee members said they liked the idea but wanted to work out some of the details. Sen. Robert Nichols, R-Jacksonville, said he would like to see the sufficient balance in the rainy day fund determined by a formula instead of the current biannual committee decision, which becomes "political."

"I like the concept. I liked it last time, but conceptually, a few things need to be figured out," he said.

Hegar said the proposal could be implemented in different ways, but he wanted lawmakers to be aware of the proposal early so they could act in the next session.

"We're not at a crisis," Hegar said. "We're growing in the wrong direction. With that being said, the sooner we start to tackle the problem, over time the problem is much smaller."

[Link to the Dallas News article](https://www.dallasnews.com/news/politics/2018/03/20/black-eye-texas-states-credit-downgraded-comptroller-tells-lawmakers)
How the Self-Driving Dream Might Become a Nightmare

What will happen if we just accept that a certain number of pedestrian deaths are an inevitable part of adopting autonomous vehicles?

Mar 21, 2018
By David Alpert
CityLab

I’m enthusiastic about the potential for autonomous vehicles. Their great promise is that they could be safer than fallible human drivers, who kill 37,000 Americans a year. And I do believe AVs will be safer. They will not drive drunk or distracted, and they will not get overwhelmed by more information to process.

How much safer they are, though, will depend on the humans who design them and make the rules. Their driving style, whether aggressive or timid, is something that will be baked into their programming, based on real-world traffic environments and how traffic laws are enforced. The question is the same as always: Are we programming for a world that’s built for humans, or a world that’s built for cars?

The killing of a pedestrian in Tempe, Arizona, on Sunday by a self-driving Uber is showing how autonomous vehicle safety might slide from promise to nightmare.

On the evening of March 19, 49-year-old Elaine Herzberg was crossing the road in Tempe when an autonomous Uber struck and killed her. According to police reports, the car was traveling under the speed limit but showed no signs of slowing or braking for her. Uber has halted testing of all of its automated vehicles while investigations get underway, as have other companies developing AV technology. But scarcely was the blood dry before the Tempe police chief, Sylvia Moir, issued statements to the press exonerating the car.

Moir told the San Francisco Chronicle that nobody could have seen the woman “based on how she came from the shadows right into the roadway.” Moir seems unaware that autonomous vehicles use LIDAR, a laser-based system, and thus should be unfazed by shadows.

The woman was, indeed, not in a crosswalk. Bizarrely, there is a direct, curving brick path through the area, but it’s strictly ornamental: Pedestrians are forbidden from using it, and there are multiple signs posted to tell people not to use the path. The path follows what seems to be the most logical route to a nearby bus stop, and crosses the roads at narrower (and thus less harrowing) spots than the official crosswalk, which requires traversing seven lanes, counting turn lanes.

This is the engineering reality of much of Tempe, and much of suburban America: Designers create inhospitable environments in which to walk, then try to prohibit walking in the least inhospitable parts of those environments. And often, when someone is killed, police rush to exonerate the driver. That reflex seems to have kicked in quite quickly in Tempe. And I fear it could now push AV makers to make dangerous programming decisions.

Let’s imagine we have two autonomous vehicle companies. Call them Wundacar and Farago. They are competing for you to buy a vehicle or use their app to hail an autonomous car.

Wundacar designs its cars to tread carefully around pedestrians. When it passes one closely on the sidewalk, it slows just a bit. It yields patiently when people cross the street. It steers well away from bicyclists and other slower road users.

People need to be able to get where they are going quickly, right? Nobody is trying to make the roads unsafe.
Farago cars do that too, but just a little less. They don’t slow quite so much. They give way to bikes a tad less. If people are crossing, they try to nose through.

Farago’s cars might get you where you are going just a few seconds faster—just enough for passengers to notice. Might you start choosing Farago over Wundacar for your go-to app? And, in the spirit of competition, might Wundacar tweak its algorithm to keep up? Just a bit. No engineer would be deliberately making it unsafe. Just… twiddle that setting there from safety factor 10 to safety factor 9.7. Let’s see if that gets people home a little bit faster. And let’s see what that does to profits.

The local police and their counterparts will help. Someone died? Well, they were off the crosswalk, so it was their fault, right? Seems it’s not a problem that the setting went to 9.7. Now it can be 9.4. Now 9. Now 8. Now 7. Now 5.

Let’s say, instead of one person, autonomous vehicles kill 10,000 Americans a year now, or even 20,000. That’s far fewer than before automation, right? And the police agree that the cars, and the companies that made them, are not really to blame. People need to be able to get where they are going quickly, right? Nobody is trying to make the roads unsafe.

And if that’s still too many fatalities, maybe the problem is too many people in the street. We don’t need those crosswalks after all. Now that we have autonomous vehicles, no senior or person with disability or teenager needs to be able to walk; they can hail an autonomous car to get to school or the doctor’s office. In fact, let’s build fences around all the roads, just to be safe.

Congratulations. You’ve criminalized moving around in the world except in a two-ton vehicle. Our traffic gets even worse. And welcome to the world of WALL-E, where people never leave their pods.

That’s not the promise of autonomous vehicles I’m still excited about today. Beyond their safety potential, I’m excited about a world where people don’t need to spend so much of their money owning a private automobile, because there’s always one that can stop by. It’ll be a shared ride so we use our roads more efficiently, don’t have to spend billions in public dollars on new highways, and can reclaim space in cities for trees and sidewalk cafes and paths for jogging and bicycling for exercise as well as transportation.

We can get there, and to their credit, many of the companies working on the technology (including Uber) have pledged to adhere to pacts like the Shared Mobility Principles for Livable Cities, which calls for things like “prioritizing people over vehicles.”

We can insist that any pedestrian death is not acceptable, just as we do for aviation, where all incidents are studied intently, and commercial aviation deaths worldwide have plummeted from 2,469 people in 55 crashes in 1972 to just 44 fatalities—and none in a passenger jet—worldwide in 2017. There have been zero deaths on U.S. airlines since 2009.

Or, we can follow the path Chief Moir is pointing toward, where we tolerate, excuse, and justify deaths on the roadways in the name of speed. Let’s let this, the first recorded pedestrian killed by an autonomous car, set a better example for what we expect of our roads, and the technologies transforming them.

What Uber’s autonomous vehicle fatality tells us about the future of place

March 20, 2018
Adie Tomer
Brookings Institute

Sometimes when a news story hits, you just know it will reverberate. The fatal collision involving an Uber autonomous vehicle (AV) hitting a pedestrian in suburban Phoenix fits that profile perfectly. While all details are not yet public, early reporting suggests the Uber AV hit someone crossing a street outside a designated crosswalk. As an initial response, Uber pulled all of its AV services from each city where it’s testing.

The story spread quickly, as coverage poured in from national newspapers, as well as in-depth stories from tech-focused outlets and continuous threads all over social media. And it’s no wonder. There are so many sensitive news items rolled into this one event—automated technology, legal gray zones, “cars versus people” tribes—that those who support and those who fear driverless technology each can use the news itself to advance their beliefs.

Yet beyond the personal tragedy, the events in Phoenix do nothing to change the broader context that existed the day before the collision happened: American roads are deeply unsafe, transformative technology is coming whether we like it or not, and the public must now enter a complex but essential debate about how we should integrate AV technology within the places where we live, work, and play.

Any unnecessary death is a tragedy, but the collision in Phoenix was far from the only death on our streets that day. Over 100 people die in automobile-related crashes each day in America. In fact, there were 10 pedestrian deaths alone in the Phoenix area last week. Most years, these crashes represent the leading cause of death for people in their teens and twenties. It’s appalling and a steep price to pay for our car-dependent geography. And since most of us drive every day, it’s a tangible risk we all take.

The promise of AV technology is to virtually eliminate this self-created scourge. The thinking is sound: when every car can communicate with each other, and when machine-learning algorithms can capture the enormous range of interactions between vehicles and non-motorists, then we can manufacture vehicles that both get us where we need to go and ensure almost no one gets hurt in the process.

Until the tragic event in Phoenix, that dream scenario of no true AV-related fatalities still felt possible. Besides a few minor nicks—nearly all of which were the fault of human drivers—Waymo, Ford, GM, Uber, and other companies working on AVs all achieved sterling safety records. But dream is the operative word, because perfect safety was never possible.

The reality is that we’re still in the nascent stages of this new technology and streets are inherently dangerous places. There is no established algorithm for all scenarios. The testing companies don’t share their code, nor is reporting consistent from state-to-state. And we’re just now seeing AVs enter the more chaotic world of cities. It’s one thing to automate driving on a well-striped, high-quality, cars-only road. But machine learning is harder when you add “unpredictable” people, poorly striped lanes, low quality pavement, inclement weather, and other inconsistencies. Algorithms thrive on order—and city streets have less of it.
When every car can communicate with each other, and when machine-learning algorithms can capture the enormous range of interactions between vehicles and non-motorists, then we can manufacture vehicles that both get us where we need to go and ensure almost no one gets hurt in the process.

Understandably, the public will respond to this new piece of information by debating the very existence of this new technology. There certainly will be calls to stop all AV testing, not just Uber’s program. The furor could slow down other cities and states from authorizing testing, much like it could influence federal legislators to redraft portions of their AV legislation. But technological progress is hard to stop, and I don’t expect it to happen in this case. AVs simply offer too many transportation benefits—greater long-run safety, hands-free travel, subscription-based models, new public revenue streams—and there is too much private investment already underway to keep them at bay.

Instead, the truly challenging debate—the one that will last—will involve where to permit AVs to drive and how we reform other transportation and design laws in the process. It’s not hyperbole to say every single rule and penalty related to transportation and street design could be upended within the next few decades. Sound fantastical? It already happened once within our grandparents’ lifetimes.

The introduction of affordable automobiles in the early twentieth century led to a safety and efficiency crisis on our city and early suburban streets. Vehicle fatalities jumped from nonexistent to over 10,000 in a short period. In response, a genuine, long-term fight ensued over where to put pedestrians and vehicles within the shared right-of-way. Peter Norton has a great book detailing this history, but the key result is that the car was the big winner. New laws restricted pedestrians to only walk on sidewalks and cross at designated places. And while vehicles had to be registered to use the streets and drivers licensed, speed limits rose significantly, including on new kinds of streets designed explicitly for higher speeds.

We did eventually get pedestrian fatalities to trend downwards, but the unintended consequences now surround us. City-based street grids gave ways to hierarchies of fast-moving arterials and essentially walled-off residential streets. Sidewalks are no longer a given. Bountiful parking is expected. The closest commerce is often a strip mall. And while we didn’t outlaw pedestrians, most places outside dense cities and suburbs are so inhospitable to walking or biking that the design does the outlawing for us.

These unintended consequences are the direct result of transportation designs not governed by more overarching principles. Sure, the transportation priorities were clear: separate uses to manage the tension between demand for higher vehicle speeds and threats to human safety. But transportation is a means, not an end. And by ignoring the ends—building places that promote opportunity for all, are aesthetically pleasing, and steward environmental health—we’re now surrounded by a daily “place” experience that few would draw up from scratch.

We cannot make that mistake again.

AV technology gives us a chance for a do-over. Our shared challenge, then, is to ensure AV technology works for us and not the other way around. First, that means local governments who control land use and their county and state partners who control many high-speed streets must figure out new ways to collaborate on purposeful place-based design. Second, specific land use and transportation decisions must formally relate back to those broader objectives. Finally, we
must be ready to scrap every regulation we know related to vehicles and pedestrians. It’s that big.

AV technology gives us a chance for a do-over. Our shared challenge, then, is to ensure AV technology works for us and not the other way around.

Take for example the Phoenix event. Should future pedestrians have to cross streets in designated places? Do we further separate uses, making AV-permitted streets and pedestrian-only routes? Do we intermingle and make vehicles always stop for pedestrians, everywhere, every time? Do we create new tiers of speed limits for vehicles? And how should pedestrian regulations differ by neighborhood density, especially when comparing central business districts to suburbs?

This is just a sampling of questions. It’s not even touching issues around parking, pricing, or zoning, to name just a few complex policy areas. Again: every single regulation is now up for debate. We’re confronting an enormous amount of work, and it will keep many of us busy for our entire career.

The positive news is we still have time. It took decades to settle on the place and road designs we know today. And design standards are living documents, even if they can feel insurmountable for those leading reform efforts. Take bike lane designs: some cities consistently test and implement new designs, while some places still functionally outlaw them. It will be the same here as everything from national street design guidelines, building codes, best practice networks, personnel training, and even computer software must undergo redesigns to consider the newest technologies and hard-wire new long-term objectives.

The tragedy in Phoenix was ultimately inevitable, as the onset of AV’s groundbreaking technology revolution would lead to an unpredictable tragedy at some point. And while the hope is AV performance will soon point to a safer future, let’s make sure we use this specific tragedy to spark even broader long-term good.

Self-driving cars still safe despite Arizona death, Texas researchers say

March 22, 2018
Written by Sabriya Rice, Business of Health Care Reporter
Dallas Morning News

The launch of a multi-city research effort in Texas early last year boosted the state as a frontrunner in the testing of autonomous vehicles.

But after the death of the Arizona woman who was hit and killed this week by a self-driving Uber car, the national dialogue has focused on whether the technology is truly ready for prime time.

While researchers and transportation officials acknowledge the tragedy, they are also pushing back against critics. There’s risk with any new innovation, they say, worrying that the negative attention from what is being deemed the first self-driving vehicle-related death could curtail efforts to make U.S. roads safer.

“The worst thing we can do is have everyone pucker up and retrench,” said Paul Brubaker, president and CEO of The Alliance for Transportation Innovation. “We’re on the cusp of being able to accelerate deployment in a way that will transform society for the better, in a way that can be measured,” he said.

That sentiment was shared by Christopher Poe, assistant director of connected and automated transportation strategy at the Texas A&M Transportation Institute. “Humans have not been doing a good at job operating vehicles. There is promise that the technology can operate far superior to people,” he said.

Texas was one of 10 states chosen by the U.S. Department of Transportation in 2017 as “proving grounds” where companies and public agencies can test automated technology in cars, trucks and buses.

Right now, Arlington is the only place in the state where the technology is being conducted in a public space, explained Poe, who is leading the statewide project that involves five cities.

“To realize a future vision where technology is helping, we purposely set up a systematic way to test,” Poe said. San Antonio, Houston, Austin and El Paso have identified local sites where the deployment of technology could be explored, but it would first happen in a controlled environment.

Arlington uses autonomous shuttles as part of a pilot program called Milo. The shuttle moves at 10 to 12 mph on average and is limited to an off-street path in the entertainment district.

“The transportation industry is changing extremely quickly,” said Alicia Winkelblech, the city’s assistant director of strategic planning. “We are researching autonomous technology so we understand what it means for our community and how we should prepare for it.”

The Texas Department of Transportation said Wednesday that it is monitoring the Arizona investigation, but there are no plans to pause state efforts at this time.

Swift reaction
Some, like Toyota Motor Corp. are temporarily suspending some of their autonomous vehicle testing over fears that the Arizona incident “may have an emotional effect” on its test drivers.

Toyota, whose North American headquarters is in Plano, had been conducting on-road testing with self-driving vehicles in Michigan and California. And in January, the manufacturer announced plans to work with its North Texas-based neighbor Pizza Hut to test autonomous pizza delivery in several regions in the early 2020s.

In response to the death in Arizona, Uber decided earlier this week to temporarily pull its self-driving cars off the roads in four cities. Still, as the nation watches the investigation unfold, industry analysts and others worry that the high-profile nature of the incident could damage public perception.

"Most people are still highly skeptical about the safety of autonomous vehicles, so this kind of tragedy is a huge setback," said analyst Jessica Caldwell of Edmunds. “Automakers will not only need to re-evaluate their testing procedures ... but also convince wary consumers that the benefits of this technology will outweigh the risks," she said.

The human factor

Suspending research frustrates Brubaker, who said fatalities are inevitable, and that there’s a level of risk people must accept to make “the most dangerous thing people do every day” (or, driving) safer.

A report released in October from the U.S. Department of Transportation found that 37,461 lives were lost on U.S. roads in 2016, which represented an increase of 5.6 percent from the previous calendar year.

Drunk driving, speeding, distracted driving and incidents involving pedestrians were among the top causes for the deaths. There were 3,582 vehicle-related deaths in Texas in 2016, a 2.3 percent increase.

“Any time anybody dies, it’s tragic. But until we really know the facts (of the Arizona case), we need to be cautious about casting aspersions on the safety of autonomous vehicles," Brubaker said.

“We’re letting perfection be the enemy of the good.”

Researchers who ask “what could possibly go wrong" before new innovations are deployed, say there’s still much to be learned about the the interaction between the technology and human behavior, or the human factor. Mike Manser, a senior research scientist at Texas A&M, says this is particularly a concern with "partial" automation.

One of the main questions about the Arizona incident is why the safety driver, employed to oversee the car’s operations in autonomous mode, didn't do something when the car failed to stop.

While Manser can’t speak directly to that case, he thinks about it in terms of what is known about human behavior.
“We know that when human beings have free resources, they are going to find something to do, like read the paper or text,” he said. Unlike an automated airplane, where a pilot may have minutes to respond, a person on a roadway may only have seconds to hit the brakes when vehicle technology seems off.

“We’re trying to help drivers drive more safely. Automation is leading them into a situation where they may become more complacent. There are significant issues that have not been resolved that need attention before this is put out in a public space.”

Poe noted that while the state has received several inquiries from the manufacturers of automated vehicles, whose products could be tested in Texas, the efforts are still just in discussion mode.

“Nothing is mature enough to start testing yet,” he said.

When will D-FW overtake Chicago to become the nation’s 3rd largest metro area?

March 22, 2108
Written by Jill Cowan, Economy Writer
Dallas Morning News

The Dallas-Fort Worth region, once again, added the most new residents of any metro area in the country -- roughly 400 per day, or a total of 146,238, over the year that ended in July, census data released Thursday shows.

That kept D-FW firmly in its spot as the nation’s fourth-largest metro, though the region is catching up to Chicago, whose population has been sliding as economic factors tip the scales in favor of Texas, experts say.

“If there are people moving out, there’s some drying up of jobs, and if there are people moving in, there are jobs being created,” State Demographer Lloyd Potter said. “Generally speaking, that’s what’s driving a lot of the flows out of the Chicago area and into the Dallas-Fort Worth area.”

The thousands of people moving in both from other states and abroad have powered a population boom in Texas and especially in D-FW, where leaders have made a point of pitching its relatively low costs of living and business-friendly regulatory environment to companies located elsewhere.

On the list of the counties that saw the biggest gains over the year, six out of 10 were in Texas, including Denton and Collin counties, which were ninth and 10th, respectively.

Potter used the two suburban counties as an example of an increasingly common pattern in Texas’ swelling metro areas.

“When [Collin and Denton] were smaller, they were up in the top 10 in terms of the rate of growth, and now they’re cracking the top 10 in terms of numeric growth.
because the foundation is there,” he said. “The economic development that’s going on up there is drawing migrants into those counties.”

That, he said, is where the Chicago area seems to be struggling.

As of January, Chicago’s annual job growth had been the slowest of any of the nation’s 12 biggest metro areas. In that same report, D-FW ranked second, behind Phoenix, which also added thousands of residents last year.

Meanwhile, the Chicago metro lost more than 13,000 residents. Cook County, which is home to Chicago, lost the most people of any county in the country.

While Potter said he couldn’t pinpoint an exact time when D-FW will surpass Chicago, it’s possible that it could happen in coming decades.

“It depends on what happens in Chicago -- if they continue to lose population and if D-FW continues the pace that it is,” he said. “We could see it in the next decade or the one after.”

According to the new census numbers, the Chicago-Naperville-Elgin metro area has about 9.5 million residents.

According to projections from Potter’s office based on growth trends from 2000 to 2010, D-FW’s population is expected to grow to almost 10 million by 2030.

And experts don’t expect that to slow anytime soon.

Still, Potter said that as living costs rise in D-FW and decline in Chicago with shifting demand, some of the differences between the two metros could even out.

A major part of Texas’ momentum stems from the sprawling of its suburbs, which have largely been able to develop unhindered by geographic barriers like mountains or oceans. That, experts have said, has helped prevent already skyrocketing housing costs from reaching the absurd heights that they’ve achieved in cities like San Francisco.

But at a certain point, new houses will be too far from job centers, which could slow some of the D-FW suburbs’ ascent.

And as suburban counties north of San Antonio continue to add residents, they’re rapidly filling in the land between Austin and the Alamo City, Potter said.

Bexar County added the seventh most new residents over the year, just ahead of Dallas.

And Comal County, just northeast of San Antonio, was the second-fastest-growing county in the country. Hays and Kendall counties, both also not far from San Antonio or Austin, were the fourth- and fifth-fastest-growing counties in the country, respectively.

As for Houston, the new data doesn’t take into account the aftereffects of Hurricane Harvey, which displaced people across huge swaths of the region.

While the Houston metro area added the second most new residents over the year after D-FW, Potter said that essentially all of that was the result of higher birth rates and international migration, rather than movement from elsewhere in Texas or other states.
Though it’s still tough to say where Harvey evacuees will settle for good, Potter said Harris County and Houston’s populations are something he’ll be keeping a close eye on.

“We’ll have to wait a year or so,” he said. “But we are going to try to make some effort to see the impacts.”

