MEETING OBJECTIVES: Identify preliminary options for route evaluation for the Lubbock Outer Route Study

Welcome/Introductions.............................................................................................................. Steve Warren, P.E.
Steve Warren, TxDOT TP&D Project Manager, welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked stakeholders and staff to introduce themselves. He decided to reorder the schedule of the meeting to discuss the upcoming public meeting first.

Review of Last Meeting Summary ................................................................. Steve Warren, P.E.
Steve asked the group if they reviewed the notes from the last meeting. He explained the last meeting looked at a route option based on a TxDOT drive along the corridor. The group reviewed it, looked at various constraints and came up with a few more route options. These options have been evaluated by Jacobs and will be presented today.

Discussion of Public Meeting ..................................................................................... Steve Warren, P.E.
Steve reminded the group about the public meeting to be held at Lubbock-Cooper Performing Arts Center on Tuesday, February 4, and encouraged members to notify their constituents of the meeting. He also informed the group that the public meeting notice has been sent to the Lubbock Avalanche-Journal to be published on Sunday, January 19. Roger Beall, TxDOT TPP, mentioned the change in verbiage from “alignment options” to “route options,” but Lubbock District staff was unclear if the change could be made before the notice is printed.

Review Preliminary Options ..................................................................................... Steve Warren, P.E.
Steve began discussing the changes in the preliminary route options as agreed upon by the stakeholders at the October meeting. He mentioned TxDOT’s initial preference is to stay on FM 1585 as much as possible. This route option would reduce additional right-of-way required. Steve also reminded the stakeholders that the proposed routes include 400-feet of right-of-way; the alignment on the map may not be as close as it appears. Starting with segment four, which terminates at US 84 near Slaton, and moving clockwise through the corridor, he addressed the following:

Segment 4:
- Reminded members that an interchange at Woodrow Road in Slaton was eliminated due to high levels of development there.
- The group’s preference is to align with FM 1585 (Segments 4A and 4B), but mentioned that alignment would be problematic once it crosses US 87 to the west.
- The primary issue to bring to the public about segment 4 is where the route should tie into US 84.

Segment 3:
- Steve believes segment 3 is more likely to align with 146th Street instead of FM 1585 due to development constraints along this route, but building farther south than 146th Street is not practical due to its distance from the existing Loop 289.
- One of the stakeholders brought up that development near and east of Kelsey Park is substantial, and that the Outer Route would need to avoid encroaching in those areas.
- In response, Nick Olenik suggested “splitting the difference” between the FM 1585 and 146th Street options and crossing US 87 between the two roads; the Mayor agreed with this suggestion.
  - After discussion the group agreed to add a new option that crosses US 87 in between FM 1585 and 146th Street.
- Steve also discussed the importance of proposing route options that avoid Playa Lakes as much as possible.
- The group confirmed that the Route should be aligned south and west of Wolfforth as the proposed options currently show.

Segment 2:
- The group concurred that any option should tie into FM 1585 West.
- Steve addressed his concern with the location of the interchange with 19th Street. He believes an exit ramp that requires traffic to cross a railroad prior to reaching 19th Street is problematic. He suggested evaluating the possibility of shifting the option to the east to avoid this dilemma. The group concurred. Another route option was added to account for this scenario.

Segment 1:
- David Vroonland from Frenship ISD mentioned a concern about the proximity of the route to the alternative school near Research Boulevard and 19th Street. He suggested possibly shifting the route to the east, which coincides with Steve’s suggestion for Segment 2.
- The group agreed to reintroduce a route option that uses the existing Research Boulevard.
- Nishant mentioned the park located just east of Reese as a potential constraint, but the group believes the park is inactive.

These options will be developed in a manner to present them at the public meeting. The public will be given an opportunity to comment on each of them. Subsequent to the public meeting, the stakeholder group will reconvene to consider the public’s comments and further discuss the route options.
**Review Draft Evaluation Criteria**  
Nishant briefly explained the process for developing the evaluation matrix, and the group was given time to review the matrix. Jacobs and TxDOT staff were on hand to answer specific questions about the evaluation criteria, the matrix and the rating system. The matrix is not fully populated and intended only as a preliminary exercise to further narrow the options based on various feasibility criteria, following the public meeting.

**Next Steps**  
Steve discussed the need to begin prioritizing segments as projects before going into the NEPA process. FHWA will not allow unfunded projects to go through the NEPA process. Therefore, he believes the project will be most likely constructed in segments rather than the entire route; phasing will be critical because of the strong competition for transportation funds. When this phase of the study concludes, TxDOT would like to see a 4-5 mile segment identified for further analysis and inclusion in the MPO’s long-range plan, The Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The funding of the initial segment will be discussed and determined at a much later date.