As Pedestrian Deaths Spike, Scientists Scramble for Answers

March 22, 2018
Nick Stockton
Wired Magazine

On Monday, the nascent self-driving vehicle sector reached an unfortunate milestone when, for the first time, a self-driving car killed a pedestrian in Tempe, Arizona. This also means robot drivers are becoming more like their human predecessors—who kill thousands of pedestrians every year.

And that number has risen dramatically in the past several years. In 2016, cars hit and killed nearly 6,000 pedestrians. That’s a serious spike from the historic low—below 4,000—in 2009.

The Great Recession explains some of the fluctuation. When fewer people have jobs, they spend less time out and about, and their exposure to potential crashes drops. When times are good, the opposite happens. “Economic changes do give us a good idea of the general direction of traffic deaths,” says Richard Retting, the general manager of Sam Schwartz, a New York City–based traffic engineering firm. But the American economy’s steady recovery can’t account for the 50 percent climb in pedestrian fatalities in the space of a few years.

OK, how about other factors? Demographics matter. “We know that a 60-year-old person hit by a car is more likely to die than a 25-year-old,” says Laura Sandt, the director of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center at the University of North Carolina. She says her team factors in things like time of day and the weather—both of which might influence visibility and behavioral choices, like whether or not a person might be drunk. Intoxicated drivers and pedestrians are more likely to be involved in fatal crashes.

Then there are design factors, like the speed limit. Faster cars are more likely to hit, and kill, slow, soft bodies. “In a lot of places where pedestrian crashes occur, the road isn’t inherently safe for all modes of travel,” says Sandt.

The federal Department of Transportation started tracking pedestrian traffic deaths in 1975, and the early numbers painted a stark picture. In 1979, the all-time high, cars killed more than 8,000 pedestrians. In the ensuing decades, activists have pushed those in power to make the streets safer, with policies like lower speed limits, more crosswalks, and stiffer punishments for drunk drivers.

“We from the high in 1979 to 2009 we’ve cut the number in half, which is nothing short of remarkable,” Retting says. And look, the decline wasn’t steady. Economics has always maintained its tidal hold over the ebb and flow of pedestrian safety, and politicians seem perennially inclined toward infrastructure that favors cars. But the upward trend in pedestrian safety seemed inexorable.

That is, until 2010, when pedestrian fatalities jumped back up. And then kept climbing. “Something remarkable has happened to cause this other than the economy improving,” Retting says. He says he has looked at every variable he can think of, but none explains numbers that he describes as “jumping off the graph.” The US has experienced economic booms without such dramatic jumps in pedestrian deaths. And while more people are taking public transportation (and thus spending more time on foot), Retting has looked at data from numerous public transit agencies, and says those don’t hold the answer either. “I’m not sitting here with a smile on my face saying this is some great research opportunity, either,” he says. “I’d like to put out a report, but we just don’t have enough data.”

He suspects the spike in deaths may be coming from a factor outside his discipline’s regular datasets: smartphone use. Between 2010 and 2016, the number of smartphones in the US
increased from 78 million to 262 million. In the same time period, annual wireless data use rose nearly 400 percent.

“We already know that distraction is a serious concern for both drivers and pedestrians,” Retting says. “When people aren’t seeing threats, it makes everyone more vulnerable.” He doesn’t have enough data to determine a causal relationship—only that there is a correlation between smartphone use and the uptick in pedestrian traffic deaths.

Car crash fatalities have risen recently too, but not as steeply as pedestrian deaths. This is most likely thanks to manufacturers designing safer cars that protect their occupants in crashes, along with advanced safety features like automatic emergency braking, which are stepping stones on the way to fully autonomous vehicles.

Sandt agrees those macro level trends are compelling, and likens the uptick in phone use to a form of impairment, comparable to the way drinking or drugs affect the brain. (Incidentally, Retting’s research shows that the eight states that have legalized recreational cannabis saw a 16.4 increase in pedestrian traffic deaths between 2016 and 2017.) But to provide policymakers with potential fixes, she says researchers need to know more. “Our problem is we don’t have good data for fatal pedestrian crashes on mobile device use.”

And that data is really hard to collect. Investigations can be hobbled by the fact that in many collisions between cars and pedestrians, the people inside the vehicle survive and the people outside do not. “There’s only one side of the story being told, and the driver has a big motivation to not acknowledge any distraction,” says Retting. Police can examine people's phones, but without knowing exactly when a crash occurred, down to the second, they can’t sync it to call logs or browser activity. Also, about one fifth of all pedestrian traffic fatalities are from hit and run collisions. Besides tragic, that's a huge gap in data.

Many states recognize distracted driving as a problem—47 ban texting and driving; 15 don’t allow drivers to use handheld cell phones whatsoever. Some have gone further. Honolulu now tickets pedestrians who stare at their phones while crossing the street. The small California town of Montclair does too. And places in Connecticut, New Jersey, and Canada are considering similar bills.

Great, fine, understandable, and totally fair to say people should pay attention to where they're going, but that doesn't mean it'll work. Laws like these assign the blame on drivers and pedestrians, when in many cases there’s a shared responsibility that goes beyond the people left injured, traumatized, or dead.

“In addition to encouraging individuals to behave safely, those responsible for designing the vehicles and roadways need to work on making it easier for people to choose the safe behavior,” Sandt says, “and to be sure that they are investing in infrastructure and creating policies that support safe walking.”

That means more of the same tactics that have driven down deaths in the past: lowering speed limits, reworking infrastructure to make it easier and safer to cross the street, designing roads with everyone in mind. Because, even when the robot drivers arrive, they’ll have to share the road with the humans.

https://www.wired.com/story/pedestrian-death-rates-climb/
A Prefabricated Tragedy

The collapse of a superbridge in Florida shows how an entire philosophy of building can go wrong.

March 18, 2018 1:27 PM
By Matthew N. Eisler
Slate Magazine

It was to be a showcase of advanced bridge technology, a centerpiece of urban development in Miami-Dade County. It was equipped with titanium dioxide–impregnated self-cleaning concrete that would always sparkle white in the Florida sun. It was designed to withstand a Category 5 hurricane. And it was supposed to last 100 years.

But last week, the FIU-Sweetwater UniversityCity Bridge failed catastrophically during construction, crushing rows of cars stopped at a red light on a busy thoroughfare. Six people were killed and 10 injured.

Failures like this invoke special horror because they are so rare, which is the only solace to be had from the tragedy. As pedestrians and motorists, we take infrastructure reliability for granted in a way that we don’t with our consumer goods. We expect cars and computers to crash, and conceptually, we can cope with that, even when the consequences are dire. When bridges and tunnels implode, though, it seems like things are truly out of our hands, the sky almost literally falling on our heads.

So it is a tad disconcerting to learn that the technology and techniques used in the UniversityCity Bridge may be coming to a neighborhood near you, if they haven’t already. The bridge was a product of something called “accelerated bridge construction,” or ABC, a technique of fast-tracked prefabricated building that has strong political backing at both the state and federal levels. More than 1,000 bridges have been built with it, and Florida International University is one of the leading research centers in this kind of engineering, an irony not lost on some commentators.

To be fair, the university did not design or build the bridge, as it hastened to point out. And neither the designer nor the builder has a spotless record. With wreckage left to be cleared, it will be a while before the National Transportation Safety Board can pinpoint the exact cause of the disaster.

What we can say is that when complex technological systems fail, usually no single factor is to blame. In her study of the Challenger Space Shuttle disaster, the sociologist Diane Vaughan noted a phenomenon she called the “normalization of deviance,” an acceptance of assumptions and shortcuts that over time incrementally piles on risk until, like compounding interest on debt, a kind of technological bill suddenly becomes due.

Something like this probably happened at the UniversityCity Bridge. And when all the rubble is removed and the reports are written, it is likely we’ll learn that the collapse had something to do with the philosophy of accelerated construction. In a part of the country notorious for slash-and-burn urban development, it turns out that ABC can be much more complicated and problematic than its rather glib acronym implies.
First, let’s discuss what probably didn’t cause the collapse. The FIU bridge looked like a cable-stayed bridge, a highly reliable technology that has been around since at least the 16th century. Cable-stayed bridges look something like suspension bridges, but the physics are significantly different. In suspension bridges, the load is transmitted through two sets of cables, one set attached to the deck that is in turn connected to two main cables loosely strung between towers, and passes into the ground at the ends, where the cables are anchored stoutly. As anyone who has walked or driven over one can attest, suspension bridges are relatively flexible. They move, and even sway, in heavy traffic, strong winds, or earthquakes.

In a cable-stayed bridge, everything is a lot stiffer. There is only one set of cables and they are rigidly embedded into towers and the deck, which has to be a lot more robust than a suspension-bridge deck because the wires tend to exert strong horizontal forces. This design is favored when ground conditions aren’t suitable for the kind of massive anchors suspension bridges require. Such bridges require fewer materials and can be erected more quickly than their suspension counterparts.

Cable-stayed bridges are also more flexible than suspension bridges in terms of design and can be built in many different configurations that play on the arrangement of cables and towers. Boosters love them for their aesthetic potential, and some of the most prestigious recent bridge projects are of the cable-stayed variety, including Santiago Calatrava’s Margaret Hill Hunt Bridge and Sir Norman Foster’s Millau Viaduct. Cable-stayed showcase bridges have become increasingly popular in the U.S. and especially Florida, where they are regarded as expressions of civic upward mobility that no self-respecting aspiring metropolis wants to be without.

In the cable-stayed bridge, the tower is the thing. It bears all of the load, which it transmits to the ground, and it is also the dramatic fulcrum of the design. Suitably enough, in boat-mad Florida, the tower in the UniversityCity design was supposed to evoke a sailboat.

But the UniversityCity design was not actually a cable-stayed bridge. It only looked like one. It was actually a kind of truss, also a well-proven technology. The proposal diagrams suggest that the two primary deck sections could be assembled prior to the erection of the tower and cables. The main section weighed 950 tons, and was exceptionally large and heavy for a bridge intended to accommodate only pedestrians. It was swung into place on support pylons in a much-publicized operation employing a huge mobile jack. And there it sat for five days until it failed. Two days before the collapse, as the New York Times reported, small cracks were observed at the slab’s north end, where the tower was to have been installed and where the failure appears to have occurred. The cracks caused sufficient disquiet that engineers were discussing the structural integrity of the span, proclaiming it safe only hours before the collapse.

Understanding why the bridge was built and assembled in this way is a lesson both in the politics of prefab and civic boosterism. All first-year civil engineering students learn that concrete is good in compression and weak in tension. Steel is good in both. But concrete can be given tension by prestressing it—that is, by running steel cables through it. This can be done at the time concrete is cast, in what is known as pre-tension.

It can also be done after casting. This is known as post-tensioning and involves tightening and locking the cables that bind a cured slab. The UniversityCity Bridge used post-tensioned parts. In an ideal world, cable tensioning is part of the prefab process. For bridges that will bear heavy traffic, engineers want to achieve a slight upward bend called a camber, which flattens out under load and gives high carrying capacity. But sometime cables are overtightened, and engineers would want to resolve adjustments before final assembly. It seems that at
the UniversityCity Bridge, the slab was stress-tested not before but after it was mounted in place. In a partly assembled structure, such a procedure is risky and has been known to end in catastrophic failure. Reports suggest that the collapse occurred when workers were adjusting the cables and, presumably, the camber.

Prefab assumes that all the complexities of construction can be front-loaded into component manufacturing, so that final assembly can take place all at once, quickly and efficiently. It has been marketed as the scientific management of building, a triumph of logistics over craft knowledge. Naturally, unions tend to hate prefab, seeing componentization as a means of destroying their ability to control the pace of construction. Managers and boosters love it for precisely those reasons.

It looks as if a giant concrete Lego set was misassembled, with fatal results.

At UniversityCity Bridge, it looks as if one of the basic precepts of prefabricated construction was undermined. If accelerated construction were premised as means of simplifying project management, prefab was surely never intended to be a complete substitute for it, as those in charge seem to have assumed. It looks as if a giant concrete Lego set was misassembled, with fatal results.

So what were the problems for which this application of ABC was the solution? Ultimately, they issue from the rush to develop some of the world’s most valuable but ecologically fragile real estate. To the pioneering activist Marjory Stoneman Douglas, the story of the colonization of Florida was one of greed, violence, displacement, and destruction on an epic scale, immortalized in her magisterial *Everglades: River of Grass*, a classic of environmental history.

Modern boosters, including FIU’s ABC center, tend to reduce Florida’s problems to traffic throughput. Western Miami-Dade was hacked out of the Everglades, which in the wet season boils over with freshwater that is kept at bay only with extensive public works. Foremost among these is the Tamiami Trail, the artery that the UniversityCity Bridge was to have spanned. Built in the 1920s to connect Florida’s east and west coasts, the road is basically a long, low dam with a highway on top of it. It cut off the flow of freshwater from Lake Okeechobee to the southern Everglades, drying up the wetlands and creating an environmental catastrophe.

Today, critics regard Tamiami Trail as emblematic of Florida’s shortsighted approach to urban development, although the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has done remedial work to remedy the water flow problem. Yet it remains an important east-west highway in the southern part of the state, and so it is a strategic traffic resource. For visitors driving in from Naples, the Tamiami is Florida’s Appian Way, and the UniversityCity Bridge was to be its triumphal arch, a gateway to greater Miami. Construction couldn’t be allowed to block traffic, which is political plutonium in any auto-centric society, especially South Florida. Enter accelerated construction.

The stakes here are far larger than the ambitions of one Sun Belt city and university. The federal government has helped fund projects like the UniversityCity Bridge through its Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery initiative, a program that has drawn criticism for privileging politics over technical merit. And federal money has played perhaps the major role in terraforming the state, not least through the National Flood Insurance Program, 35 percent of which is devoted to the Sunshine State, the largest single chunk of the program.

So it is hard not to see the tragedy of the UniversityCity Bridge as a kind of metonym for the reckoning that Florida has long been setting itself up for. Designed to withstand the biggest
storms nature could throw at it, the structure couldn’t withstand a perfect storm of hasty planning, managerial incompetence, and human hubris.

The Four-Letter Word Changing Daily Commutes

Paying an extra toll for rush hour driving isn’t a popular idea with many motorists. But its time seems to have come. Is it here to stay?

April 2018
By Daniel C. Vock
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Until December, the 10-mile stretch of Interstate 66 in Northern Virginia that takes drivers from the Washington Beltway into the nation’s capital was off limits to nearly everyone driving alone during rush hour. Officials in the traffic-choked region reserved the popular route for electric cars and vehicles carrying multiple passengers.

But late last year, Virginia added another option. The state started letting single-occupancy cars use the road, but at a price. The exact price would depend on how many people were driving on it at a given moment, bringing the concept of supply and demand to the daily commute. The greater the congestion on the tolled road, the higher the charge. The idea was to keep traffic moving quickly along the highway, even if that meant discouraging people from using it. The exemption for electric vehicles was eliminated, and the rush hour period was extended from two and a half hours each way to four. The state promised to use up to $10 million of the toll money to pay for more bus routes, bike-share stations and other options that would give commuters choices other than clogged highways.

Those details, though, were quickly overshadowed by how high the tolls went. At one point in the first two months, the posted price along the 10-mile stretch hit $47.25, and it broke the $40 mark several other times. True, very few people paid that toll -- statistics showed that for the first 594,381 trips taken under the new rules, only 461 drivers paid a toll of $40 or more. And anyway, that was the point, to clear traffic off the road. But it didn’t stop drivers, local newscasters and Northern Virginia politicians from denouncing the “highway robbery.”

Managers at the Virginia Department of Transportation, on the other hand, viewed the project as a success. The fact that some drivers, even if just a few, were willing to spend $40 for a quick trip in or out of Washington, D.C., showed VDOT the value of adding a tolled option. If not for the changes, drivers traveling alone who really needed to get somewhere fast during rush hour were literally stuck with no choices. Now, at least, they had one, even if it meant paying an exorbitant price.

The sky-high tolls drew national attention, but similar systems, sometimes known as “congestion pricing” or “demand pricing,” are being installed throughout the country. There are roughly 40 of them now in 15 metropolitan areas, the vast majority of which opened in the last decade. The concept of paying more when traffic is heaviest is expanding in Atlanta, Los Angeles, Seattle and Tampa. New toll charges are being debated in Maryland and in Portland, Ore. And New York City is considering a related idea: charging motorists a fee for driving into lower Manhattan at busy times. “Political leaders and people say they want to solve the congestion problem,” says Jennifer Dill, the director of the Transportation Research and Education Center at Portland State University. “Right now, people are paying for congestion in time. Transportation planners and academics like me say, if you want to solve the congestion problem, you have to charge the right price.”
It’s the appeal of solving two problems at the same time -- managing traffic and bringing in revenue -- that largely explains why the idea of congestion pricing is getting so much attention these days. “It is a very powerful tool for managing congestion,” says Patrick Jones, the executive director and CEO of the International Bridge, Tunnel and Turnpike Association. “We’ve seen that with I-66. There’s been quite a bit of hue and cry about it, but nobody is compelled to pay that toll. The express lanes are doing what they set out to do.”

The prices and peculiarities of the I-66 toll system are new to Virginia, but the concept of congestion pricing has a long history in the state. Well before Virginia added its recent tolls, it granted Transurban, an Australian company, the right to add high-occupancy toll lanes (HOT lanes) to two of the region’s biggest expressways. The company started using demand-based pricing in 2012, when it opened toll lanes on a rebuilt 14-mile stretch of the Capital Beltway. A little later, Transurban added fluctuating tolls to the reversible lanes along a 29-mile segment of Interstate 95 through the outer Washington suburbs.

Motorists can check the shifting rates by looking at roadside signs or mobile apps. But the process that Transurban actually uses to set the tolls is nearly invisible to most users. Roadside radar devices track how many cars are traveling down certain segments of the tolled lanes at any given time, and cameras cover the entire length of the Transurban highway. The data and video feeds are sent back to a suburban office park where Transurban runs its U.S. operations out of a two-story building with an angular glass face.

Inside, Transurban employees follow the traffic on 18 flat-screen televisions covering the front wall of a sunlit room that feels like a modern college lecture hall. They also each watch a bank of computer monitors, looking for anything that could impede the flow of traffic. If a car breaks down and pulls over, they’ll send a maintenance crew. If there’s a crash backing up traffic, they can post warnings on highway message boards so that motorists can avoid the area, or at least get out of the toll lanes to avoid paying money to sit in bumper-to-bumper frustration. Operators can change the speed limit if needed.

The process of calculating tolls, though, takes place in a back room, somewhere out of sight, where servers crunch real-time data on traffic conditions. The goal is to spit out toll rates that will keep traffic cruising in the toll lanes at a breezy 60 mph.

Like the I-66 tolls, the rates on Transurban’s lanes are not capped, which theoretically means they could go just as high as they have on the neighboring interstate. But Transurban says its average tolls have been much lower: $5.77 last year on the Beltway, and $8.46 for I-95. The system saves rush hour Beltway commuters an average of 23 minutes per trip, according to the company. Even motorists using the free lanes save time, Transurban says, because other drivers are in the toll lanes.

The goal of keeping traffic moving at 60 mph in the toll lanes is a federal requirement, but it’s also crucial to satisfying customers who want the maximum benefit from the system, says Transurban spokesman Michael McGurk. “Folks that are paying the tolls want to be going at highway speeds,” he says. “They want to go 60 mph if they’re paying tolls or picking up carpoolers. They don’t want to go 40 mph.”

The arrangement seems to be working for Transurban. The company reported that in the last fiscal year, the number of average daily trips increased by 12.8 percent over the previous year. Some of that is because carpooling and bus trips have been increasing. But demand for the toll lanes is going up, too, and that, in turn, is pushing up toll prices and bringing in more money.
Transurban says its toll revenue in the Washington area grew by 23.7 percent in the year ending in June 2017, to $157 million. The average price to use the toll lanes increased by 21 percent on the Beltway and 19 percent on I-95.

In other words, more drivers are using the toll lanes, and they’re paying more to do it. It’s no wonder Virginia and other jurisdictions are planning to build more of them.

While many state and local officials are still getting comfortable with congestion pricing, the idea has been in the works for decades.

The so-called “father of congestion pricing” was William Vickrey, who first became fascinated by the link between prices and traffic when he took a largely empty train from New Haven to New York as an undergraduate in the 1930s. He started thinking about how wasteful it was that so many of the seats went unfilled when many of his fellow classmates would have loved to spend some time in the city if the train fare were lower.

In the early 1950s, Vickrey tried to convince New York City to charge subway riders more if they wanted to ride during rush hour. He suggested that all vehicles should have transponders installed, so that city officials could charge drivers for entering crowded areas, and charge them more for entering during high-traffic times. Neither idea moved forward.

In 1963, Vickrey, by then a professor at Columbia University, laid out the case for congestion pricing on New York’s bridges. He questioned why New York officials let drivers cross older East River bridges for free because the bridges were “paid for,” but charged tolls on newer bridges. That approach promoted congestion on the older bridges. “The delusion still persists,” Vickrey wrote, “that the primary role of pricing should always be that of financing the service rather than that of promoting economy in its use.”

Over time, his ideas gained more acceptance. Many transit systems today charge passengers more for traveling during peak hours. Everything from airline fares to utility rates to baseball tickets is sold using some form of congestion pricing. Vickrey, the champion of all these once-obscure ideas, won the Nobel Prize in Economics in 1996, just days before his death.

The use of congestion pricing on toll roads in the United States began slowly. The first to make use of it was State Route 91, south of Los Angeles in Orange County, Calif., which opened in 1995. The project added four tolled lanes next to eight free lanes along a 10-mile stretch of the highway. Although a private consortium built and originally ran the toll road, Orange County took it over in 2003 and kept the congestion pricing. The project gave transportation planners a real-life example of how the abstract idea of congestion pricing might work for roadways.

It came at a time when much of the technology that makes demand-based pricing practical was becoming more widespread. Electronic transponders, like the E-ZPass now used in much of the Midwest and on the East Coast, were first rolled out in the early 1990s. The transponders allowed for the widespread introduction over the next decade of open road tolling, in which drivers don’t have to slow down to pay their fares at a toll booth. That saves them a lot of time and makes the toll itself seem less onerous.

The new experiments also benefited from changes in federal transportation policy. In 1991, Congress passed a transportation funding law that for the first time let states use congestion pricing to set tolls on federally backed highways. Congress has long prohibited states from adding tolls to existing interstate lanes, but it did start allowing states to convert carpool lanes
It also let states toll newly added lanes along those interstates. The administrations of both George W. Bush and Barack Obama encouraged states to take advantage of those exceptions, and states found many private companies like Transurban eager to get into the tollway business.

But despite the fancy algorithms and larger societal goals, the fact remains that congestion pricing still takes money out of drivers’ pockets. In many quarters, “toll” is still a four-letter word.

For most traditional opponents, the pricing structure doesn’t fundamentally change the argument against tolls. Truckers are one example. The American Trucking Associations has long favored raising fuel taxes to pay for better roads rather than imposing new tolls. The trucking industry says it can live with congestion pricing, if it allows truckers to avoid tolls by using general purpose lanes. But any attempt to use variable rate tolls to discourage truckers from traveling at peak times will likely fail, says Darrin Roth, the group’s vice president of highway policy, who says truckers rarely opt to pay for faster lanes when given the choice. “The goal of congestion pricing,” he says, “is to get people onto alternative modes of transportation or change the time of day they travel. But changing modes is not an option for truckers. And pickup and delivery times are determined by customers.”

Most trucking companies don’t have any way to assign the costs of particular tolls to individual customers; instead, the costs of tolls are lumped together as an overhead expense that’s borne equally by everyone who buys the service. Charging a customer for getting a delivery during rush hour could be even more complicated under congestion pricing, Roth says, because a company would not know what toll rate to charge the customer until the truck was on its way.

Likewise, congestion pricing doesn’t change the calculus for opponents of adding tolls to existing interstates, something that the Trump administration, like the Obama administration before it, has encouraged.

Stephanie Kane, a spokeswoman for the Alliance for Toll-Free Interstates, says toll roads can overcrowd surrounding communities when drivers get off the interstate to look for a free route on smaller roads nearby. And toll roads are relatively inefficient ways to raise money for transportation projects, at least compared to fuel taxes. “Running it is complicated,” she says. “The contracts are complicated. Enforcement is complicated. They’re so inefficient in so many ways, that tolls should be removed from the conversation about transportation funding altogether.”

Managed lanes, whether they have fixed or variable toll rates, have also long been disparaged as “Lexus lanes,” catering to rich motorists. Toll operators insist that the tolled lanes are not there to provide an everyday shortcut for wealthy drivers, but to make it easier for ordinary motorists to get where they are going when they cannot be late, whether it’s catching a flight, meeting with a boss or picking up children from school. Many researchers have concluded that this is, in fact, how most drivers use the lanes -- as an option in emergencies -- although richer motorists do use them more often.

But among the voices urging caution about congestion pricing are experts in the tolling industry itself. They warn that such a system works only in certain circumstances, and that it needs to be tailored to the specific needs of a region.

Matthew Click, an expert on managed lanes for the construction engineering company HNTB, has reviewed dozens of congestion pricing proposals. Most times, he says, the projects aren’t
feasible. They fall short for a number of reasons. From a practical standpoint, an area has to have enough of a traffic problem -- measured by distance, density and duration -- to make congestion pricing workable. There needs to be a way to solve that problem with new lanes. Even more important, local leaders must first agree on what the problem is. “The very first thing public officials have to ask themselves is why they want to institute this type of policy in their area,” Click says. “Is it to improve transit? Better air quality? Mobility benefits? A lot of people rush to ask how we’re going to do it, but I would say they should start with the why.”

Robert Poole, the director of transportation policy at the libertarian Reason Foundation and one of the proponents of the original Orange County experiment in the 1990s, agrees that some of the difficulties of demand pricing projects trace back to differing visions of what they should accomplish. Some proponents see the tolled lanes as a way to encourage people to share rides. On the other hand, Poole puts a priority on providing a congestion-free route for buses, emergency vehicles and drivers who are making high-value trips.

It’s not just an academic distinction. One reason the tolls on I-66 are so high, Poole says, is that, for the time being, vehicles carrying only two people ride free there. With so many two-person carpools, there’s little room for toll payers. Virginia plans eventually to raise the threshold for free rides on I-66 to three passengers per vehicle, which would bring it in line with the other toll facilities in the area. But Poole would abolish the carpool exception completely, something that toll roads in the Austin and Baltimore areas have already done.

Atlanta is moving in that direction, too, as the region plans to expand its network of tolled lanes aggressively over the next decade, says Chris Tomlinson, the executive director of Georgia’s State Road and Tollway Authority. The state will continue to allow a free ride on Interstate 85’s existing carpool lanes, but in its other projects, where the state will be adding new lanes, the only vehicles that will likely get out of paying tolls are transit buses. That policy is simpler, Tomlinson says. “We are all in on the public policy that these toll roads should provide a benefit for those who pay the tolls or are using public transit operating in these corridors.”

Another factor that can slow traffic in managed lanes is an artificially low cap on toll prices. Low tolls are politically popular, but if they are too popular, they can defeat the purpose of the toll lanes, which is to keep the flow of traffic at an acceptable pace. That’s part of the problem in the Salt Lake City area, where Utah officials hoped to keep traffic in the Interstate 15 toll lanes at 55 mph. Tolls there have been capped at $1 a ride, and average speeds at peak times have dropped to 31 mph. State leaders are considering doubling -- or even tripling -- the maximum toll.

Another problem in some areas is cheating: People will set their transponders to carpool mode even if they have no other passengers in the car. On the toll lanes of Los Angeles’ 110 freeway, for example, it is estimated that 25 to 30 percent of drivers are in the lanes illegally. The county is working on technology that can determine how many people are in a car, so it could automatically send tickets to freeloaders. But Poole says the tolling industry has been trying for years to develop that type of tool, with no success. “The only enforcement has been when an officer in a patrol car looks in and sees that there’s not two or three people riding in the car,” he says. “It’s kind of a joke, frankly. And a lot of people are troubled by it.”

Perhaps the biggest threat to congestion pricing on toll roads is the potential for a political backlash, like the one in Virginia early this year. But in Virginia and other states that are building a network of toll lanes, changing course could be difficult.
Several Virginia lawmakers from the D.C. area tried to convince their colleagues to change the tolling scheme for I-66. Some of their ideas would not have affected the top rate, but merely scaled back the hours when the tolls are imposed. So far, though, those changes haven’t found much traction in the legislature. One reason is that the state already signed a deal to add new toll lanes using congestion pricing for I-66 outside the Beltway. As part of the deal, the private operators promised to pay $500 million to the state up front. But some or all of that money could be in jeopardy if Virginia changed the tolling rules for its segment of the highway. Meanwhile, the state has reached deals with Transurban to extend its congestion-priced toll lanes on I-95 north toward Washington and south toward Fredericksburg. Despite the recent outcry, it looks as if Virginians will see a lot more congestion pricing, not less, for years to come.

WEATHERFORD – An $11.5 million grant could set the city back more than a century.

The money from the North Central Texas Council of Governments will help the city “bring back Weatherford’s original historic downtown square,” read a news release.

When the dust settles, the square would look a lot more like it did not long after the courthouse was built in 1885, said City Manager Sharon Hayes.

Hayes described what the square evolved into as “four islands, instead of the intended community gathering area. Even with 40,000 people at Peach Festival, we still have traffic going through north and south. We’ve lost the walkability of the square.”

The project also could involve a swap that will give portions of U.S. 180, Farm Road 51 (Main Street), and Farm Road 2552 to Weatherford, shifting control from the Texas Department of Transportation to the town.

“This control will allow Weatherford to redirect truck traffic away from the central core of the community,” said Terry Hughes, the city’s director of capital improvements projects. He added that the region’s 20-year projection predicted as many as 24,000 vehicles per day passing through on U.S. 180. Traffic crawling along 180 and 51 through the two-lane oval that skirts the courthouse already is frustrating.

And all it takes is one extra-long tractor-trailer to make a ball of worms and bring everything to a halt.

“The projected numbers would place the traffic conditions on the square at an unmanageable level that could undermine the community’s desire for a strong and vibrant downtown,” the news release read.

TRAFFIC HEADACHES ABOUND

A report from the council of governments’ study confirmed local officials’ assessments.

“Traffic going from one section of the town to another is forced through the downtown area when [drivers have] no interest in the downtown area, because no alternate routes have been provided,” the report stated. “Consequently, there should be streets around the outskirts of the downtown area permitting through-traffic movements to bypass the central business district.”

Weatherford got the bypass ball rolling in 2014, opening the Ric Williamson Memorial Highway’s western loop. Southbound drivers on FM 51 north of town can take the half-loop rather than going through Weatherford to reach U.S. 180 or Interstate 20. The other half of the loop eventually will take westbound through traffic off of 180 before it reaches the square, and carry it out to join the western loop.
The city’s goal is to turn the courthouse square into Heritage Square, officials said, finally accomplishing something residents have demanded for decades.

Hughes said traffic-pattern proposals to skirt the downtown area have been on City Council agendas since a 1961 thoroughfare study. It earned higher priority this decade.

“In 2011, Weatherford started updating its thoroughfare plan,” Hughes said. “The idea is to bring traffic off 180 at Santa Fe, loop around the south side of the square on widened existing roads — Spring, Bridge to Alamo and back to 180. And, we’re exploring the use of a roundabout.”

‘ORIGINAL SQUARE CONCEPT’

City officials look at a century-old photo of the courthouse square for inspiration. The square captured by that photographer was one that was easily navigated on foot.

“We want to capture the original square concept as depicted in a circa-1915 photo,” Hughes said.

Hayes said that working with the state to “take back control of the highways going through the city” is the crux of a recently drafted memorandum of understanding.

“We will give the west loop [Ric Williamson] to the state, and they’ll give us the stretch of 51 that’s inside our city limits,” Hayes said.

“The west loop will become 51, and through truck traffic will be routed onto it. We’ll redirect 180 traffic down to I-20, or divert it to the northern loop.”

Parker County is acquiring rights of way and designing what will become the eastern loop of Ric Williamson Highway from Centerpoint Road to FM 51 and the western loop, Hayes said.

Last week, the NCTCOG’s Regional Transportation Council awarded $11,552,000 for the city’s bypass, Hayes said.

Once the money’s in the bank next year, the tricky part becomes getting started, Hughes said. Designing should start in early 2019.

“I think we’re looking at three years to completion,” Hughes said.
Dallas tells DART it wants fewer stops, more neighborhood amenities for Cotton Belt rail line

March 29, 2018
Written by Ray Leszcynski, Communities
Dallas Morning News

Dallas officials are OK with fewer stops as the Cotton Belt commuter train rolls through the northernmost portions of the city starting in 2022, so long as residents get 15-foot sound walls and reduced traffic impact.

That's what the Dallas City Council told DART in a resolution approved Wednesday, while also reminding the transit agency that what the city really wants is better bus service.

Dallas Area Rapid Transit continues to move toward building its first east-west rail line, the $1.1 billion Cotton Belt project to connect North Dallas to Plano, Richardson, Addison, Carrollton and DFW International Airport.

Dallas officials opposed to the Cotton Belt told DART in fall 2016 they would rather the agency prioritize improving bus service and building a downtown subway, also known as D2. DART agreed that October to build both the Cotton Belt and the subway.

Cotton Belt construction is scheduled to start next year. The federal government's draft environmental impact statement for the rail line is weeks away, to be followed by a 45-day public input period.

Two stations targeted

Cities are registering their positions now. A resolution approved by Plano officials Feb. 26 didn't sit well with North Dallas council member Sandy Greyson because it underlined support for building a station at Coit Road in Dallas — a proposed stop that Dallas doesn't want and that DART says only has "mixed support."

"I've gone to every meeting that there's been in the North Dallas area, and I have had a grand total of three people say they want a station there," Greyson told DART officials at the council's Mobility Solutions, Infrastructure and Sustainability Committee meeting on Monday. "There's not mixed support for it in Dallas. Support is coming from people outside of Dallas."

There's even less momentum in Dallas for the Preston Road station. Dallas' resolution asks that both stops be removed from the Cotton Belt plan.

DART believes eliminating North Dallas stations would increase daily ridership about 15 percent at a station in Addison and about 41 percent at a stop at the University of Texas at Dallas.

Environmental clearance of all the stations does not mean they all have to be built, Timothy McKay, DART vice president of growth and regional development, told the council. DART already lists Preston Road as a "candidate for elimination."

"The number of businesses that would have to be moved, the street configurations, all of those things make it very, very challenging, and there's just not a lot of support for that station," McKay said.
Dallas officials do support a Knoll Trail station, a proposed stop about a mile away from Preston Road and close to the Dallas North Tollway.

The city also supports a stop planned near Cypress Waters, a 1,000-acre mixed-use development near LBJ Freeway and Belt Line Road. And it backs DART's plan to bend the commuter line south of the existing Cotton Belt freight line at that location.

**Also on city's wish list**

Only about a quarter of the 26-mile planned path of the Cotton Belt cuts through Dallas. But of roughly 5,400 residents who would be moderately or severely impacted by the train, according to DART's environmental study, nearly half live in Dallas.

Planned grade separations — the track passing over or under — at Coit Road and Hillcrest Road will help minimize the impact on Dallas traffic.

Under DART's plan, Dallas neighborhoods will get 17 of the Cotton Belt's 19 planned sound walls — more than three miles in total length. According to the council resolution, the city will settle for noise barriers no less than 15 feet tall. DART has discussed sound walls as low as 7 feet.

"An important component to understand is the difference between mitigation and betterments," said council member Lee Kleinman, chairman of the mobility committee. "Mitigation is what is really required by DART to protect the community. We're pushing in this resolution for betterments, which are really well and above what is required."

Dallas' resolution also asks DART for rubber track aggregate, rather than rock, to reduce vibration; enhanced landscaping; double-gated crossings; and quiet zones — no train whistles — at all at-grade street crossings.

**Better busing sought**

But the City Council on Wednesday also stipulated in the resolution that DART design and set funding aside for bus system improvements throughout the city before breaking ground on the rail line.

"I anticipate and expect for DART to start listening to the requests," Mayor Pro Tem Dwaine Caraway, who represents southern Dallas, said before voting in favor of the resolution. "Every time there is something that is north, we can find the dollars, but when it is south and in the Lancaster [Road] area where DART rail first begun, it falls on deaf ears."

Greyson said many in her district, where the Cotton Belt trains will run, don't even want the line.

"But if it's going to happen, then we need these protections that are listed in this resolution," she said.

Officials: Toll roads may be key to Texas’ economic growth

March 28, 2018
Bob Sechler
Austin American-Statesman Staff

A four-letter word — toll — must re-enter the state’s political vocabulary if Texas is to solve its serious traffic congestion problems that are only getting worse because of continued rapid population growth, local business and civic leaders were told Wednesday.

“We don’t have sufficient funds to cover all of the (road transportation) needs in Texas” without resorting to tolls in some areas, state Sen. Kirk Watson, D-Austin, said during an Opportunity Austin event at the JW Marriott hotel.

Opportunity Austin is the economic development affiliate of the Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce.

“Everybody in this room knows there is no room on our current road system” for all of the new vehicles anticipated to clog Texas highways in coming years, Watson said.

Watson made the comments after J. Bruce Bugg Jr., chairman of the Texas Transportation Commission, told the group that his agency is in the early stages of exploring the possibility of prioritizing some available state road money for congestion-relief projects in Austin, Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston and San Antonio.

The transportation commission axed tolls from its toolbox of potential road financing mechanisms late last year after Gov. Greg Abbott and Lt. Gov. Dan Patrick, both Republicans, took anti-toll stances.

Bugg, who was appointed by Abbott, said Wednesday that preliminary discussions are underway regarding the possibility of using more than $4 billion annually in new tax money for roads — which Texas voters approved in referendums in 2014 and 2015 — on projects aimed at unclogging the top 100 congestion “choke points” across the state. Thirteen of the choke points are in the Austin area, he said, and 92 are in one of the five major metro areas.

If the new money is just deployed on the top 100 congested roadways, the commission is looking at “what effect that will have” statewide, Bugg said.

He added that his agency is “certainly mindful” that many other regions of Texas are experiencing traffic problems as well, which he said will be taken into consideration.

“Congestion is not just an Austin problem or a problem in all these five major metropolitan areas — it’s a Texas problem,” he said.

Later Wednesday, Bugg’s commission heard a presentation on the idea during a previously scheduled work session. Bugg and other commissioners stressed that the presentation was for “discussion purposes only” because the plan is hypothetical, and they took no action on it.

Regardless, Watson said during the Opportunity Austin event that he doubts such a plan would fly statewide.
“Huge parts of the state will never see (road) money again” if the money from the 2014 and 2015 referendums are prioritized to the largest metro areas, Watson said. “That is going to create a policy problem in the state.”

Gary Farmer, chairman of Opportunity Austin 4.0 — the next iteration of the organization’s five-year economic development road map — agreed with Watson that tolls “absolutely” have to be part of the state’s congestion solution.

“Economic development (in Texas) is history if we don’t get new roads,” Farmer said in an interview after the event. “If we want to maintain a quality of life … we need to build these roads.”

He also disputed the notion that Texas residents are predominantly anti-toll, citing the estimated 1 million toll tags that have been issued in the Austin area.

“There’s only two types of roads — tax (funded) or tolls,” Farmer said. “The thing about toll roads (is) you don’t have to use them if you don’t want to.”

Also Wednesday, Opportunity Austin released its annual report for 2017, showing that it had spent about $4 million on economic development initiatives last year on about $3.8 million in revenue. The organization is wrapping up its five-year Opportunity Austin 3.0 road map — which covers 2014 through 2018 — and Treasurer Cindy Matula said it’s normal in later years for expenses to outstrip revenue.

Opportunity Austin is attempting to raise $30 million for its 4.0 plan that will run through 2023 and include a range of new programs, such as efforts to address transportation and affordability issues. For the 3.0 plan, Opportunity Austin raised about $21 million in 2013 out of a targeted $25 million.

After Uber’s fatal self-driving taxi crash, city planners suggest a radical new solution

April 2, 2018
By Andrew Griffin
The Independent

When a woman was hit and killed by a self-driving Uber taxi in Arizona recently, it was both an awful shock and a horrifying inevitability.

The crash was the combination of a series of tragic and small problems. If the car had been going slightly more slowly, if either its human or computer driver had spotted the woman slightly earlier, or if the road was slightly differently designed, then it’s possible no accident would have happened.

But there was also a grim lack of surprise in the crash. The cars were always destined to be involved in fatal accidents – even if they are projected to happen much less than they do in cars driven by humans – and that will continue, with this first death all but guaranteed to be followed by many more.

Limiting those fatal crashes will be the responsibility of the companies, policymakers, designers, engineers and other experts. But it could also be the responsibility of a group little talked about in the debate over autonomous vehicles: town planners, and the politicians who decide how we build the places we live.

There was always going to be a first crash. But this one seemed in so many ways to exemplify the challenges those concerned by the social impact of autonomous vehicles now face: the woman hit by the car was pushing along her bike, a form of transport mostly neglected by many modern city planners, and some have suggested she was forced to cross in the middle of the road by a road scheme that is almost actively hostile to pedestrians.

That the car was part of a self-driving vehicle trial by Uber, a company known for providing cabs, might appear strange. But the race to make self-driving cars is being entered by just about everyone with any connection to automobiles: traditional car companies, technology firms such as Google and taxi companies like Uber. (That the latter two industries have always had something of an allergic reaction to regulation might be chilling to the people who have to share roads with their vehicles.)

Those technology companies have done something like this before. Autonomous vehicles are often compared to the internet: both potentially transformative, both potentially disastrous. And getting them right could require avoiding some of the mistakes that were made when the web was introduced.

“What we’re seeing is that the focus has been largely on the engineering side – on developing vehicles,” says urban planner Mark Wilson. “What we found with other technologies like the internet, and will probably find with autonomous vehicles, is that the social context lags way behind.”

Those social questions are not about engineering. They’re about how we share and live in our cities: how space should be taken by cars and road, and how those cars should be controlled. It’s not too grand to say this might require entirely rethinking what we expect from a city.
"On the dream side, we’d see a road with vehicle-sharing, more efficient vehicles, perhaps a denser city and more efficient use of urban land area," says Wilson. "Then there’s also the planner’s nightmare: people own autonomous vehicles and won’t share, they drive more miles, people will live in the countryside and sip coffee and work on their laptop while the vehicle travels even further, because now the time and frustration has been reduced.