One stakeholder asked if there is a process by which those purchasing property in Lubbock could be informed about the potential for right-of-way to be acquired for the Outer Route. The group mentioned there are no legal means to do this; TxDOT cannot preemptively tag land for purchase before they have received clearance and funding to do so. The best means to inform the public about the planned route is to include it on the Thoroughfare Plan. Another suggestion was to include the information in the City’s ETJ documents.

Mr. Vroonland of Frenship ISD asked how school districts can integrate the information from this study into their demographic studies for school planning purposes. Steve answered that planning for the Outer Route is no different than planning for another thoroughfare, and that the likely timeframe for the Outer Route is beyond the scope of the school districts’ demographic studies.

**Adjourn**  
The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:15 p.m.

**Next meeting** will be the public meeting, scheduled for February 4th. A follow up stakeholder group meeting has not been scheduled.

**Attachments:**
1. Sign-in sheets
2. Agenda
3. Preliminary Options
4. Preliminary Evaluation Criteria

**Meeting Staff:**
Steve Warren, Jerry Cash, Karen Bradshaw, Joni Hutson, Cary Karnstadt, Lindsey Kimmit, Julie Jerome, Dianah Ascencio, Roger Beall (TxDOT)
Nishant Kukadia, Chris Lazaro (Jacobs)
Sonia Jimenez (Ximenes & Associates)
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Sign-in sheets
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attending</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate (Print Name)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Baker</td>
<td>South Plains Community Action Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Mark Heinrich</td>
<td>Lubbock County</td>
<td>Mark Heinrich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Pat Henderson</td>
<td>Cooper ISD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>H. David Jones</td>
<td>Lubbock MPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Lamberson</td>
<td>City of Slaton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>George McMahan</td>
<td>West Texas HBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Darrell Newsom</td>
<td>City of Wolfforth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Nick Olenik</td>
<td>Lubbock County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Drew Paxton</td>
<td>City of Lubbock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Mayor Glen Robertson</td>
<td>City of Lubbock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Stacy Smith</td>
<td>Plains Cotton Growers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>David Vroonland</td>
<td>Frenship ISD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Neil Welch</td>
<td>City of Lubbock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (Please Print)</td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>E-mail address (optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Kimmitt</td>
<td>TxDOT-ENV</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lindsey.Kimmitt@txdot.gov">Lindsey.Kimmitt@txdot.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Kaminstad</td>
<td>TxDOT-TPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Jerome</td>
<td>TxDOT-EP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Warren</td>
<td>TxDOT-LBB</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Steven.Warren@txdot.gov">Steven.Warren@txdot.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Cash</td>
<td>TxDOT-LBB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Bradshaw</td>
<td>TxDOT-LBB</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Karen.Bradshaw@txdot.gov">Karen.Bradshaw@txdot.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joni Hutton</td>
<td>TxDOT-LBB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Gibson</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kgibson@mylubbock.us">Kgibson@mylubbock.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianah Ascencio</td>
<td>TxDOT-LBB</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Dianah.Ascencio@txdot.gov">Dianah.Ascencio@txdot.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Bull</td>
<td>TxDOT-TPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Lazaro</td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nishant Kukadia</td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:NISHANT.KUKADIA@JACOBS.COM">NISHANT.KUKADIA@JACOBS.COM</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Agenda
AGENDA
Lubbock Outer Route Study
Stakeholder Meeting #3
Wednesday, January 15, 2014, 2:00pm to 4:00pm
TxDOT Lubbock District Office Training Center
135 Slaton Road, Lubbock, TX 79404
Bluebonnet Room

MEETING OBJECTIVES: Review preliminary options to be presented to the public in early February.

Welcome/Introductions.................................................................Doug Eichorst, P.E.

Review of last Meeting Summary.................................Steve Warren, P.E.

Review Preliminary Options .............................................Steve Warren, P.E.

Review Preliminary Options Evaluation Matrix ..............Steve Warren, P.E.

Discussion of Public Meeting ..............................................Steve Warren, P.E.

Next Steps ...........................................................................Doug Eichorst, P.E.