“We all bring our own hopes and dreams. For planners, we are optimistic but it still may not come about.

“The internet started as a very optimistic technology, but what we’ve seen is that it’s bogged down in great complexities related to how it’s used.”

If we’re not careful, self-driving cars might simply make it easier to get around; they’ll trigger no deep rethinking of our cities, apart perhaps from letting people travel further and longer and thereby entrenching many of the problems that currently flow from unequal and inefficient transport systems. “When they invented low-fat foods, people ended up eating more of them,” says Jarrett Walker, a public transit consultant who regularly speaks about the future of transport.

“The problem, the challenge of induced demand in particular is enormous.”

Now is precisely the time those questions need to be asked: someone has died on our streets, and did so in service of a technology that remains mostly hypothetical to most people. “Not many people have shared a road with an autonomous vehicle, or at least known about it,” says Wilson. “We don’t have a lot of insight into how people will feel – whether it’ll be upsetting, off-putting or reassuring. We just don’t know yet.”

But if most people believe autonomous vehicles to be a long way off, many of the people who should be thinking about it appear to think those questions have already been answered.

“Very frequently, when I’m talking about any issue about how to build a city or to build a better transport system in the pre-automation condition, many people have been trained to tune out and not care, because soon we’ll have autonomous cars and they’ll change everything,” says Walker.

“There are two problems. First, the cars won’t change everything: there are still basic geometric problems. And secondly they undermine support for a space efficient, large-scale public transport system.”

On his website, Walker describes how he came to do the work he does: seeing the transformation of Portland, Oregon, as the city changed direction and adopted public transit. “Experiencing this transformation as a teenager – commuting by bus across the city through a downtown that grew more vibrant by the day – taught me to believe in the possibility of rapid and fundamental change in how a city imagines and builds itself,” he writes. It’s easy to imagine teenagers in a few years will be living through the exact same kinds of revolution, for better or worse.

Whether we integrate autonomous vehicles into a public transit network, or an even more extreme version of the current, privatised network of road vehicles, is another question that governments must yet still have mostly not reckoned with. Uber’s work on self-driving vehicles is
largely selfish – it hopes eventually to do away with the drivers that it has to pay, and who have largely served to be a frustration because they ask for proper rights and protections.

But Uber’s car will at the very least be shared; if it is successful, it might do away with some of the paradigm of each person owning a car, which is unsustainable as cities continue to grow and become more dense. “The only way that we can make an autonomous vehicle work is if they are fleets – if you experience them as taxis rather than cars in your driveway,” says Walker.

This is only halfway towards the utopia that some thinkers lay out, in which those autonomous vehicles will operate more like buses.

“We have to compare the autonomous car with autonomous public transport,” says Walker. “There simply will be no way for public transport to compete with their sudden abundance and the reduction in the hassle of driving.

“On the other hand, the sudden increase will cause so many problems that it will be an emergency.

“I assume that when we have abundant and scalable driverless vehicles, we will also have driverless buses. And because public transport operating costs are mostly labour, it can be massively easier and cheaper to run.

“That’s the only way the autonomous future works.”

The world has addressed something like these problems before. Cities had run for thousands of years before the car turned up, but even the most ancient places were able to adapt to the new vehicles. It’s easy to forget, however, just how much work that took and how much time was spent; there’s much less labour and time available this time around.

“The first automobile required constant innovation,” says Wilson. “Someone had to invent the stop sign, or the traffic light.

“We also had an an incredible willingness in many places to embrace the new technology and change our way of life in order to accommodate it – neighbourhoods were bulldozed, motorways were built.”

There appears to be very little appetite for restructuring our cities today. Even the places that have welcomed autonomous vehicle firms into their cities – Arizona, where the Uber crash happened, has welcomed the trials with open arms, which self-driving carmakers like in part because there is no complicated weather to get in the way of sensors – haven’t made any great moves towards fixing transportation. The Uber crash happened on a road that was built for cars, and a world controlled by them, and autonomous vehicles are mostly being placed on those same roads with few adjustments.

“In an ideal world we would overlay our planning interests with transportation. Transportation has always been a force in designing cities,” says Wilson, pointing to the fact that cities were once designed only for walking, then for public transport, and now for cars – though in ways that still need to map onto those old walking paths.

“Many cities, especially in the UK, are hundreds of years old or even thousands of years old and they’re not designed for traffic. There are problems with retrofitting cities into modern footprints.”
We may finally have a chance to reverse some of that trend. We might not need quite so much road space, for instance – so what if that became cycle space, or footpaths? “Each one of these decisions is going to be subject to national and local forces that are trying to influence the outcome, and one of the challenges in all of this is who has the responsibility for educating the public, meeting the public and explaining to voters what the future holds,” says Wilson.

“While the engineering and automotive world has been looking at this for quite a while, it’s fairly new in terms of politics, and planners and the social context.”

WASHINGTON – Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Scott Pruitt announced Monday that he would revoke Obama-era standards requiring cars and light trucks sold in the United States to average more than 50 miles per gallon by 2025, a move that could change the composition of the nation’s auto fleet for years.

The push to rewrite the first-ever carbon limits on cars and SUVs, which came out of an agreement among federal officials, automakers and the state of California, is sure to spark a major political and legal battle.

California has authority under the Clean Air Act to set its own emissions limits, and it has threatened to sue if its waiver is revoked and it is blocked from imposing stricter targets. Such a fight has broad implications because 12 other states, representing more than a third of the country’s auto market, follow California’s standards.

Pruitt’s decision reflects the power of the auto industry, which asked him to revisit the Obama administration’s review of the model years 2022-2025 fuel-efficiency targets just days after he took office. President Donald Trump told autoworkers in Detroit last year that he was determined to roll back the emissions rules as part of a bigger effort to jump-start the nation’s car industry.

“The Obama administration’s determination was wrong,” Pruitt said in a statement. “Obama’s EPA cut the Midterm Evaluation process short with politically charged expediency, made assumptions about the standards that didn’t comport with reality, and set the standards too high.”

Pruitt did not specify what limits would be put in place, saying the EPA and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration would establish a standard that “allows auto manufacturers to make cars that people both want and can afford – while still expanding environmental and safety benefits of newer cars.” The agency said he is still considering the status of California’s waiver.

Officials in that state immediately excoriated the decision.

“This is a politically motivated effort to weaken clean vehicle standards with no documentation, evidence or law to back up that decision,” Mary Nichols, head of the California Air Resources Board, said in a statement. She argued that the move would “demolish” the nation’s shift toward cleaner cars and that “EPA’s action, if implemented, will worsen people’s health with degraded air quality and undermine regulatory certainty for automakers.”

Nichols also hinted at the potential legal fight to come.

“This decision takes the U.S. auto industry backward, and we will vigorously defend the existing clean vehicle standards and fight to preserve one national clean vehicle program,” she said. The EPA’s decision “changes nothing in California and the 12 other states with clean-car rules that reduce emissions and improve gas mileage – those rules remain in place.”

The efficiency gains that the U.S. auto fleet has made in recent decades have slowed since 2013, as gas prices dipped and the sale of pickup trucks and SUVs accelerated. In the document Pruitt signed Monday, he said EPA had been “optimistic in its assumptions and projections” about the availability of technology to meet the standards and had received substantial input from automakers that they needed to be scaled back.
He suggested that if cleaner vehicles are too expensive, consumers will hold onto older cars, thereby lowering the overall efficiency of cars on the road.

Peter Welch, president and chief executive of the National Automobile Dealers Association, said in a statement Monday that while the group supports “continuous improvements” in reducing vehicle emissions, “Standards alone – whatever they are – won’t do the trick.”

The Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, whose members produce 70 percent of the cars and light trucks sold in the United States, endorsed the shift. The group estimates that it would be more realistic to require the fleet to reach a miles-per-gallon target in the high 40s by 2025.

The U.S. fleet averaged 31.8 mpg for model year 2017, according to federal figures.

Alliance spokeswoman Gloria Bergquist said in an email that her members “support the administration for pursuing a data-driven effort and a single national program as it works to finalize future standards. We appreciate that the administration is working to find a way to both increase fuel economy standards and keep new vehicles affordable to more Americans.”

But two of those members, Ford and Honda, recently urged the government to maintain the current requirements but give manufacturers additional flexibility.

At the Safe Climate Campaign, Director Dan Becker projected that retaining the Obama rule would cut carbon dioxide emissions by 6 billion tons and save 12 billion barrels of oil over the lifetime of vehicles complying with these standards.

“Even though automakers are pushing gas-guzzling pickups and SUVs rather than more efficient cars, it’s still the biggest step any nation has ever taken to cut global warming pollution and save oil,” he said.

Two of Pruitt’s predecessors were harshly critical.

“All they care about is undoing everything the prior administration did, and they’ll use any excuse for doing that. They don’t even have the industry itself asking for this,” said Gina McCarthy, EPA administrator under President Barack Obama and now director of Harvard’s Center for Health and the Global Environment.

McCarthy said that the standards set during the Obama era were based on extensive negotiations with states and the federal government, as well as with the auto industry.

“The decision I made was based on real information,” while Pruitt’s decision seemed to have no factual basis, she said.

And former EPA administrator Carol Browner, who helped forge the initial carbon thresholds for cars and light trucks in 2009 while serving in the Obama White House, took issue with Pruitt’s allegation that officials in California are somehow at fault, saying “this idea that California is dictating or arbitrating for the rest of the country is not accurate.”

Rather, Browner said, federal and state officials in past administrations worked hard to reach a compromise that gave certainty to automakers while moving the nation to embrace more fuel-efficient vehicles.

“There’s an opportunity for us to lead the global market in cleaner, more efficient cars,” she said. “But (Trump officials) are simply going to walk away from that opportunity.”
More cities are banishing highways underground — and building parks on top

April 2, 2018
By Martha T. Moore
Stateline.org

WASHINGTON — The most popular place to put a city park is, increasingly, on a highway.

Cities looking to boost their downtowns, or to improve downtrodden neighborhoods, are creating “highway cap parks” on decks constructed over freeways that cut through the urban center. Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Denver and Dallas have deck parks underway. Atlanta, Houston, Minneapolis and Santa Monica, Calif., are among the cities considering similar projects.

In crowded cities, highway deck parks are a way to create new acreage and provide green space that can spur downtown development. Capping a highway to create a park also can reconnect urban neighborhoods sliced apart by the expressway building boom of the 1960s and '70s.

“There’s been a sort of a sea change in the way people think about roads and real estate in general,” said Ed McMahon, a senior fellow at the Urban Land Institute, a Washington, D.C., nonprofit that focuses on land use. “If you design a city around cars, you’re going to get more cars. If you design a city around people, you’re going to get more people and places and better real estate value.”

Dallas broke ground in February on the highway project that will undergird its second deck park, to be built over Interstate 35 in the Oak Cliff neighborhood. In 2012, the city opened the 5-acre, $110 million Klyde Warren Park above a freeway that separates the downtown Dallas Arts District from the Uptown residential and retail neighborhood.

“Everyone knows the future of cities is a good quality of life and attracting folks and telling them you don’t have to live in a concrete jungle,” said Bobby Abtahi, president of the Dallas Park and Recreation Board.

Dallas began building deck parks when local officials realized that its paucity of green space was hurting the city’s competitiveness with businesses, Abtahi said. Klyde Warren Park, now run by a foundation, includes a performance space, a children’s park, a restaurant and a dog run.

Property values around the park have shot up, bringing higher property tax revenue for the city. Office rents in nearby towers have risen by a third since the park opened. New development brought 7,000 more workers to downtown and 1,500 new apartments.

Klyde Warren Park, which draws a million visitors a year, “has kind of turned into our public square,” Abtahi said. “It’s really turned into a place where you see anyone and everyone.”

But skeptics argue that highways topped by parks are still highways, and that cities would be better off investing in mass transit.

Angie Schmitt, editor of Streetsblog USA, a news site that promotes alternatives to car transportation, said deck parks are too often used to “greenwash” highway expansion projects.
“The problem with having a park over a highway is that highways aren’t a very nice place to be,” Schmitt said. “There’s a lot of pollution and a lot of noise. Capping a highway is a very expensive way to create land. You could end up with a very expensive park that’s not a great park.”

Some deck parks have been around for decades: Seattle opened Freeway Park over I-5 in 1976 and Phoenix has had a park over I-10 since 1990. The current surge is being spurred by strong demand for development in the urban core, where there’s not much space for new parks.

“If you had plenty of other well-located urban land, you don’t need to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to make this location better,” said Jennifer Ball, vice president for planning and economic development of Central Atlanta Progress, a business coalition. “This urban land is at a premium now.”

To respond to the demand, Central Atlanta Progress has designed and is studying the feasibility of the Stitch, a $300 million proposed project to cover portions of the I-75/I-85 “connector” that creates a 14-lane gash through Atlanta’s downtown. The Stitch would include parks, a rebuilt transit station, and land for new development.

“It really is an economic development strategy,” Ball said. “It has a park, but if you dig closely into all the pretty renderings, we also see it as real estate development projects and the development of air rights. You’re creating land.”

Deck parks are expensive: Chicago’s Millennium Park, built over railroad tracks, cost $490 million and opened in 2004, four years after the millennium it was intended to celebrate. The Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy Greenway, created during Boston’s “Big Dig” to bury its Central Artery, cost $40 million, a fraction of the entire project’s $15 billion price tag but still a sizeable investment. Almost half of the $110 million cost of building Klyde Warren Park came from corporate and private donors.

The urgent need to repair or upgrade many half-century-old urban expressways also is fueling the construction of so-called cap parks. Highway reconstruction projects offer an opportunity — and possibly funding — for freeway caps.

In Denver, a $1.3 billion highway project will tear down an elevated portion of I-70 that runs through a low-income neighborhood, sink the rebuilt roadway and build a 5-acre deck park on top. (The project is being challenged in court on environmental grounds.) In Dallas, the Oak Cliff park deck will be built as part of a $666 million highway reconstruction project that will widen I-35 from eight lanes to 10.

The Oak Cliff park will reconnect a residential neighborhood divided by the highway’s construction in the ‘50s. Oak Cliff residents objected to the current planned highway widening and proposed a cap park to offset the impact.

“The sentiment was, ‘Why should North Dallas and Klyde Warren get all the nice things?’” Abtahi said. “That was never a discussion that was had before this highway was built.”

Highways built during the interstate highway boom are nearing the end of their useful life, so some kind of reconstruction is inevitable, said Michael Morris, director of transportation for the North Central Texas Council of Governments. The council is funding the bulk of the nearly $40 million cost for the Oak Cliff park.
“If you’re going to do it, you might as well have adult conversations with the people along the corridor about what’s in the best interests of their communities,” he said. For one thing, unhappy residents can drastically slow down the approval process for a highway project. “If you want to be in the freeway business in urban regions, you’ve got to be in the context-sensitive design business or you’re going to be there for a long time.”

Similarly, in Pittsburgh, a $26 million cap park over I-579 will rejoin the Hill District, a primarily African-American part of the city that was cut off by the highway construction, to downtown.

And in Minnesota, the state transportation department is considering three expressway lids as part of a two-year planning project for overhauling I-94, one of the city’s main arteries. One of the decks would reconnect Rondo, an African-American neighborhood in St. Paul split in two by the highway. The destruction of that neighborhood was so great — 900 homes and businesses were demolished — that in 2015 the state transportation commissioner Charles Zelle and Mayor Chris Coleman formally apologized to residents.

The Obama administration also gave deck parks a push, offering a $19 million grant for the Pittsburgh park. Then-Secretary of Transportation Anthony Foxx in 2016 said that urban highways had exacerbated economic inequality by devastating African-American neighborhoods for the benefit of suburban drivers.

“We have entire areas in this country where the infrastructure that is supposed to connect people is constraining them,” Foxx said in a speech at the Center for American Progress, a progressive think tank. “Achieving a middle-class life is made harder because of past transportation decisions.” He urged transportation planners to work on “connecting people to opportunity.”

Morris, the Texas transportation engineer, said Foxx “correctly reminded people … you have a responsibility to be sensitive to these issues.” The Oak Cliff park “speaks very directly to this particular policy.”

SolSmart Helping Make North Texas Solar-Friendly
Program aids air quality, economy while providing participants national recognition

March 7, 2018 (Arlington, Texas) – The North Central Texas Council of Governments recently partnered with SolSmart, a national solar-designation program, to recognize five local cities making strides toward becoming solar-friendly.

Each city accumulated points across eight categories representing actions municipalities can take to become more solar-friendly, earning Gold, Silver or Bronze status. The results are as follows:

- Gold – Cedar Hill
- Silver – Kennedale
- Bronze – Denton, Plano and Lewisville

The designated cities were judged across the following categories: Permitting; Planning, Zoning, and Development; Inspection; Construction Codes; Solar Rights; Utility Engagement; Community Engagement; and Market Development and Finance.

NCTCOG served as a SolSmart adviser to six local municipalities, identifying barriers and opportunities for improvement to their permitting, inspection and zoning processes.

Removing or lowering these “soft costs” saves entities time and money, which ultimately helps consumers. Streamlined processes also may attract solar companies to the region, thereby increasing job prospects for North Texans.

NCTCOG worked to educate staff from over 20 cities and counties about solar through webinars, trainings and meetings so that they may be equipped to address solar-related issues. Each community sets an example for other cities considering joining the solar movement, which can result in a wide range of benefits.

For example, the five megawatts of solar capacity installed within the municipal boundaries of the local SolSmart-designated cities is estimated to displace almost 20,000 pounds of harmful emissions annually, according the US Environmental Protection Agency.

For more information on the SolSmart program or to get involved, visit www.gosolartexas.org/solsmart.
About the North Central Texas Council of Governments:

NCTCOG is a voluntary association of local governments established in 1966 to assist local governments in planning for common needs, cooperating for mutual benefit and coordinating for sound regional development. NCTCOG's purpose is to strengthen both the individual and collective power of local governments and to help them recognize regional opportunities, eliminate unnecessary duplication and make joint decisions.

NCTCOG serves a 16-county region of North Central Texas, which is centered on the two urban centers of Dallas and Fort Worth. Currently, NCTCOG has 238 member governments including 16 counties, 169 cities, 22 school districts and 31 special districts. For more information on the NCTCOG Transportation Department, visit www.nctcog.org/trans.

# # #
Comment on Funding Program for Safety, Innovative Projects
Input on transportation program accepted online through April 10

March 12, 2018 (Arlington, Texas) – A funding program for safety, innovative and emergency transportation projects will be available for review during an online public comment period, scheduled to begin March 12.

The Safety, Innovative Construction and Emergency Projects Program awards federal funding for emergencies and to projects that improve safety conditions or have innovative construction methods. Details on the program and the projects being proposed for funding are available at www.nctcog.org/input.

Information related to April Car Care Clinics, the AirCheckTexas Drive a Clean Machine Program and funding opportunities for vehicles and refueling stations will also be posted throughout the comment period, which runs until April 10.

NCTCOG is partnering with local repair facilities to offer free engine code scans and multi-point vehicle checkups during the month of April. Car Care Clinics help promote vehicle maintenance and improve air quality.

AirCheckTexas offers qualifying motorists up to $3,500 to replace vehicles that have failed the emissions portion of the State inspection or are at least 10 years old. The program also provides up to $600 toward emissions repairs for residents who meet the income criteria.

NCTCOG will open the Clean Fleets North Texas 2018 Call for Projects in March. This opportunity will pay for up to 45 percent of the cost of replacing heavy-duty diesel vehicles or non-road equipment owned by public fleets or private entities.

Additionally, the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan recently reopened the Alternative Fueling Facilities Program for a second round. The program provides funding for the installation or expansion of alternative fuel refueling infrastructure.

To participate in the online comment period, visit www.nctcog.org/input. To request printed copies, call 817-608-2365 or email cbaylor@nctcog.org.

About the North Central Texas Council of Governments:
NCTCOG is a voluntary association of local governments established in 1966 to assist local governments in planning for common needs, cooperating for mutual benefit and coordinating for sound regional development. NCTCOG's purpose is to strengthen both the individual and collective power of local governments and to help them recognize regional opportunities, eliminate unnecessary duplication and make joint decisions.
NCTCOG serves a 16-county region of North Central Texas, which is centered on the two urban centers of Dallas and Fort Worth. Currently, NCTCOG has 238 member governments including 16 counties, 169 cities, 22 school districts and 31 special districts. For more information on the NCTCOG Transportation Department, visit www.nctcog.org/trans.

About the Regional Transportation Council:

The Regional Transportation Council (RTC) of the North Central Texas Council of Governments has served as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for regional transportation planning in the Dallas-Fort Worth area since 1974. The MPO works in cooperation with the region’s transportation providers to address the complex transportation needs of the rapidly growing metropolitan area. The Dallas-Fort Worth metropolitan area includes Collin, Dallas, Denton, Ellis, Hood, Hunt, Johnson, Kaufman, Parker, Rockwall, Tarrant and Wise counties. The RTC’s 44 members include local elected or appointed officials from the metropolitan area and representatives from each of the area’s transportation providers. More information can be found at www.nctcog.org.

###
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project/Facility</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Scope/Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>NCTCOG CMAQ (CAT 5) Federal Amount</th>
<th>NCTCOG STBG (CAT 7) Federal Amount</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total Proposed Funding</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria Addressed</th>
<th>Notes/Partnership Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denton County</td>
<td>South Shady Shores Road to Swisher Road</td>
<td>From West Shady Shores Road to Swisher Road</td>
<td>Reconstruct road from 2 to 2 lanes to elevate it out of the flood plain with drainage improvements</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>Addresses flooding hazard/system resilience</td>
<td>Denton County, Town of Shady Shores, and City of Lake Dallas to pay for engineering and utility relocations as well as provide matching funds for the construction phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton County</td>
<td>South Shady Shores Road to Swisher Road</td>
<td>From West Shady Shores Road to Swisher Road</td>
<td>Reconstruct road from 2 to 2 lanes to elevate it out of the flood plain with drainage improvements</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>UTIL</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>Addresses flooding hazard/system resilience</td>
<td>Denton County, Town of Shady Shores, and City of Lake Dallas to pay for engineering and utility relocations as well as provide matching funds for the construction phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton County</td>
<td>South Shady Shores Road to Swisher Road</td>
<td>From West Shady Shores Road to Swisher Road</td>
<td>Reconstruct road from 2 to 2 lanes to elevate it out of the flood plain with drainage improvements</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>Addresses flooding hazard/system resilience</td>
<td>Denton County, Town of Shady Shores, and City of Lake Dallas to pay for engineering and utility relocations as well as provide matching funds for the construction phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Highland Park</td>
<td>Wycliff Avenue from West of Lakeside Drive to West of Glenwood Avenue</td>
<td>Wycliff Avenue from West of Lakeside Drive to West of Glenwood Avenue</td>
<td>Reconstruction of a two-lane roadway that will include a new bridge structure to raise roadway out of the 100-year floodplain as well as drainage improvements at Tributary 1 in order to reduce/eliminate flood frequency</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>Project includes improvements at a nearby tributary (Tributary 1) within the City of Dallas; City of Dallas to pay the local match for that portion of the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Highland Park</td>
<td>Wycliff Avenue from West of Lakeside Drive to West of Glenwood Avenue</td>
<td>Wycliff Avenue from West of Lakeside Drive to West of Glenwood Avenue</td>
<td>Reconstruction of a two-lane roadway that will include a new bridge structure to raise roadway out of the 100-year floodplain as well as drainage improvements at Tributary 1 in order to reduce/eliminate flood frequency</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>UTIL</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Project includes improvements at a nearby tributary (Tributary 1) within the City of Dallas; City of Dallas to pay the local match for that portion of the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Highland Park</td>
<td>Wycliff Avenue from West of Lakeside Drive to West of Glenwood Avenue</td>
<td>Wycliff Avenue from West of Lakeside Drive to West of Glenwood Avenue</td>
<td>Reconstruction of a two-lane roadway that will include a new bridge structure to raise roadway out of the 100-year floodplain as well as drainage improvements at Tributary 1 in order to reduce/eliminate flood frequency</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>Project includes improvements at a nearby tributary (Tributary 1) within the City of Dallas; City of Dallas to pay the local match for that portion of the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TxDOT Dallas</td>
<td>IH 30 Managed Lane Access Gates</td>
<td>From SH 161 to Sylvan Avenue</td>
<td>Install access gates along the IH 30 Managed lane corridor</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Incident management/First responder safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTCOG</td>
<td>Regional Safety Program - Wrong Way Driving Prevention (Phase 2) and the New Safety Performance Measure</td>
<td>Regionwide</td>
<td>Implement improvements within the region that address and mitigate safety issues (e.g. wrong-way driving, dangerous intersections, etc.) and work toward achieving the RTC's recently approved safety targets/goals</td>
<td>2020, 2021</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>Improvements identified in Regional Safety Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Worth</td>
<td>Meacham Airport Northern Hangar Turn Lane</td>
<td>Bus 287N. Main Street at North Hangar Entrance</td>
<td>Add right turn lane for southbound traffic</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>$41,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>Safety data: 124 crashes from 2012-2016; Fort Worth may wish to utilize Transportation Development Credits earned via the MTP Policy Bundle Initiative in lieu of the local match.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Worth</td>
<td>Meacham Airport Northern Hangar Turn Lane</td>
<td>Bus 287N. Main Street at North Hangar Entrance</td>
<td>Add right turn lane for southbound traffic</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>UTIL</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>Safety data: 124 crashes from 2012-2016; Fort Worth may wish to utilize Transportation Development Credits earned via the MTP Policy Bundle Initiative in lieu of the local match.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Worth</td>
<td>Meacham Airport - North Entrance Turn Lane</td>
<td>Bus 287N. Main Street at North Airport Entrance</td>
<td>Add right turn lane for southbound traffic into Airport’s northern entrance (main entrance for jet fuel trucks)</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>$155,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$38,800</td>
<td>$194,000</td>
<td>Safety data: 2 crashes from 2013-2016; Fort Worth may wish to utilize Transportation Development Credits earned via the MTP Policy Bundle Initiative in lieu of the local match.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Worth</td>
<td>Meacham Airport - North Entrance Turn Lane</td>
<td>Bus 287N. Main Street at North Airport Entrance</td>
<td>Add right turn lane for southbound traffic into Airport’s northern entrance (main entrance for jet fuel trucks)</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>$142,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$35,600</td>
<td>$178,000</td>
<td>Safety data: 2 crashes from 2013-2016; Fort Worth may wish to utilize Transportation Development Credits earned via the MTP Policy Bundle Initiative in lieu of the local match.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,916,800</td>
<td>$24,300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$27,154,200</td>
<td>$59,671,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program/Surface Transportation Block Grant
# CMAQ/STBG Funding Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Federal/Local Funding Exchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Automated Vehicle Program <em>(May bring back a Round 2 effort)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Strategic Partnerships <em>(Will bring back a Round 2 effort)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Planning and Other Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>10-Year Plan/Proposition 1 Adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Phase 4: Turnback Program, Context Sensitive, Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Transit Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>Assessment Policy Programs/Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Local Bond Program Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Safety, Innovative Construction, and Emergency Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>Management and Operations (M&amp;O), NCTCOG-Implemented, and Regional/Air Quality Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ✔️ = Project Selection Completed
- ☐️ = Pending STTC/RTC Approval
- ☑️ = Program Partially Completed
## Description/Purpose

To support operations, safety, innovative construction, and emergency improvements.

### Initial Requests

- Wycliff Avenue Flooding Project
- Shady Shores Bridges
SELECTION CRITERIA

• When evaluating projects, the following criteria were taken into account by staff:
  • Project addresses a safety issue (pedestrian safety at risk, history of vehicle crashes, etc.)
  • Project involves an innovative construction element (e.g., modular bridges)
  • Project addresses an emergency situation
    • Flooding issues that affect system resilience
  • Project includes incident management/first responder safety benefits
  • Projects that implement recommendations from regional safety plan
# PROPOSED FUNDING BY AGENCY

DRAFT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT/PROGRAM</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROPOSED RTC FUNDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Safety Program – Wrong Way Driving Prevention (Phase 2) and the New Safety Performance Measure</td>
<td>NCTCOG</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shady Shores Road</td>
<td>Denton County</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycliff Avenue</td>
<td>Town of Highland Park</td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH 30 Managed Lane Access Gates</td>
<td>TxDOT Dallas</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meacham Airport Improvements</td>
<td>City of Fort Worth</td>
<td>$416,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$32,216,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING/TASK</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STTC Information</td>
<td>February 23, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Information</td>
<td>March 8, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement (Online Opportunity to be held in place of meetings)</td>
<td>March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STTC Action</td>
<td>March 23, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Action</td>
<td>April 12, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUESTED ACTION

• RTC approval of:
  • The proposed list of projects to fund through the 2017-2018 CMAQ/STBG: Safety, Innovative Construction, and Emergency Projects Program (Electronic Item 3.1.1)
  • Administratively amending the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)/Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and other planning/administrative documents to incorporate these changes.
QUESTIONS?

Adam Beckom, AICP
Principal Transportation Planner
817-608-2344
abeckom@nctcog.org

Christie J. Gotti
Senior Program Manager
817-608-2338
cgotti@nctcog.org

Brian Dell
Transportation Planner III
817-704-5694
bdell@nctcog.org
### Draft Regional Traffic Signal Retiming Program - Master Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subregion</th>
<th>Corridor ID</th>
<th>D &amp; M Agency</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Agency Priority</th>
<th>Corridor Name</th>
<th>Number of intersections</th>
<th>On - System</th>
<th>Off-System</th>
<th>Total Signals</th>
<th>Local Match</th>
<th>Net Retained After 2013</th>
<th>Traffic Signals on ROS</th>
<th>8 or More Signals</th>
<th>Pass (5 Pts)</th>
<th>Mobility Benefit/Cost Ratio (Max 15 Pts)</th>
<th>Air Quality Benefits/ Cost (Max 20 Pts)</th>
<th>TMC &amp; GPS (Max 10 Pts)</th>
<th>Multi-Modal Operations (Max 15 Pts)</th>
<th>Multi-Jurisdictional (Max 15 Pts)</th>
<th>Data Cloud (Max 5 Pts)</th>
<th>Total (Max 100 Pts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western 4</td>
<td>Arlington 3</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Arlington 3</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Arlington Avenue</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western 12</td>
<td>Arlington 12</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Arlington 12</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cooper Street</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western 16</td>
<td>Arlington 16</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Arlington 16</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Collins Street</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western 20</td>
<td>Arlington 20</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Arlington 20</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western 24</td>
<td>Arlington 24</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Arlington 24</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Shady Grove</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western 28</td>
<td>Arlington 28</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Arlington 28</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Village Street</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western 31</td>
<td>Arlington 31</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Arlington 31</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Weatherford Street</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western 35</td>
<td>Arlington 35</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Arlington 35</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Benbrook Street</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western 39</td>
<td>Arlington 39</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Arlington 39</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>East Side</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western 43</td>
<td>Arlington 43</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Arlington 43</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Bradford Boulevard</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western 47</td>
<td>Arlington 47</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Arlington 47</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Keller Parkway</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western 51</td>
<td>Arlington 51</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Arlington 51</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Black Horse</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western 55</td>
<td>Arlington 55</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Arlington 55</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western 59</td>
<td>Arlington 59</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>Arlington 59</td>
<td>TxDOT</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Worth Avenue</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Highlighted projects are recommended for selection.

* Corridor #1 is included under corridor #16.
** Corridor exchange at request of the city and adjust signals from 28 to 17 to match funding based on recommendations approved by STTC on March 18, 2010.
## Draft Minor Improvement Program - Master Table

| Subregion | Project ID | O & M Agency | City | Agency Priority | Project Name | Project Cost (Max 80) | 25% Local Match | Along ROS | No Construction | 35+ Points | Eligible Project | Pass | Mobility Benefit/Cost Ratio (Max 35 Points) | Air Quality Benefit/Cost (Max 35 Points) | Recommended Improvements (20 Points) | Additional Local Match (5 Points) | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
|-----------|------------|---------------|------|----------------|--------------|------------------------|-----------------|----------|----------------|------------|----------------|------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Eastern   | 321        | Dallas        | Dallas | 43             | Greenville @ IH 635 (S) | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 30 0 0 5         | 5 70                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 322        | Dallas        | Dallas | 44             | Greenville @ IH 635 (E) | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 6 20 5 0          | 5 66                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 323        | Dallas        | Dallas | 45             | Greenville @ IH 635 (W) | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 324        | Dallas        | Dallas | 46             | Greenville @ Bachman Hill | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 325        | Dallas        | Dallas | 47             | Greenville @ Federal | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 326        | Dallas        | Dallas | 48             | Greenville @ Park | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 327        | Dallas        | Dallas | 49             | Greenville @ Royal | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 328        | Dallas        | Dallas | 50             | Greenville @ IH 635 (W) | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 329        | Dallas        | Dallas | 51             | Greenville @ Bachman Hill | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 330        | Dallas        | Dallas | 52             | Greenville @ Federal | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 331        | Dallas        | Dallas | 53             | Greenville @ Royal | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 332        | Dallas        | Dallas | 54             | Greenville @ IH 635 (E) | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 333        | Dallas        | Dallas | 55             | Greenville @ Bachman Hill | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 334        | Dallas        | Dallas | 56             | Greenville @ Federal | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 335        | Dallas        | Dallas | 57             | Greenville @ Royal | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 336        | Dallas        | Dallas | 58             | Greenville @ IH 635 (W) | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
| Eastern   | 337        | Dallas        | Dallas | 59             | Greenville @ Bachman Hill | $40,000            | Yes            | Yes       | Yes           | Yes        | Yes            | Pass | 35 22 0 0 5          | 5 62                                      | 0                          | 0              | 0                 | 35 Project Cost | Total (Max 100 Points) |
## Draft Minor Improvement Program - Master Table

### Eligibility Requirements

| Subregion | Project ID | O & M Agency | City | Agency Priority | Corridor Name | Project Cost (Max 10 Pts) | 20% Local Match Along ROS (Max 5 Pts) | No Construction (Max 5 Pts) | Not more than $5M (Max 10 Pts) | Eligible Project (Max 10 Pts) | Mobility Benefit/Cost Ratio (Max 10 Pts) | Air Quality Benefit/Cost Ratio (Max 5 Pts) | Recommended Improvements (20 Points) | Additional Local Match (5 Points) | EJ (Max 5 Pts) | Total (Max 100 Pts) |
|-----------|------------|---------------|------|-----------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Eastern   | 100        | ODOT         | Dallas | 46              | Wilson @ I-805 | $40,000               | Yes                                      | Yes                          | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                          | 15               |
| Eastern   | 101        | ODOT         | Dallas | 46              | I-805 @ Loop 120 | $40,000               | Yes                                      | Yes                          | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                          | Yes                          | 15               |
| Eastern   | 102        | ODOT         | Dallas | 46              | Loop 120 @ US 75 | $40,000               | Yes                                      | Yes                          | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                          | Yes                          | 15               |
| Eastern   | 103        | ODOT         | Dallas | 46              | Loop 120 @ US 380 | $40,000               | Yes                                      | Yes                          | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                          | Yes                          | 15               |
| Eastern   | 104        | ODOT         | Dallas | 46              | US 380 @ I-805  | $40,000               | Yes                                      | Yes                          | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                          | Yes                          | 15               |
| Eastern   | 105        | ODOT         | Dallas | 46              | I-805 @ Loop 360 | $40,000               | Yes                                      | Yes                          | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                          | Yes                          | 15               |
| Eastern   | 106        | ODOT         | Dallas | 46              | Loop 360 @ US 75 | $40,000               | Yes                                      | Yes                          | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                          | Yes                          | 15               |
| Eastern   | 107        | ODOT         | Dallas | 46              | US 75 @ I-805   | $40,000               | Yes                                      | Yes                          | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                          | Yes                          | 15               |
| Eastern   | 108        | ODOT         | Dallas | 46              | I-805 @ Loop 120 | $40,000               | Yes                                      | Yes                          | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                          | Yes                          | 15               |
| Eastern   | 109        | ODOT         | Dallas | 46              | Loop 120 @ US 380 | $40,000               | Yes                                      | Yes                          | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                          | Yes                          | 15               |
| Eastern   | 110        | ODOT         | Dallas | 46              | US 380 @ I-805  | $40,000               | Yes                                      | Yes                          | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                          | Yes                          | 15               |
| Eastern   | 111        | ODOT         | Dallas | 46              | I-805 @ Loop 360 | $40,000               | Yes                                      | Yes                          | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                          | Yes                          | 15               |
| Eastern   | 112        | ODOT         | Dallas | 46              | Loop 360 @ US 75 | $40,000               | Yes                                      | Yes                          | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                          | Yes                          | 15               |
| Eastern   | 113        | ODOT         | Dallas | 46              | US 75 @ I-805   | $40,000               | Yes                                      | Yes                          | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                                | Yes                          | Yes                          | 15               |

### Evaluation Criteria

- **Mobility** Benefit/Cost Ratio (Max 10 Pts)
- **Air Quality** Benefit/Cost Ratio (Max 5 Pts)
- **Recommended Improvements** (20 Points)
- **Additional Local Match** (5 Points)
- **EJ (Max 5 Pts)**

### Note:
- Highlighted projects are recommended for selection.
REGIONAL TRAFFIC SIGNAL RETIMING PROGRAM AND MINOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Call for Projects
Recommendations

Regional Transportation Council
Natalie Bettger
April 12, 2018
What are these Programs?

Programs Overview

The **Regional Traffic Signal Retiming Program (RTSRP)** is a regional program to maximize the capacity of the existing roadway system by improving traffic operations through signal retiming.

The **Minor Improvement Program** improves the capacity of the existing roadway system by implementing low-cost operational improvements, thereby enhancing mobility and improving air quality.
2017 Call for Projects RTSRP

- Eighty Percent of Traffic Signals Have Not Been Retimed Since 2013
- Eighty Percent of Traffic Signals Located Along Route of Significance
- Eight or More Consecutive Traffic Signals
- No Construction Planned Within Two Years
- Staff Time is Not Eligible
Project Eligibility

2017
Call for Projects
Minor Improvements

• Projects Along Route of Significance
• No Construction Planned Within Two Years
• Project Funding Request Not to Exceed $50,000
• Low-cost Improvements such as Cabinets, Controllers, Restriping, etc.
• Staff Time is Not Eligible
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program Funding

Local Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Traffic Signal Retiming Program</th>
<th>Minor Improvement Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2 Million</td>
<td>$2.9 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Twenty Percent (Minimum) Local Match
- Local Match Must be Cash
- Sixty-six Percent Eastern Sub-Region and Thirty-four Percent Western Sub-Region
## Evaluation and Scoring Criteria for RTSRP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scoring (pts)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Benefit/Cost Ratio</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Project benefit/cost ratio will be calculated based on the improvements associated with basic traffic signal program input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx &amp; VOC Cost Per Pound</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Air quality benefits will be calculated based on the improvements associated with basic traffic signal retiming improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Communication technology that keeps traffic signals in sync.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice Distribution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Environmental justice methodology used to map concentrations of EJ populations using demographic data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Modal Operations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Projects supporting multimodal operations including high truck volume corridors (four percent or greater) and/or located at or near transit facilities/routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Jurisdictional Corridor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Corridors passing through more than one agency's jurisdictional boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Cloud</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide traffic signal data to the cloud.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation and Scoring Criteria for Minor Improvement Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scoring (pts)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Benefit/Cost Ratio</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Project benefit/cost ratio will be calculated based on improvements associated with basic traffic signal program input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx &amp; VOC Cost Per Pound</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Air quality benefits will be calculated based on the improvements associated with basic traffic signal retiming improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended improvements</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Recommended improvements from previous RTSRP phases by consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Local Match</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Agency willing to contribute more than twenty percent local match.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice Distribution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Environmental justice methodology used to map concentrations of EJ populations using demographic data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RTSRP and Minor Improvement Proposals Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>Western Region (Fort Worth District)</th>
<th>Eastern Region (Dallas District)</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTSRP</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$2,156,000</td>
<td>$4,104,800</td>
<td>$6,260,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Improvement Program</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$1,127,500</td>
<td>$3,073,700</td>
<td>$4,201,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RTSRP Projects Recommendations (Eastern Sub-Region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>On-System</th>
<th>Off-System</th>
<th>Total Signals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Midway/Frankford</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>SW Garland Group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TxDOT Dallas</td>
<td>FM 544</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>NW Garland Group</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Carrollton/Coppell</td>
<td>Belt Line Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TxDOT Dallas</td>
<td>SH 78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>LBJ</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>Arapaho Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>Renner Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>Spring Valley Rd*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Forest/Abrams</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Webb Chapel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Walnut Hill</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: 99 227 326

*City requested exchange of Spring Valley Road Corridor with Campbell Road Corridor for same number of traffic signals as approved by STTC on March 23, 2018.*
### RTSRP Projects Recommendations (Western Sub-Region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>On-System</th>
<th>Off-System</th>
<th>Total Signals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>Pioneer Parkway</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>S Cooper St</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>S Collins St</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TxDOT Fort Worth</td>
<td>Southlake Boulevard</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TxDOT Fort Worth</td>
<td>US 377</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Keller</td>
<td>Keller Parkway</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TxDOT Fort Worth</td>
<td>SH 174</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TxDOT Fort Worth</td>
<td>SH 199</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TxDOT Fort Worth</td>
<td>US 377</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Minor Improvement Projects
### Recommendations by Agency (Eastern Sub-Region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th># of Projects</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Allen</td>
<td>Communication System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City of Carrollton</td>
<td>Detection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City of Dallas</td>
<td>Detection</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$860,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City of Garland</td>
<td>Detection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$17,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>City of McKinney</td>
<td>Controllers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>City of Richardson</td>
<td>Detection</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,507,200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td># of Projects</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Arlington</td>
<td>Controllers, Detection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City of Fort Worth</td>
<td>Controllers, Cabinets, Communication</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City of Keller</td>
<td>Communication System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City of Mansfield</td>
<td>Flashing Yellow Arrows, Detection</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TxDOT Fort Worth</td>
<td>Controller Upgrades</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$166,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>$754,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minor Improvement Projects Recommendations by Agency
(Western Sub-Region)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information - Corridor Selection Criteria</td>
<td>STTC</td>
<td>July 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information - Corridor Selection Criteria</td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>August 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action - Approval of Selection Criteria</td>
<td>STTC</td>
<td>August 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action - Approval of Selection Criteria</td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>September 14, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTCOG Call for Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>September 15, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals Due</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 13, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals Due</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 13, 2017 5:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring by NCTCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td>November 15, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 10, 11,16 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information - Projects Selected</td>
<td>STTC</td>
<td>January 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information - Projects Selected</td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>February 8, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action - Projects Selected</td>
<td>STTC</td>
<td>March 23, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action - Projects Selected</td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>April 12, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RTC Action

Recommend Regional Transportation Council Approval of the:

- 2017 Regional Traffic Signal Retiming Program and Minor Improvement Program Call for Projects as Provided in Electronic Items 3.2.1 and 3.2.2
- Ability to Administratively Amend the TIP/STIP, UPWP and Any Other Documents as Appropriate to Include All Projects in the Region
- If Projects Above the Line do Not Move Forward, Allow Staff to Continue to Next Project on the List
Questions?