Adjourn
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Preliminary Options
Attachment 4

Preliminary Evaluation
### Lubbock Outer Route Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference #</th>
<th>US 84 (North) to SH 114</th>
<th>SH 114 to US 62/82</th>
<th>US 62/82 to US 87</th>
<th>US 87 to US 84 (South)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SH 114 to US 62/82</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>US 62/82 to US 87</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>US 87 to US 84 (South)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria**
- Population Served (5 mile buffer)
- Potential to serve travelers (5 mile buffer)
- Segments
- Potential land use lost (acreage impacted by segment)
- Environmental Factors
- Floodplains (in acres)
- National Wetlands Inventory (in acres)
- Number of water wells
- Additional impervious cover (Ultimate Buildout, square yards)
- Additional impervious cover (Interim Buildout, square yards)
- Number of stream crossings
- Environmental Parameters
- Potential residential displacements
- Number of intersecting parcels
- Potential commercial displacements
- Residential Land Use (acreage impacted by segment)
- Commercial (acreage impacted by segment)
- Agricultural (acreage impacted by segment)
- Additional impervious cover (Ultimate Buildout, square yards)
- Additional impervious cover (Interim Buildout, square yards)
- Floodplains (in acres)
- National Wetlands Inventory (in acres)
- Number of water wells

**Scoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1E</th>
<th>1B or 1F</th>
<th>2B</th>
<th>2A</th>
<th>3B</th>
<th>3D</th>
<th>4B or 4C</th>
<th>4D</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Desirable</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Desirable</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**
1. Criteria not present in any conditions or with no data removed from scoring
2. Information may be revised based on results of environmental field investigation
3. Highest and lowest scores in Segment 3 vary due to the connections between segments

**TOTAL SCORE**
- Reference # 1: 86
- Reference # 2: 102
- Reference # 3: 92
- Reference # 4: 90

**1/14/2014**
### Lubbock Outer Route Evaluation Matrix

#### DRAFT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td><strong>US 84 (North) to SH 114</strong></td>
<td><strong>US 84 (South)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><strong>US 180 to US 62/87</strong></td>
<td><strong>US 62/87 to US 97</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td><strong>US 287 to US 84 (South)</strong></td>
<td><strong>US 84 (North)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td><strong>US 84 (South)</strong></td>
<td><strong>US 84 (North)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Safety

1. Population served (5 mile buffer)
3. Potential impact to tax rolls (Reduction in taxable value, based on 2012 data)
4. Number of potential historic sites
5. Number of potential archaeological sites
6. Number of stream crossings
7. Number of parks affected
8. Number of acres with an elevated potential for archaeological resources
9. Number of acres with an elevated potential for ecological resources
10. Number of roads affected

#### Socio-economic

1. Number of Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks
2. Number of potential historic sites
3. Number of parks affected
4. Number of acres with an elevated potential for ecological resources
5. Number of acres with an elevated potential for archaeological resources
6. Number of road crossings
7. Number of parks affected
8. Number of acres with an elevated potential for ecological resources
9. Number of acres with an elevated potential for archaeological resources
10. Number of road crossings

#### Environmental Factors

1. Floodplains (in acres)
2. Abandoned river channels (in miles)
3. National Wetlands Inventory (in acres)
4. Agricultural land (in acres)
5. Playa Lakes (in acres)
6. Water wells (in number)
7. Number of oil/gas wells
8. Oil/Gas Pipeline Crossings
9. Number of stream crossings
10. Number of bridges
11. Segment length (in miles)

#### Construction cost

- **Interim Segment**: $111 - $131 Million
- **Ultimate Segment**: $152 - $170 Million

#### Safety

1. Population served (5 mile buffer)
3. Potential impact to tax rolls (Reduction in taxable value, based on 2012 data)
4. Number of potential historic sites
5. Number of potential archaeological sites
6. Number of stream crossings
7. Number of parks affected
8. Number of acres with an elevated potential for archaeological resources
9. Number of acres with an elevated potential for ecological resources
10. Number of roads affected

#### Socio-economic

1. Number of Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks
2. Number of potential historic sites
3. Number of parks affected
4. Number of acres with an elevated potential for ecological resources
5. Number of acres with an elevated potential for archaeological resources
6. Number of road crossings
7. Number of parks affected
8. Number of acres with an elevated potential for ecological resources
9. Number of acres with an elevated potential for archaeological resources
10. Number of road crossings

#### Environmental Factors

1. Floodplains (in acres)
2. Abandoned river channels (in miles)
3. National Wetlands Inventory (in acres)
4. Agricultural land (in acres)
5. Playa Lakes (in acres)
6. Water wells (in number)
7. Number of oil/gas wells
8. Oil/Gas Pipeline Crossings
9. Number of stream crossings
10. Number of bridges
11. Segment length (in miles)

#### Construction cost

- **Interim Segment**: $111 - $131 Million
- **Ultimate Segment**: $152 - $170 Million

#### NOTES

- ¹ To be determined following results of travel demand forecasts
- ² Information may be revised based on results of environmental field investigation
- ³ To be determined during environmental field investigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49,658</td>
<td>12,552</td>
<td>56,184</td>
<td>60,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38,540</td>
<td>34,361</td>
<td>75,114</td>
<td>69,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33,658</td>
<td>35,062</td>
<td>122,001</td>
<td>91,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>99,735</td>
<td>8,713</td>
<td>17,682</td>
<td>20,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/14/2014