Contact Information

Natalie Bettger
Senior Program Manager
nbettger@nctcog.org
817-695-9280

Marian Thompson, P.E.
Transportation System Operations Supervisor
mthompson@nctcog.org
817-608-2336

Gregory Masota
Transportation Planner
gmasota@nctcog.org
817-695-9264
April 12, 2018

The Honorable J. Bruce Bugg, Jr.
Chairman
Texas Transportation Commission
125 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Chairman Bugg:

On behalf of the Regional Transportation Council (RTC), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Dallas-Fort Worth area, this letter transmits three items you requested related to IH 635 East Phase 3. You requested that we close the funding gap on IH 635, create a transparent process in our decision making, and examine a path forward that could build the project without tolls.

We are suggesting that the Texas Transportation Commission proceed with a design-build procurement on IH 635 East Phase 3 from US 75 to and including the IH 30 Interchange. This will include all frontage roads, main lanes, interchanges, and express lanes consistent with congestion pricing and funding for selected hours of the day. An RTC resolution and supporting materials are enclosed.

We appreciate your leadership and will continue to work with you to implement this critical transportation project. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me or Michael Morris, P.E., Director of Transportation for the North Central Texas Council of Governments, at (817) 695-9241 or mmorris@nctcog.org.

Sincerely,

Rob Franke, P.E., Chair
Regional Transportation Council
Mayor, City of Cedar Hill

cc: Members of the Texas Transportation Commission
    James Bass, Executive Director, TxDOT
    Marc D. Williams, P.E., Deputy Executive Director, TxDOT
    Kelly Selman, P.E., District Engineer, TxDOT Dallas District
    Michael Morris, P.E., Director of Transportation, NCTCOG
RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE TEXAS TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION TO AUTHORIZE A PROCUREMENT FOR THE IH 635 EAST PROJECT FROM US 75 TO IH 30 (R18-01)

WHEREAS, the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) is designated as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Dallas-Fort Worth Metropolitan Area by the Governor of Texas in accordance with federal law; and,

WHEREAS, the Regional Transportation Council (RTC), comprised primarily of local elected officials, is the regional transportation policy body associated with the North Central Texas Council of Governments, and has been and continues to be the regional forum for cooperative decisions on transportation; and,

WHEREAS, IH 635 from US 75 to IH 30 (IH 635 East) is the RTC’s highest priority project in the eastern subregion of the Dallas-Fort Worth Metropolitan Area; and the Cities of Dallas, Garland, and Mesquite; business and community stakeholders; and citizens that live in or travel through the corridor have expressed strong support in expediting improvements in the corridor for congestion relief, safety, air quality, economic development, and quality of life reasons; and,

WHEREAS, IH 635 East from US 75 to IH 30 currently operates with four general purpose lanes in each direction, discontinuous frontage roads, and a tolled managed lane in each direction; and,

WHEREAS, in 2008, IH 635 East was restriped to add a high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction from US 75 to north of IH 30, and in 2016 these lanes were converted to tolled managed lanes to allow single-occupant vehicles to pay a toll to use the lanes with both of these improvements being funded with Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds; and,

WHEREAS, in March 2016, the RTC approved Mobility 2040: The Metropolitan Transportation Plan for North Central Texas (Mobility 2040) which identifies the need for improvements to IH 635 from US 75 to IH 30, including the expansion of the general purpose lanes to five lanes in each direction, reconfiguration of interchanges at arterial streets (e.g., Skillman/Audelia), continuous frontage roads, and two tolled managed lanes in each direction from US 75 to Royal Lane/Miller Road with a cost of approximately $1.8 billion; and,

WHEREAS, the tolled managed lane component of the IH 635 East corridor is one of the management strategies identified through the federally required Congestion Management Process in order to add significant single-occupant vehicle capacity in the corridor; and,

WHEREAS, the RTC is currently in the process of updating the Metropolitan Transportation Plan for the 2045 horizon year (Mobility 2045), including recommending needed improvements to IH 635 East; and,

WHEREAS, the IH 635 East Environmental Assessment was approved by the Federal Highway Administration in 2003 and a subsequent reevaluation for the project, consistent with the recommendations in Mobility 2040, was completed and approved by the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) in April 2017; and,
WHEREAS, the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality (SIP) identifies a portion of the HOV/tolled managed lane on IH 635 (Coit Road to Greenville Avenue) as a transportation control measure commitment (TCM); and,

WHEREAS, in October 2017, the RTC approved Policy P17-01 to support the expediting of IH 635 East from US 75 to and including the IH 30 Interchange; expressing its desire to complete the project in its entirety through tax-supported general purpose lanes and frontage roads with dynamically priced managed lanes for the entire corridor; with toll revenue to remain with the public sector for debt service, operations, maintenance, and congestion management and optional off-peak and weekend tolling (IH 635 East project); and,

WHEREAS, in December 2017, the Texas Transportation Commission (TTC) approved updates to the 2018 Unified Transportation Program and removed funding for the tolled managed lane components of IH 635 East; and,

WHEREAS, in January 2018, the Chair of the TTC requested RTC staff work jointly with TxDOT staff to develop 1) a funding plan to address the approximately $1.0 billion funding gap and 2) a transparent process to identify the necessary steps to proceed with IH 635 East; and,

WHEREAS, staff has developed options to fully fund the project with a risk assessment of each option for consideration by the RTC.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT:

Section 1. The RTC finds that there is strong support by the cities, businesses, and citizens in and along the corridor for the IH 635 East project to proceed to construction in its entirety to minimize the length of construction impacts.

Section 2. The RTC finds that federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program funds were used to fund the original HOV lane and later the HOV/tolled managed lanes which are currently operated on IH 635 from US 75 to IH 30, and that there is no existing federal authority that authorizes repayment of the CMAQ funds if the original purpose of the project is discontinued.

Section 3. The RTC finds that the HOV TCM commitment in the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality should be maintained and continue to be operated in the IH 635 East corridor.

Section 4. The RTC finds that a tolled managed lane component of the IH 635 East project is one of the management strategies identified through the federally required Congestion Management Process in order to add significant single-occupant vehicle capacity in the corridor.

Section 5. The RTC finds that the IH 635 East project should include tolled managed lanes from US 75 to IH 30 with the public sector retaining the toll revenues for debt service, operations, maintenance, and congestion management to maintain a minimum speed of 50 mph consistent with RTC Policy 17-01. The RTC instructs staff to develop a tolling policy for IH 635 East to minimize tolling for these purposes and create non-tolled hours of operation.
Section 6. The RTC finds that there are sufficient funding sources, including the use of toll revenues for limited purposes, to fully fund the IH 635 East project without the need to utilize funding allocated to other projects.

Section 7. Based on the findings above, the RTC requests the Texas Transportation Commission initiate the design-build procurement for the IH 635 East project by issuing a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to design, develop, construct, and potentially maintain the entire project with tolled managed lanes for the following work components:

(i) five (5) general purpose lanes in each direction;
(ii) continuous frontage roads in each direction;
(iii) reconfiguration of interchanges at arterial streets (including Skillman/Audelia);
(iv) IH 635/IH 30 interchange reconstruction/reconfiguration; and
(v) two (2) tolled managed lanes in each direction (US 75 to IH 30).

Section 8. The RTC instructs staff to continue including recommended improvements for IH 635 East as described herein in the draft recommendations for Mobility 2045 for public review and comment.

Section 9. The RTC instructs staff to continue refining funding options to implement the IH 635 East project consistent with the principles in this resolution and the implementation of a transportation system.

Section 10. The RTC requests that the Texas Department of Transportation initiate a process to reevaluate the current environmental clearance consistent with the terms of this resolution, contingent upon favorable public review and comment on Mobility 2045.

Section 11. This resolution shall be transmitted to members of the Texas Transportation Commission; the TxDOT Executive Director; the District Engineer of the TxDOT Dallas District; the mayors and city managers of the Cities of Dallas, Garland, and Mesquite; State elected officials in North Central Texas; the Congressional delegation from North Central Texas; and the Lieutenant Governor and Governor of the State of Texas.

Section 12. This resolution shall be in effect immediately upon its adoption.

Rob Franke, Chair
Regional Transportation Council
Mayor, City of Cedar Hill

I hereby certify that this resolution was adopted by the Regional Transportation Council of the North Central Texas Council of Governments for the Dallas-Fort Worth Metropolitan Area on April 12, 2018.

Andy Eads, Secretary
Regional Transportation Council
Commissioner, Denton County
| Cost and Revenue Elements | $ in Millions | No Build | Express Lane All the Way | No Managed Lanes (At All) | No Managed Lanes (At All) | Toll Managed Lanes to Royal/Miller, No Managed Lanes Rest of the Way (Staged EB) | Toll Managed Lanes to Royal/Miller, No Managed Lanes Rest of the Way (Staged WB) | Toll Managed Lanes to Royal/Miller, Toll Managed Lanes Rest of the Way | Toll Managed Lanes to Royal/Miller, Non-tolled Managed Lanes Rest of the Way (Current EB) | Toll Managed Lanes to Royal/Miller, Non-tolled Managed Lanes Rest of the Way (Current WB) | Toll Managed Lanes Whole Way (New Mobility Plan) | Toll Managed Lanes Whole Way (New Mobility Plan) |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Initial Cost:             | $1,800       | $0     | $1,800                 | $1,800                 | $1,800                 | $1,800                                          | $1,800                                          | $1,800                          | $1,800                                          | $1,800                                          | $1,800                                          | $1,800                                          |
| Potential Cost Savings:  |              |        |                        |                        |                        |                                                |                                                |                                 |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                |
| Remove Managed Lanes Costs| $200         | $0     | $200                   | $200                   | $200                   | $135                                            | $135                                            | $135                            | $135                                            | $135                                            | $0                                             | $0                                             |
| More Efficient Eastern Section of 30 Interchange | $200 | $0 | $200 | $200 | $200 | $200 | $200 | $200 | $200 | $200 | $200 | $200 |
| Competitive Tension      | $200         | $0     | $200                   | $0                     | $0                     | $0                                              | $0                                              | $0                               | $0                                              | $0                                              | $0                                             | $0                                             |
| Options                  |              |        |                        |                        |                        |                                                |                                                |                                 |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                |
| Subtotal                 | $600         | $0     | $600                   | $600                   | $600                   | $600                                            | $600                                            | $600                            | $600                                            | $600                                            | $600                                            | $600                                            |
| Revised Costs            | $1,200       | $0     | $1,200                 | $1,200                 | $1,200                 | $1,200                                          | $1,200                                          | $1,200                          | $1,200                                          | $1,200                                          | $1,200                                          | $1,200                                          |
| Existing Funding (per UTP): |              |        |                        |                        |                        |                                                |                                                |                                 |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                |
| Category 2 (including Skillman/Audelia) | $100 | $0 | $100 | $100 | $100 | $100 | $100 | $100 | $100 | $100 | $100 | $100 | $100 |
| Category 4                | $175         | $0     | $175                   | $175                   | $175                   | $175                                            | $175                                            | $175                            | $175                                            | $175                                            | $175                                            | $175                                            |
| Category 12               | $425         | $0     | $425                   | $425                   | $425                   | $425                                            | $425                                            | $425                            | $425                                            | $425                                            | $425                                            | $425                                            |
| Swap Cat 2 with SH 183 ($400M available) | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $175 | $175 | $420 | $420 | $420 | $420 | $420 |
| Subtotal                 | $717         | $0     | $717                   | $717                   | $717                   | $717                                            | $717                                            | $717                            | $717                                            | $717                                            | $720                                            | $729                                            |
| Potential Revenues:      |              |        |                        |                        |                        |                                                |                                                |                                 |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                |
| Re-aid Cat 2 already approved by the RTC (removed by TTC) | $115 | $0 | $115 | $115 | $115 | $115 | $115 | $115 | $115 | $115 | $115 | $115 | $115 |
| Revenue from Toll Elements (TIFIA) | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Federal INFRA             | $100         | $0     | $100                   | $100                   | $100                   | $100                                            | $100                                            | $100                            | $100                                            | $100                                            | $100                                            | $100                                            |
| MEP/ROW Funding           | $250         | $0     | $250                   | $250                   | $250                   | $250                                            | $250                                            | $250                            | $250                                            | $250                                            | $250                                            | $250                                            |
| Reprogram Trinity Funding | $50          | $0     | $50                    | $50                    | $50                    | $50                                             | $50                                             | $50                             | $50                                             | $50                                             | $50                                             | $50                                             |
| Add/Remove Funding        | $100         | $0     | $100                   | $100                   | $100                   | $100                                            | $100                                            | $100                            | $100                                            | $100                                            | $100                                            | $100                                            |
| Additional Revenue from 10 Year Plan (2019 UTP, 10th Year) | $150 | $0 | $150 | $150 | $150 | $0 | $65 | $0 | $158 | $445 | $93 | $100 | $0 |
| Pass Through/Unsolicited Proposal (repay with post-2028 funding) | $415 | $0 | $415 | $415 | $415 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Total Funds Thus Far      | $1,487       | $0     | $1,487                 | $1,338                 | $1,338                 | $1,100                                          | $1,100                                          | $1,100                          | $1,100                                          | $1,100                                          | $1,100                                          | $1,000                                          | $1,000                                          |
| Category 12 Funds from TTC |              |        |                        |                        |                        |                                                |                                                |                                 |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                | |
| Request of Category 12 Clear Lanes "Soft Match" Formula Allocation? | $300 | $0 | $300 | $300 | $300 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Total Without Collateral  | $1,787       | $0     | $1,787                 | $1,787                 | $1,787                 | $1,400                                          | $1,400                                          | $1,400                          | $1,400                                          | $1,400                                          | $1,600                                          | $1,600                                          | $1,600                                          |
| Other:                   |              |        |                        |                        |                        |                                                |                                                |                                 |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                | |
| Collateral Projects      |              |        |                        |                        |                        |                                                |                                                |                                 |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                | |
| IH 30 from Bass Pro Drive to Datrock Road | $128 | $0 | $128 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| IH 635 from IH 635 to Denison Co Line | $262 | $0 | $262 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| US 30 East of Town East Blvd | $263 | $0 | $263 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Subtotal                 | $653         | $0     | $653                   | $653                   | $653                   | $0                                              | $0                                              | $0                              | $0                                              | $0                                              | $0                                              | $0                                              | $0                                              |
| Revised Funding Total    | $2,150       | $0     | $2,150                 | $2,150                 | $2,150                 | $2,150                                          | $2,150                                          | $2,150                          | $2,150                                          | $2,150                                          | $2,150                                          | $2,150                                          | $2,150                                          |
| Notes:                   |              |        |                        |                        |                        |                                                |                                                |                                 |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                |                                                | |
1 Category 12 Clear Lanes project from US 75 to IH 30
2 Category 12 Clear Lanes project from Royal/Miller to IH 30
3 Category 12 funds only proposed for non-tolled sections
4 Tolling according to new RTC P17-01 Policy
5 "Soft Match" remains in the region if not used on IH 635
## LBJ East Funding Options
### Risk Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan, Program, Policy or Action</th>
<th>Potential Areas of Risk</th>
<th>Type of Risk</th>
<th>Potential Risk Mitigation</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Express Lane All the Way</th>
<th>No Managed Lanes (At All)</th>
<th>Toll Managed Lanes to Royal/Miller, Non-tolled Managed Lanes Rest of the Way (Current EIS)</th>
<th>Toll Managed Lanes to Royal/Miller, Non-tolled Managed Lanes Rest of the Way (Staged EIS)</th>
<th>Toll Managed Lanes the Whole Way (New Mobility Plan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous Regional Transportation Council Actions Related to IH 635 East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent RTC Actions on IH 635 East:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Year Plan Supporting LBJ East with Tolled Managed Lanes (12/2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Statement in Support of LBJ East Tolled Managed Lanes at TxDOT Public Hearing (1/2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Policy Position on Advancing LBJ East with Tolled Managed Lanes (10/2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Correspondence to Lt. Governor (1/2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is proposed project consistent with recent action and current policy of the RTC?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan Transportation Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement: Projects in the Transportation Improvement Program must be consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (23 CFR 450.326)(i). Is the proposed project consistent with Mobility 2040?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal, Time/Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impractical to update or amend Mobility 2040 at this time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposed project consistent with draft recommendations for Mobility 2045?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal, Time/Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If RTC-selected option is not consistent with current draft recommendations, additional public involvement may be required depending on timing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congestion Management Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement: In non-attainment areas over 200,000, federal funds may not be programmed for any project that will result in a significant increase in single-occupant vehicle (SOV) general purpose highway capacity unless the project is addressed through the Congestion Management Process. (23 CFR 450.322)(c) Does the proposed project add significant SOV capacity, and if so, is the project addressed through the Congestion Management Process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal, Time/Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC-selected option would have to comply with CMP, potentially requiring additional management strategies. Currently identified CMP strategies specific to current EIS (i.e., tolled managed lane) would have to be updated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement: If the CMP analysis demonstrates that travel demand and operational management strategies cannot fully satisfy the need for additional capacity and additional SOV capacity is warranted, the CMP shall identify all reasonable strategies to manage the SOV facility safely and effectively. (23 CFR 450.322(f).) Does the CMP Identify all reasonable strategies to manage the SOV facility safely and effectively?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal, Time/Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC-selected option would have to comply with CMP, potentially requiring additional management strategies. Currently identified CMP strategies specific to current EIS (i.e., tolled managed lane) would have to be updated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Program, Policy or Action</td>
<td>Potential Areas of Risk</td>
<td>Type of Risk</td>
<td>Potential Risk Mitigation</td>
<td>No Build</td>
<td>Express Lane All the Way</td>
<td>No Managed Lanes (At All)</td>
<td>Toll Managed Lanes to Royal/Miller, No Managed Lanes Rest of the Way (Staged EIS)</td>
<td>Toll Managed Lanes to Royal/Miller, Non-tolled Managed Lanes Rest of the Way (Current EIS)</td>
<td>Toll Managed Lanes the Whole Way (New Mobility Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Participation Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Requirement: Changes to Plans, Programs, Policies require public review and comment through a formal public involvement process, which varies by Plan, Program, Policy, or Action. Is the proposed project expected to receive favorable public comment?</td>
<td>Legal, Time/Cost</td>
<td>RTC-selected option would need to go through public review and comment as part of Mobility 2045 update.</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Program, Policy or Action</td>
<td>Potential Areas of Risk</td>
<td>Type of Risk</td>
<td>Potential Risk Mitigation</td>
<td>No Build</td>
<td>Express Lane All the Way</td>
<td>No Managed Lanes (At All)</td>
<td>Toll Managed Lanes to Royal/Miller, No Managed Lanes Rest of the Way (Staged EIS)</td>
<td>Toll Managed Lanes to Royal/Miller, Non-tolled Managed Lanes Rest of the Way (Current EIS)</td>
<td>Toll Managed Lanes the Whole Way (New Mobility Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of Free to Toll Restriction</td>
<td>Requirement: Texas Transportation Code Chapter 228.201 prohibits operation of a non-tolled state highway as a toll project with some exceptions (toll designation prior to award; in an MPO plan prior to 2005; facility constructed such that number of non-tolled lanes is equal or greater than in existence prior to construction). Is the proposed project consistent with the toll conversion statute?</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Opening of free express lanes would restrict future ability to toll for congestion management purposes under toll conversion statute.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Does the proposed project minimize the potential risks areas (legal, time/cost) sufficient to proceed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ✓: Yes
- ✗: No
IH 635 LBJ East

From US 75 to IH 30
Option 1 – No Build

- From US 75 to I-30
- Existing Condition
  - Eight General Purpose Lanes
  - Two HOV/Express (Tolled SOV) Lanes
  - Discontinuous 4/6 Frontage Roads
Option 2 – Non-Tolled Express Lanes From US 75 – I-30

- From US 75 to I-30
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Four Non-Tolled Express Lanes
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads
Option 3 – General Purpose Lanes and Frontage Roads Only

- From US 75 to I-30
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Open Median for Future Development
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads
Option 4– General Purpose Lanes and Frontage Roads Only

- From US 75 to I-30
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Open Median for Future Development
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads
Option 5– General Purpose Lanes and Frontage Roads Only

- From US 75 to I-30
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Open Median for Future Development
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads
Option 6 – Partial Tolled Managed Lanes

- From US 75 to Royal Lane/Miller Road
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Four Tolled Managed Lanes
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads

- From Royal Lane/Miller Road to I-30
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Open Median for Future Development
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads
Option 7 – Partial Tolled Managed Lanes

- From US 75 to Royal Lane/Miller Road
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Four Tolled Managed Lanes
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads

- From Royal Lane/Miller Road to I-30
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Open Median for Future Development
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads
Option 8 – Partial Tolled Managed Lanes

- **From US 75 to Royal Lane/Miller Road**
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Four Tolled Managed Lanes
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads

- **From Royal Lane/Miller Road to I-30**
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Open Median for Future Development
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads
Option 9 – Tolled Managed Lanes & Non-Tolled Express Lanes

- From Royal Lane/Miller Road to I-30
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Non-tolled Express Lanes
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads

- From US 75 to Royal Lane/Miller Road
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Four Tolled Managed Lanes
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads
Option 10 – Tolled Manage Lanes from US 75 to I-30

- From US 75 to I-30
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Four Tolled Manage Lanes
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads
Option 11 – Tolled Manage Lanes from US 75 to I-30

- From US 75 to I-30
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Four Tolled Manage Lanes
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads
Option 12 – Tolled Manage Lanes from US 75 to I-30

- From US 75 to I-30
  - Ten General Purpose Lanes
  - Four Tolled Manage Lanes
  - Continuous 4/6 Frontage Roads
The Regional Transportation Council (RTC) reaffirms support for formula allocations from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and between the western and eastern subregions of the Dallas-Fort Worth area. New revenues from "Big Projects" will be placed on this project.

The RTC wishes to complete this project after years of delay and to complete the project in its entirety, including improvements to the IH 635/IH 30 Interchange. To accomplish this, the RTC and impacted local governments wish to construct tax-supported frontage roads, tax-supported main lanes, and tolled dynamically priced managed lanes from US 75 to IH 30. The public sector will retain the revenues from tolls and develop a tolling policy to pay back the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) loan, operations, maintenance, rehabilitation, and congestion management only. Off-peak and weekend tolling may be phased out over time. The RTC is requesting the tolled component to complete the managed lane system in this part of the region. The RTC reminds TxDOT that this project will need to be funded with federal funds in order to comply with State laws and voter-approved constitutional amendments.

The RTC requests that TxDOT expedite this project through a pass-through toll or design-build contract.

The RTC requests that the North Texas Tollway Authority waive primacy in the corridor.

The Skillman/Audelia project and already approved project revenues will be included in this construction in order to expedite both projects.

The RTC requests that North Central Texas Council of Governments staff place this project in the Mobility 2045 plan and commence with public involvement.

Approved: October 12, 2017
IH 635 EAST PHASE 3
From US 75 to IH 30

Regional Transportation Council
April 12, 2018

Michael Morris, P.E.
Director of Transportation

Ken Kirkpatrick
Counsel for Transportation

Christie Gotti
Senior Program Manager
Transportation Project Programming
IH 35W

Segment 3A

Segment 3B

Segment 3C
IH 635 EAST PHASE 3: WORK UNDERWAY

Noise Walls

Major Utility Relocation

Right-of-Way Purchase

Skillman/Audelia Funds Already Approved by Commission
THREE CONCURRENT ELEMENTS ON IH 635 EAST FROM MARCH RTC MEETING

Continue RTC Member Engagement with State Officials

Answers to Questions/Risk Assessment
Response to Legal Question from Last Month

Options to Close Funding Gap
# MAPPING RESPONSIBILITIES IN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Regional Transportation Council</strong></th>
<th><strong>Texas Transportation Commission</strong></th>
<th><strong>Texas Representatives and Senators</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeframe</strong></td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geography and Population Size</strong></td>
<td>DFW Region</td>
<td>State of Texas</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale</strong></td>
<td>System</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>Multimodal</td>
<td>Rural/Urban</td>
<td>District Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>Oversight/Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Funding

Roadway Expenditures
$ 52 B

Regional Roadway Needs
$ 389 B

Shortfall
$ 337 B

Facility recommendations indicate transportation need. Corridor-specific alignment, design, and operational characteristics will be determined through ongoing project development.
From July 1, 2016, to July 1, 2017, the Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington metropolitan area’s population increased by 146,000.

Dallas-Fort Worth’s congestion is offset with transportation investments.

Sources: TomTom Traffic Index 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 Data; North Central Texas Council of Governments
MANAGED LANES EVOLUTION

- HOV
- Tolled Managed
- Dynamically Priced
- Guaranteed Transit
- Early Deployment Vehicle Technology
- Driverless Trucks
Within Boundary – Year 2018
13% Land Area
79% Vehicle Hours of Congestion Delay

Cost of Congestion/Delay: $11.9 billion
Congestion Index is based on a percent increase in travel time.
### INVENTORY OF OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Express Lane Alternative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Express Lane All the Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 3</td>
<td>3,4,5</td>
<td>No Express Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 4</td>
<td>6,7,8</td>
<td>Tolled Managed Lane to Royal Miller/Nothing East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tolled Managed Lanes to Royal Miller/Non-Tolled Rest of the Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 6</td>
<td>10,11,12</td>
<td>Tolled Managed Lanes the Whole Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IH 635 EAST POTENTIAL AREAS OF RISK

- Existing Tolled Managed Lane (CMAQ) (23 USC 116, 23 USC 149)
- State Implementation Plan (40 CFR 93.113(a))
- No Toll Conversion Restriction (Texas Transportation Code 228.201)
- Environmental Clearance (43 TAC 2.85)
- RTC Policy Consistency (RTC P17-01)
- Air Quality Conformity (40 CFR 90.109)
- Congestion Management Process (23 CFR 450.322)
- Consistency with Draft Mobility 2045 (23 CFR 450.326(i))

Family 6
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Reevaluation
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes (Draft)
FRIDAY-SATURDAY HOURLY VOLUMES

Congestion Pricing

Funding Pricing
TOLLED MANAGED LANES

Purpose: Manage Congestion
Effect: Increase Mobility

Guaranteed Speeds with Tolled Managed Lanes
  Speeds 50% Faster for Non-Tolled Lanes
  Speeds 75% Faster for Tolled Lanes

Project Funding Supplement
Drivers Have Choice and Predictability
Managed Lanes have Free Periods
Approve RTC Resolution R18-01

Instruct Staff to Advance Family 6, Options 10, 11, and 12 and Other Funding Options that Maximize System Implementation
# Regional Transportation Council Attendance Roster

## April 2017 - March 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennell Atkins (09/17)</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Bagheri (12/16)</td>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue S. Bauman (10/17)</td>
<td>DART</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Bush (01/15)</td>
<td>Ellis Cnty</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyl Bussell (05/17)</td>
<td>TxDOT, FW</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rickey D. Callahan (09/17)</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Cantrell (1/07)</td>
<td>Dallas Cnty</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David L. Cook (05/16)</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudy Durham (7/07)</td>
<td>Lewisville</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Eads (1/09)</td>
<td>Denton Cnty</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Falconer (07/17)</td>
<td>Carrollton</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Fickes (12/10)</td>
<td>Tarrant Cnty</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fuller (07/17)</td>
<td>McKinney</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moji Haddad (10/14)</td>
<td>NTTA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Harmon (1/02)</td>
<td>Johnson Cnty</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Lewis Jenkins (04/11)</td>
<td>Dallas Cnty</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Jensen (06/13)</td>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A(R)</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungus Jordan (4/07)</td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee M. Kleinman (09/13)</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry LaRosiliere (06/17)</td>
<td>Plano</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Magness (06/13)</td>
<td>Rockwall Cnty</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Mahaffey (03/13)</td>
<td>FWTA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Adam McGough (07/16)</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Meadows (02/17)</td>
<td>DFW Airport</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Mitchell (07/17)</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary Moon (06/15)</td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Pickett (06/15)</td>
<td>Mesquite</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Riley (1/09)</td>
<td>Parker Cnty</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Selman (02/15)</td>
<td>TxDOT, Dallas</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Sowell (10/17)</td>
<td>Frisco</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Taylor (7/14)</td>
<td>Colleyville</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **P** = Present
- **A** = Absent
- **R** = Represented by Alternate
- **--** = Not yet appointed
- **E** = Excused Absence (personal illness, family emergency, jury duty, business necessity, or fulfillment of obligation arising out of elected service)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Glen Whitley (2/97)</td>
<td>Tarrant Cnty</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A(R)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E(R)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Date in parenthesis indicates when member was 1st eligible to attend RTC meetings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette Bacchus</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah Baker</td>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Beck</td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Beck</td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Bentley</td>
<td>Farmers Branch</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Boski</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Brooks</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Bur</td>
<td>TxDOT, Dallas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Carter</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Cassidy</td>
<td>Mesquite</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceason Clemens</td>
<td>TxDOT, Dallas</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Cohen</td>
<td>Southlake</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Collins</td>
<td>Coppell</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cordary, Jr.</td>
<td>TxDOT, FW</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Cranor</td>
<td>Euless</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Daugherty</td>
<td>Collin County</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Davis</td>
<td>Wise County</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Dickens</td>
<td>Hurst</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Disheroon</td>
<td>Johnson County</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Dupler</td>
<td>FWTA</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massoud Ebrahim</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Edwards</td>
<td>DART</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claud Elsom</td>
<td>Rockwall County</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Fisher</td>
<td>Cleburne</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Fladager</td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Flanigan</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Foss</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Graham</td>
<td>McKinney</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hammons</td>
<td>Carrollton</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Hartline</td>
<td>The Colony</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina Holcomb</td>
<td>DCTA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Hotelling</td>
<td>Flower Mound</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Houser</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Hughes</td>
<td>Weatherford</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Hutt</td>
<td>Colleyville</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Iwuchukwu</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Johnson</td>
<td>NTTA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Johnson</td>
<td>DeSoto</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sholeh Karimi</td>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Knippel</td>
<td>Frisco</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiamin Kornkebel</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonzo Liñán</td>
<td>Keller</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Luedtke</td>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = Present    A = Absent
R = Represented -- = Not yet eligible to attend
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Lynch</td>
<td>Hunt County</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Mares</td>
<td>Ellis County</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Melton</td>
<td>Burleson</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Moen</td>
<td>Frisco</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Molina, Jr.</td>
<td>Carrollton</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Neal</td>
<td>Plano</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Nelson</td>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey Nesbit</td>
<td>Mesquite</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim O'Connor</td>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Overstreet</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Overton</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Plesko</td>
<td>DART</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Poe</td>
<td>Rowlett</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Polster</td>
<td>Denton County</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Porter</td>
<td>Wylie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Prendergast</td>
<td>Plano</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Pyles</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan G. Ramey II</td>
<td>Duncanville</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Riley</td>
<td>Tarrant County</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Royster</td>
<td>DFW Int. Airport</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moosa Saghian</td>
<td>Kaufman County</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Salmon</td>
<td>Lewisville</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Shelton</td>
<td>NTTA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Shumac, III</td>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Slimerly</td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Skinner</td>
<td>Tarrant County</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Smith</td>
<td>FWTA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea St. Louis</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caleb Thornhill</td>
<td>Plano</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Tilke</td>
<td>McKinney</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Timbrell</td>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Titus</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Van Nieuwenhuize</td>
<td>Haltom City</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Vedrall</td>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Waggoner</td>
<td>North Richland Hills</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared White</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Wimberley</td>
<td>Hood County</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Woodbury</td>
<td>Cedar Hill</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Zech</td>
<td>TCEQ</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = Present  A = Absent  R = Represented  -- = Not yet eligible to attend


1. **Approval of January 26, 2018, Minutes:** The minutes of the January 26, 2018, meeting were approved as submitted in Reference Item 1. John Polster (M); Jim O'Connor (S). The motion passed unanimously.

2. **Consent Agenda:** The following items were included on the Consent Agenda.

   2.1. **Transportation Improvement Program Modifications:** A recommendation for Regional Transportation Council (RTC) approval of revisions to the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), provided in Electronic Item 2.1, was requested.

   2.2. **Unified Planning Work Program Modifications:** A recommendation for Regional Transportation Council (RTC) approval of modifications to the FY2018 and FY2019 Unified Planning Work Program, provided in Electronic Item 2.2.1, was requested. Action also included a recommendation that the RTC direct staff to also amend other administrative/planning documents, as appropriate, to reflect the approved modifications. Additional information was provided in Electronic Item 2.2.2.
2.3. **Waze/Traffic Signal Grants: Approval to Advance Second Round:** A recommendation for Regional Transportation Council (RTC) approval to open the second round of Waze/511DFW and Traffic Signal Data Sharing grants was requested.

A motion was made to approve the items on the Consent Agenda. John Polster (M); Stanford Lynch (S). The motion passed unanimously.

3. **2017-2018 CMAQ/STBG Funding Program: Sustainable Development Phase 4:** Adam Beckom presented proposed projects to be funded through the Sustainable Development Phase 4 Program in the 2017-2018 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)/Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) Funding Program. The status of the 11 CMAQ/STBG funding programs were highlighted. The purpose of this effort is to support sustainable development initiatives by providing funds for Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Turnback partnerships, context sensitive design projects, and transit-oriented development (TOD) projects. When selecting projects for the program, staff used the following criteria: 1) can the North Central Texas Council of Governments partner with TxDOT as part of the TxDOT Turnback program, 2) are there opportunities for redevelopment, 3) is there a payback mechanism for these projects through a Tax Increment Finance (TIF) District or a Public Improvement District (PID), and 4) do the projects include context sensitive design elements, pedestrian friendly elements, as well as TOD elements. Details of the projects proposed through this effort were provided in Electronic Item 3.1. Additional details on the overall funding program were provided in Electronic Item 3.2. Mr. Beckom noted that there were no changes to the proposed projects since presented at the January 26, 2018, meeting. Proposed projects total $51,353,056 in Regional Transportation Council funding. The schedule for this effort was reviewed. A motion was made to recommend Regional Transportation Council approval of the proposed list of projects to fund through the 2017-2018 CMAQ/STBG Sustainable Development Phase 4 Program in Electronic Item 3.1. Action also included a recommendation for RTC approval to direct staff to administratively amend the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program/Statewide Transportation Improvement Program and other planning/administrative documents to incorporate the changes. John Polster (M); Kristina Holcomb (S). The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Auto Occupancy Detection and Verification Technology:** Natalie Bettger provided an update on the auto occupancy detection and verification technology pilot that was conducted on the DFW Connector and requested a recommendation for Regional Transportation Council (RTC) approval of additional funding for full implementation of the technology once all testing is completed. Background information on the project was presented and provided in Electronic Item 4. Since 2012, efforts have been ongoing to identify an auto occupancy detection and verification technology related to the tolled managed lane high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) subsidy paid by the Regional Transportation Council (RTC). A technology is needed that ensures the discount is applied and that those receiving the discount are HOV users. The current HOV enforcement process was highlighted. Users must register prior to each trip. The occupancy declaration is sent to a field device and occupancy compliance is verified by an officer. The toll is collected in parallel, and if occupancy is not met there is no process to collect the full toll if the vehicle was not HOV. Direction from the Surface Transportation Technical Committee (STTC) and RTC is to determine if there is automated technology that could apply the correct toll rate in the field, preventing the need for manual officer enforcement and moving to a verification process. The new technology is expected to simplify the process and eliminate the need for enforcement. A car beacon is installed and registered to a toll tag. The smartphone application detects the number of passengers in the vehicle and the toll tag transaction is matched to the user and the proper rate is applied.
Results from the recent pilot study of the technology in the DFW Connector corridor were presented. A total of 17 drivers were recruited for the pilot test, with 643 toll transactions generated by 10 of the 17 drivers. Overall, 250 toll transactions included both a verified occupancy report as well as a user-completed end-of-trip occupancy survey to verify vehicle occupancy, with a 1.6 percent over count in which the system reported an HOV occupancy while the user reported a single-occupancy trip. The system successfully reported on occupancy for 591 toll transactions, with the other 52 transactions discounted due to Bluetooth being disabled, a car beacon configuration issue for one driver, and a battery issue on one smartphone. Ms. Bettger discussed current funding in the Transportation Improvement Program for the pilot project, which includes $2 million to complete the pilot and $400,000 for integration costs with existing toll operators. She noted that the request is for future year funding, contingent on additional testing, to allow staff to continue efforts if tests indicate that full deployment is appropriate. Currently, the technology cost is $1.6 million per year to operate the system with additional funding for marketing/education. Funding is proposed for a 10-year period. If at any time after each year the technology is no longer needed, there is no requirement to move forward. The total cost proposed for both the technology and the marketing component is approximately $19 million. Ms. Bettger compared the direct costs of the existing system that include manual enforcement, enhancement of the current application, and marketing/education totaling approximately $23 million. The new technology cost, including the pilot, is approximately $21.4 million. Other indirect benefits include the safety of officers and travelers, congestion reduction, ease of use, air quality, court cost savings, and compliance. Additionally, technology will allow for transition to a rewards program. The timeline for this effort was reviewed. Additional testing regarding partner integration, the violation process, and the transition plan are anticipated through May, with system-wide deployment testing anticipated in June and system-wide deployment in the fall of 2018.

Michael Morris discussed the technology, noting that funding is being requested as a contingency. Local funds may be replaced with State funds if the technology is deployed statewide. Chad Edwards noted the technology is identified at $1.6 million per year over 10 years and asked if inflation of the cost was anticipated. In addition, he suggested that marketing/education continue at a level amount throughout the term due to new drivers each year. Ms. Bettger noted the $1.6 million per year is the negotiated contract amount from the vendor. She added that continued marketing to educate new drivers each year was something staff should consider. John Polster discussed his position that the technology would not be needed if the RTC was not responsible for the HOV 2+ subsidy costs, and that the cost for the technology seems to exceed the amount that is spent on the subsidy. The region would be paying $21 million for minimal return on air quality. While the technology has safety benefits to officers enforcing the occupancy, not providing the discount has the same safety benefits and $21 million could likely be used for other more cost-effective air quality benefits. Ms. Bettger noted that there is still interest in HOV users in the region because it is part of the Congestion Management Process. In addition, the RTC Tolled Managed Lane policy includes a provision to explore a technology solution for the verification of auto occupancy rather than relying on manual enforcement. Technology is the only way to ensure accuracy in terms of declaration. Also, this application would have the ability to identify any number of occupants. This will allow occupancy verification if the requirement of occupants is adjusted in the future, and will also allow the program to transfer to an incentive program. Dave Carter asked staff the annual cost of the discount. Dan Lamers noted that since 2015, the cost of the subsidy is slightly over $1 million. Mr. Carter noted that the proposal to spend $2 million per year to verify a $400,000 per year cost seemed like an ineffective use of funds. Ms. Bettger noted that as the system continues to grow and the goals of the Congestion Management Process continue to be implemented,
the region must explore ways to deal with congestion. Encouraging users of the system to carpool is one option and the only way to increase users is to make the process more user friendly. Alonzo Liñán noted that while he appreciates the need to continue to encourage HOV use and that he had questions about how staff will conclude that the system does or does not work with only the minimal data reported to date. Staff noted that the first phase was a proof of concept to determine if the devices can communicate correctly and the percentage of error. Future tests will be conducted on additional corridors and with additional beta users, with results reported back to the Committee and RTC. Staff has proposed funding at this time in parallel to the additional testing, to avoid future delay. The contingency funding would not be used until all tests prove to be positive and the Committee and RTC are satisfied. Mr. Liñán asked if ten years of funding is approved, with the option of bailing out in any given year, on what basis the Committee and RTC would make their decision. Mr. Morris noted ease of use, reliability over time, and error percentages are some of the ways to determine the effectiveness of the technology. Paul Luedtke asked what is included in the $1.6 million per year. Ms. Bettger noted the funding covers the cost of collecting data for the application, tracking of the HOV users, implementation in new corridors, and the cost of the beacon. The vendor is the host and operates and maintains the back office system. Dan Lamers clarified that the $1.6 million is an averaged amount over the 10-year term of the contract that was negotiated with the vendor. Most of the cost is borne upfront, and the averaged cost allows the cost to be spread out over the cost of the contract. Phil Dupler asked if the technology could be used on buses. Ms. Bettger indicated that staff could provide information to Mr. Dupler to see how the technology might apply to transit vehicles. Dave Carter asked if officers are actually enforcing HOV occupancy and asked how many tickets have been issued over the last three years for occupancy-related HOV violations. Dan Lamers noted that currently, approximately $1 million per year is spent on HOV enforcement. When the entire system is implemented in the next few years, the cost for HOV enforcement is anticipated to be nearly $2 million per year. Officers have indicated that they can only pull over 1-3 people per hour in the peak period and that violators could easily determine that enforcement could be avoidable. Discussion continued regarding the RTC policy for HOV occupancy. Paul Iwuchuku noted that he believed the question to answer is whether the desire is to use technology to enforce occupancy even if the technology has higher initial costs. A motion was made to recommend Regional Transportation Council approval of the proposed $19 million in funding for full implementation of the auto occupancy detection and verification technology, contingent on all remaining tests being met. Action also included that the RTC direct staff to administratively amend the Transportation Improvement Program/Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, Unified Planning Work Program, and any other documents as appropriate to include this project. Paul Iwuchuku (M). There was no second on the motion. The motion failed for lack of a second.

5. **Access North Texas:** Kelli Schlicher provided an overview of Access North Texas plan recommendations. Access North Texas is the regional public transportation coordination plan for North Texas. The plan aims to improve public transportation for older adults, individuals with disabilities, individuals with lower incomes, and others with transportation challenges. It lists regional and county specific strategies to address existing transportation challenges, and its goal is to encourage coordination of existing transportation services and providers while meeting necessary federal and State requirements. Some of the overarching regional strategies included in the 2018 plan that are relevant to all 16-counties include improving the availability of public transportation services across the region and increasing affordability of public transit. Recently, the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) approved $1 million to support the early implementation of affordable fares for individuals with the most need. In addition, another regional strategy is reducing the existing complexities with
using public transit, as well as advocating for public transit. Ms. Schlicher noted the last few steps in finalizing the plan include taking the Access North Texas to the Regional Transportation Council for approval, the Executive Board for endorsement, and providing the finalized document to the Texas Department of Transportation. Upon approval, regional partners will begin to implement strategies identified in the plan. Lastly, projects that seek funds through the RTC’s Transit Call for Projects must be included in Access North Texas, specifically those that seek funding under the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program. The schedule for this effort was reviewed. To date, no public comments that have altered the draft document have been received. Summary information regarding Access North Texas was provided in Electronic Item 5.1, and the plan document was provided in Electronic Item 5.2. A motion was made to recommend Regional Transportation Council approval of Access North Texas, the region’s locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan. Kristina Holcomb (M); John Polster (S). The motion passed unanimously.

6. **Regional Traffic Signal Retiming and Minor Improvement Program Call for Projects:** Marian Thompson noted that North Central Texas Council of Governments staff have received comments to one of the funding spreadsheets provided to members for the Regional Traffic Signal Retiming and Minor Improvement Program Call for Projects recommendations. Based on the comments, she noted that staff would like to withdraw the item to allow staff to further review the information. Ms. Thompson requested that members also review Electronic Item 6.1 and Electronic Item 6.2 and provide NCTCOG staff comments by March 9, 2018. This item is anticipated to be included on the March 23, 2018, Surface Transportation Technical Committee agenda for action.

7. **Mobility 2045 Update:** Kevin Feldt provided an update on the development of the region's next long-range transportation plan, Mobility 2045. Major roadway recommendations were highlighted and include asset optimization projects, arterial capacity improvements, priced facility recommendations, and freeway recommendations. He noted the project recommendation tables, which identify the specific projects, will be provided to members by email following the meeting. He also highlighted a map of roadway corridors for future evaluation. Additional Mobility 2045 components include sustainable development, people movers, freight, aviation, Transportation Demand Management, Transportation System Management areas, environmental considerations, high-speed rail, technology, policies/programs, public transportation, and others. Mr. Feldt highlighted the public transportation recommendations map, and noted this map has not changed since last presented. Regarding the draft financial plan, a comparison of Mobility 2040 versus Mobility 2045 was provided. During development of the financial assumptions, staff used multiple scenarios and options that generated some additional funding. Toll roads and tolled managed lanes are also proposed as a long-term strategy. A specific funding scenario is not recommended, but use of future known available funding sources as well as unknown sources such as the new federal infrastructure initiative is proposed. Staff also recommends approving the equivalent of the current magnitude of funding through the horizon year of the document. He noted revenues are then assigned to the specific areas of the document and are estimated at approximately $135.5 billion over the life of the Mobility 2045 Plan. Roadway expenditures are estimated at approximately $51 billion, which is only part of the $389 billion anticipated in roadway needs leaving a shortfall of approximately $338 billion. Mr. Feldt also highlighted selected proposed policy additions. These include encouraging regional railroads to participate in regional planning, support increasing active transportation mode share, encouraging data sharing, automated vehicles and ridesharing, and supporting infrastructure maintenance, supporting asset optimization and roadway maintenance. In addition, supporting the ability for staff to modify the Mobility Plan for emergency operational...
improvements and supporting the implementation of a tolled managed lane policy area are proposed. Comments received in recent public meetings were highlighted and include comments on eminent domain, the Lake Corridor Project in Collin County, funding, the Hyperloop and bullet train, availability of the draft Plan, alternate roads, and no expansion of other non-roadway transportation modes. At the latest public meetings, comments were received on the policy foundation for Mobility 2045, transportation assistance for south Dallas County, and transit funding. Regarding the availability of the full draft Mobility 2045 document, Mr. Feldt noted the draft will be available April 1. The official 60-day public comment period will begin in April 2018, with Surface Transportation Technical Committee action requested in May 2018 and Regional Transportation Council action requested in June 2018.

8. **Regional Transportation Council Follow Up on IH 635 East Phase 3:** Michael Morris provided an overview of the January 25, 2018, Texas Transportation Commission (TTC) meeting and Regional Transportation Council (RTC) action at the February 8, 2018, meeting. RTC members and staff attended the January 25, 2018, TTC meeting and presented the importance of the IH 635 East project moving to procurement. No action was taken by the TTC at the meeting and the TTC Chairman asked that the RTC work to close the financial gap on the project. North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) staff worked on a financial scenario that was presented at the February 8, 2018, RTC meeting. The financial scenario was not approved, but instead members approved correspondence from the RTC Chair to the TTC Chair supporting a continued partnership on IH 635 East Phase 3, provided in Electronic Item 8. Mr. Morris noted that he was in Austin earlier in the week and presented two additional options on which NCTCOG is working closely with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Dallas District. One option is to defer the express lanes and build the continuous frontage roads and ten lane section, including the IH 30 Interchange. The second option is to request the TTC approve proceeding with the express lanes even though the lanes may not be able to proceed as tolled managed lanes. A third option is being consider, which is to propose that the Lieutenant Governor request the Governor to permit tolled managed lanes (already in the approved environmental document) to proceed to construction. He noted that staff will continue efforts in preparation for the March 8, 2018, RTC meeting. Members discussed the collateral projects presented to the RTC and the political environment currently surrounding the project. In addition, it was noted that the IH 635 East decision by the TTC has long-term impacts to many future transportation decisions. Mr. Morris highlighted various options to close the funding gap that may not necessarily include the use of collateral projects. He noted that NCTCOG and TxDOT Dallas staffs are continuing to work together on options to close the financial gap and give the TTC confidence that the RTC is committed to this project.

9. **2017-2018 CMAQ/STBG Funding Program: Safety, Innovative Construction, and Emergency Projects:** Adam Beckom presented proposed projects to be funded through the Safety, Innovative Construction, and Emergency Projects Program of the 2017-2018 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)/Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) Funding Program. The status of the 11 CMAQ/STBG funding programs were highlighted. The purpose of this effort is to support operations, safety, innovative construction, and emergency improvements throughout the region. When evaluating projects, staff reviewed to determine if a project: addresses a safety issue, involves an innovative construction element, addresses an emergency situation, includes incident management/first responders safety benefits, implements recommendations from the regional safety plan. Details on the projects staff proposed for funding were provided in Electronic Item 9.1. Projects include: 1) North Central Texas
Council of Governments (NCTCOG) Regional Safety Program for $15 million to address wrong way driving, yellow flashing lights, and intersection safety, 2) South Shady Shores Road for $10 million for flood improvements in partnership with Denton County, City of Lake Dallas, and Town of Shady Shores, 3) Wycliff Avenue for $5 million for drainage issues in partnership with the Town of Highland Park, 4) IH 30 managed lanes access gates for $1.2 million for emergency vehicle and first responder access in partnership with the Texas Department of Transportation Dallas District, and 5) Meacham Airport area intersection improvements for $380,800 in partnership with the City of Fort Worth. The proposed Regional Transportation Council (RTC) funding for the projects total approximately $31.58 million. Additional details on the overall funding program were provided in Electronic Item 9.2. The schedule for this effort was reviewed, with Committee action proposed at the March 23 meeting and RTC action at the April 12 meeting. Mark Nelson thanked NCTCOG for its support on the Shady Shores projects and recognized Mayor Program Tem Paula Woolworth and Alderman Hanes from the City of Shady Shores and the City Manager of Lake Dallas demonstrating their partnership by attending the meeting. John Polster asked about the local match for the NCTCOG Regional Safety Program. Mr. Beckom noted that the proposed local match would be provided by the local entities determined in the process.

10. **2019-2022 Draft Transportation Improvement Program Listings:** Adam Beckom briefed the Committee on the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) development process. For this effort, staff has been reviewing existing projects and gathering information on additional locally funded projects. Staff has met with implementing agencies regarding projects, and has made revisions to the existing project schedules, funding and/or scope of projects. The revised project listings are expected to be available by close of business later in the day. Next, staff will work to financially constrain the TIP listings to the FY2018 Unified Transportation Plan (UTP), as well as conduct a review against the Mobility Plan and air quality conformity. Public review and comment on the 2019-2022 draft TIP listings will be solicited in April 2018, with finalized projects listings expected to be submitted to the Texas Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration in June 2018.

Mr. Beckom highlighted TIP development focus areas. In April 2016, the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) approved the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Milestone Policy. When meeting with local agencies, projects schedules were discussed for projects that are required to go to construction by the end of FY2017 and in FY2018 to ensure the projects are proceeding to avoid the cancellation of funding. He noted that draft project information reflects updates to projects provided by agencies. Agencies have also been asked to complete a survey for projects in FY2019, the first year of the TIP. Many times, the first year of the TIP is oversubscribed so staff would like to ensure that too many projects are not included in FY2019 and that agencies are not being overly optimistic about projects scheduled for FY2019. This will also help prevent the need for additional TIP modifications in the future. Staff is also reviewing Regional Toll Revenue (RTR) funded projects, and adjustments are being made as projects are closed out and cost savings are identified. In addition to a new TIP, a new Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is being developed. The TIP team and the MTP team are working closely together to ensure that projects in the TIP are consistent with the new MTP. Staff is also continuing to track and update projects approved by the RTC as part of the Regional 10-Year Plan initiative, making adjustments for cost, year of expenditure, and inflation. Mr. Beckom highlighted the scope of programming efforts. Currently, there is approximately $5.24 billion in roadway and transit improvements in the draft 2019-2022 TIP. This includes 1,078 active projects from 71 implementing agencies. The timeline for this effort was reviewed. As mentioned, staff is continuing coordination with agencies to finalize remaining questions. He noted the draft listings would be available online by close of business, and will be presented to the RTC at its March 8, 2018, meeting. The deadline for comments on the draft listings is March 16,
2018. Comments received after the deadline will be difficult to include in the public meeting material for April public meetings. Mr. Beckom noted that action on the final listings will be requested at the April 27, 2018, Committee meeting and the May 10, 2018, RTC meeting. Staff anticipates transmitting the final document to the Texas Department of Transportation in June, with approval anticipated by the Texas Transportation Commission in August and federal approval in the October/November timeframe. Staff urged agencies to review listings and to communicate with North Central Texas Council of Governments staff to ensure projects are listed correctly and included. He added that projects in FY2023 and later will be placed in the environmental clearance appendix of the TIP.

11. **Fast Facts:** Michael Morris noted that Sandy Wesch would be leaving the agency full time, but was expected to continue working part time as a contracted employee.

April Leger discussed the new agenda format that began with the February meeting agenda. The new format is intended to track if an item addresses any of the federal performance measures listed.

In addition, April Leger noted an article, *Bringing MPOs Into the FAST Era*, beginning on page 16 of Electronic Item 11.1. The article discusses changing roles of metropolitan planning organizations and mentions the Dallas-Fort Worth region.

Kevin Feldt noted that North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) staff attended two public hearings for the Dallas to Houston high-speed rail project. Comments were made on behalf of the Committee and the Regional Transportation Council. The comments were provided in Electronic Item 11.2.

Kate Zielke noted that the NCTCOG will conduct a webinar on March 26 to communicate to mitigation bankers the potential demand for wetland and stream mitigation credits generated by projects in the long-range transportation plan. Additional information was provided in Electronic Item 11.3. In addition, Transportation Department staff will also be partnering with the NCTCOG Environment and Development Department to create a database of wetland or stream restoration projects that cities would like to be considered as opportunities for responsible mitigation projects. Staff will be reaching out to city environmental staff in the next few months to provide more information on the database.

Allix Philbrick highlighted the current air quality funding opportunities for vehicles. She noted that the webpage has been redesigned to be more user friendly. Details were provided in Electronic Item 11.4.

Allix Philbrick also noted that current Dallas-Fort Worth Clean Cities events were provided in Electronic Item 11.5. A Clean Vehicle Solutions for Refuse Haulers webinar is scheduled for February 27, 2018.

In addition, Allix Philbrick noted that on January 28, 2018, the trustee of the Volkswagen Settlement filed a list of designated beneficiaries. Next, the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality is required to submit a mitigation plan. Additional information is provided in Electronic Item 11.6.

DJ Hale provided a Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Policy Bundle update. She noted that the second round of the MTP Policy Bundle is now open and accepting applications. The early deadline is March 2, 2018. The final deadline is April 6, 2018. More information, including how to apply, was provided in Electronic Item 11.7.
Carli Baylor noted that January public meeting minutes were provided in Electronic Item 11.8. Staff presented Unified Planning Work Program modifications, Mobility 2045, and North Texas SolSmart designations.

Carli Baylor also noted that NCTCOG will host a March online comment input opportunity March 12-April 10. Members of the public can review and comment on the funding program for safety innovative and emergency projects. Details were distributed at the meeting in Reference Item 11.12.

Victor Henderson referenced the Public Comments Report provided in Electronic Item 11.9. The report is a compilation of general comments submitted by members of the public from December 20, 2017, through January 19, 2018. The majority of the comments received were regarding the Collin County Strategic Roadway Plan.

Jessica Scott noted that the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) met earlier in the week. At the meeting, a panel was hosted regarding bike share. Key issues discussed included bicycle parking and the responsiveness of bike share companies addressing issues such as rebalancing fleet when necessary. Other considerations discussed included limitations on the maximum number of bikes within a community or geographic area and data collection. At an upcoming Surface Transportation Technical Committee (STTC) meeting, NCTCOG staff will provided additional information related to bike share considerations.

Michael Overton noted the City of Dallas Office of Environmental Quality, in conjunction with the Dallas Bar Association Environmental Law Section, was hosting the first annual North Texas Climate Change Symposium on March 9, 2018, from noon to 4:00 pm at the Belo Mansion in Dallas. He noted that additional details were available at www.northtexasclimate.eventbrite.com.

The current Local Motion was provided in Electronic 11.10, and transportation partner progress reports were provided in Electronic Item 11.11.

12. **Other Business (Old and New):** There was no discussion on this item.

13. **Next Meeting:** The next meeting of the Surface Transportation Technical Committee is scheduled for 1:30 pm on March 23, 2018, at the North Central Texas Council of Governments.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 pm.
Access North Texas updated to meet transit needs

The North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) recently updated Access North Texas through an inclusive planning process relying on local input. The process included the participation of elected officials, local government staff, transit riders, health and human service agencies, educational institutions, and businesses.

Access North Texas is the public transit-human services transportation coordination plan for the 16 counties served by NCTCOG. The plan identifies the transportation needs of older adults, individuals with disabilities, and individuals with lower incomes. Based on a combination of research, technical analysis, and public input, the plan identifies strategies to better serve these vulnerable populations with public transportation.

During the public outreach process, NCTCOG staff polled attendees to gauge how transportation network companies (TNCs) such as Uber and Lyft, self-driving vehicles, and other technologies were perceived in their communities.

Some communities saw the potential transportation gap that TNCs could fill while others had concerns about their accessibility. Concerns included vehicle accessibility for individuals using mobility devices and people who don’t own smartphones. In the updated plan, NCTCOG staff included a new regional strategy that encourages communities to consider non-traditional ways to deliver public transportation, including TNCs. Encouraging TNC service and coordination with transit agencies, where appropriate, will help in the development of their accessibility to all riders. While Access North Texas is not a funding document, it is used as a guide for agencies that provide transportation services when federal and State funding becomes available. To review the plan, please visit www.accessnorthtexas.org.

For more information about Local Motion topics, contact Brian Wilson at 817-704-2511 or bwilson@nctcog.org. Visit www.nctcog.org/trans for more information on the department...
Check engine light on? Visit a Car Care Clinic near you in April

Did the check engine light recently appear on your car’s dashboard? The reasons could be numerous, from a simple thing such as a loose gas cap to a more serious — and expensive — issue.

Regardless of the problem, it is important to have it checked because your car will not pass the emissions portion of the State inspection until it is repaired.

The North Central Texas Council of Governments is partnering with local automotive repair shops to conduct a series of Car Care Clinics in April. Once again, the focus is on the dreaded check engine light. While you need to have a problem with the light addressed, repairs may cost less than you think.

Talk to a mechanic for FREE at one of 12 clinics throughout the region beginning Saturday, April 7 and continuing until April 28. These clinics will provide drivers with an opportunity to talk to a technician about the potential cause the problem and how it may be fixed. Some vehicle owners may qualify for assistance with emissions repairs if they meet certain income requirements.

A NCTCOG staff member will be on hand at select clinics to explain the AirCheckTexas Drive a Clean Machine Program, which allows qualifying motorists to get their vehicles repaired for as little as a $30 copay, so they can pass the emissions inspection. Income and vehicle requirements for the program are available at [www.airchecktexas.org](http://www.airchecktexas.org). A family of four earning $75,300 or less, for example, is eligible for a repair voucher worth up to $600.

AirCheckTexas is one of many successful programs credited with helping the region improve its air quality over the past several years. Ten Dallas-Fort Worth area counties are in nonattainment for ozone pollution and are working toward compliance with the federal government’s standard. To find a clinic near you, visit [www.ntxcarcare.org](http://www.ntxcarcare.org).

High-speed rail project moving forward

High-speed rail is moving forward across Texas. A series of public hearings were held along the planned Dallas-to-Houston corridor, and comments have been received on that project. The Federal Railroad Administration is now working on responding to them. The hope is to have a record of decision by the end of the year, allowing the project to advance to design and construction.

Elsewhere, NCTCOG is trying to assist Dallas and Fort Worth with the creation of a local government corporation, which would have high-speed rail oversight in the region. Discussions also continue on how to advance high-speed rail from Fort Worth to South Texas. The ultimate result could be a network of high-speed trains providing Texans another safe, efficient way to travel among the State’s major metropolitan areas.
The Federal Highway Administration has announced another round of designations of the Alternative Fuel Corridors. These corridors were established to ensure alternative fuel vehicles can travel on specified roadways that have adequate alternative fuel refueling/charging infrastructure.

In addition to previously awarded interstate highway corridors designated in 2016, the second round added US Highway 75 as a corridor for natural gas, propane, and electric vehicles to the North Texas region.

Based on these corridor designations, drivers from North Texas can have confidence in operating a variety of alternative fuel vehicles to neighboring metropolitan areas.

A third round of corridor designations will occur later in 2018.

For a complete map of all designated alternative fuel corridors across the country, visit www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/alternative_fuel_corridors/maps.

Data sharing grants available for DFW cities

Transportation partners interested in sharing information on road closures, major events and traffic signals to make the roads safer and more efficient are invited to apply for grants of up to $25,000 by May 4.

NCTCOG is offering assistance to cities and other transportation partners as part of two initiatives. First, $125,000 is available to encourage the sharing of traffic signal data.

This information can be shared with the developer community to support development of connected-vehicle, vehicle-to-infrastructure and other intelligent transportation applications in an effort to improve how vehicles communicate.

These grant programs also seek to prepare the region for automated vehicles.

Additionally, the Waze Data Sharing Program offers entities that agree to share information on road closures access to real-time data provided by users of the navigation app. Like the traffic signal data project, this grant has $125,000 available for awards.

Ultimately, this information will help build out 511 DFW as a portal for transportation information.

To be eligible, applicants must:

- Have jurisdiction over the relevant traffic signals and routes
- Be willing to share their data with outside entities, such as NCTCOG, neighboring jurisdictions, transit authorities, transportation information applications and others

This is the second time NCTCOG has offered such grants. Last year, grants were provided for both programs.

The latest round of grants will help entities implement low-cost solutions to improve the reliability of their transportation networks.
Share thoughts on the Mobility 2045 plan

NCTCOG staff will present Mobility 2045 draft recommendations, funding initiatives, an air quality update and bicycle opinion survey results during public meetings in April.

Residents can provide input on Mobility 2045, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan for Dallas-Fort Worth, as well as several other transportation initiatives at public meetings on April 9 (Garland), April 10 (North Richland Hills) and April 11 (Arlington).

Mobility 2045 will define a long-term vision for the region’s transportation system and guide spending of federal and State transportation funds. This includes funding for highways, transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and other programs that can reduce congestion and improve air quality. The Regional Transportation Council is expected to take action on draft recommendations in June.

In addition to developing a Metropolitan Transportation Plan, NCTCOG staff is responsible for assisting with funding initiatives. The Transportation Improvement Program is a federally and State-mandated list of projects with committed funding for construction or implementation within a four-year period. Staff will present the draft list of projects to be funded between 2019 and 2022.

Staff will also provide proposed modifications to the fiscal year 2018 and fiscal year 2019 Work Program. The UPWP for regional transportation planning provides a summary of transportation and related air quality planning tasks to be conducted by the metropolitan planning organization within a two-year period.

Finally, air quality updates and bicycle opinion survey results will also be presented.

Watch the Arlington meeting in real time by clicking the “live” tab at www.nctcog.org/video. A recording of the presentations will also be posted at www.nctcog.org/input.