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Project Background – Steps for Project Development

Feasibility Study (2010)

Route Study (2013-2014)

Environmental Study & Schematic Design

Detailed Design & ROW Acquisition

Utility Adjustments

Construction

We are here
2010 Feasibility Study – Project Map
Route Study - Overview

- Feasibility Study (2010)
- Route Study (2013-2014)
- Environmental Study & Schematic Design
- Detailed Design & ROW Acquisition
- Utility Adjustments
- Construction

We are here
Route Study – Stakeholder Meetings

- **Kick-off Meeting – July 2013**
  - History and Overview of the Study
  - Discuss Project Schedule

- **Second Meeting – October 2013**
  - Identify Constraints and Features
  - Review Preliminary Options
  - Review Draft Evaluation Criteria
  - Determine Date and Location of Public Meeting

- **Third Meeting – January 2014**
  - Review Revised Options for Public Meeting
Route Study – Stakeholder Meetings

- Fourth Meeting – April 2014
  - Review input from February public meeting
  - Refine route options

- Fifth Meeting – May 2014
  - Review evaluation of route options
  - Identify Recommended Options
Evaluation Criteria – Congestion/Mobility and Safety

- **Congestion/Mobility:**
  - ✔ Average Estimated Traffic Demand (2040)
  - ✔ Population within 2 miles

- **Safety**
  - ✔ Potential for Reduction in Crashes (2040)
Evaluation Criteria – Socioeconomic Factors

- Potential Impact to Tax Rolls
- Number of Parcels Impacted
- Potential Residential Displacements
- Potential Impact to Land Use
  - Residential
  - Commercial
  - Agricultural
  - Other
Evaluation Criteria – Environmental Factors

- Floodplains
- Additional Impervious Cover
- Wetlands
- Playa Lakes
- Water Wells
- Streams
- Potential Wildlife Habitat
- Potential Historic Sites
- Cemeteries
- National Historic Register Sites
- Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks
- Official Texas Historical Markers
- Parks
- Potential Archaeological Resources
- Potential Hazmat Sites
- Prime Farmland
- Potential Traffic Noise Receptors
- Oil/Gas Wells
- Oil/Gas Pipelines
Evaluation Criteria – Engineering Factors

- Amount of Existing Pavement Utilized
- Total Right-of-Way Required
- Estimated Construction Cost (Interim and Ultimate)
- Number of Stream Crossings
- Number of Bridges
- Segment Length
Evaluation Ratings

- - -
Higher Socioeconomic Impact
Higher Environmental Impact
Higher Engineering Constraints or Costs

O

+++
Lower Socioeconomic Impact
Lower Environmental Impact
Lower Engineering Constraints or Costs
Segment 1 – Preliminary Options
# Segment 1 - Evaluation

## Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congestion/Mobility &amp; Safety</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic</strong></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering</strong></td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Ranking</strong></td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Average Traffic Demand (2040)**: 5,000 to 6,000
- **Interim Construction Cost (2014$)**: $49 M to $52 M
- **Ultimate Construction Cost (2014$)**: $181 M to $186 M

* Does not include Right-of-way Costs
Segment 1 – Recommended Option 1D

Recommended Route Options Map
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Evaluation – Why Option 1D?

- Ability to expand toward airport in the future by utilizing existing FM 2641
- Lowest socioeconomic impact of all options in Segment 1
- Lower environmental impact than options 1A and 1C
Segment 2 – Preliminary Options
## Segment 2 - Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2A</th>
<th>2B</th>
<th>2C</th>
<th>2D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congestion/Mobility &amp; Safety</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

- Average Traffic Demand (2040): 11,000 to 12,000
- Interim Construction Cost (2014$)*: $36 M to $37 M
- Ultimate Construction Cost (2014$)*: $116 M to $120 M

* Does not include Right-of-way Costs
Evaluation – Why Option 2D?

- Lowest socioeconomic impact of all options in Segment 2
- Lowest environmental impact of all options in Segment 2
- More direct route than option 2C
Segment 3 – Preliminary Options
Segment 4 – Preliminary Options
Segment 4 – Revised Options
### Segment 3 and 4 Combination Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option in Segment 3</strong></td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>3E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option in Segment 4</strong></td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>4D</td>
<td>4D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congestion/Mobility &amp; Safety</strong></td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic</strong></td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering</strong></td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Ranking</strong></td>
<td>2nd (tie)</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>2nd (tie)</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Segment 1 – Recommended Option 3D
Segment 1 – Recommended Option 4D
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Evaluation – Why Options 3D & 4D?

- Lowest environmental impact of all options
- Reduces impact to existing development along FM 1585
- Establishes opportunity for extension to northeast side of the community
## Segment Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Average Traffic Demand (2040)</th>
<th>Interim Construction Cost (2014 $)*</th>
<th>Ultimate Construction Cost (2014 $)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment 1</td>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>$49 – 52M</td>
<td>$181 – 186M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 2</td>
<td>11,000 - 12,000</td>
<td>$36 – 37M</td>
<td>$116 – 120M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 3</td>
<td>24,000 - 25,000</td>
<td>$54 – 72M</td>
<td>$198 – 220M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 4</td>
<td>15,000 - 16,000</td>
<td>$32 – 49M</td>
<td>$141 – 168M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,000 - 25,000</td>
<td>$171 – 210M</td>
<td>$636 – 694M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include Right-of-way Costs
Recommended Route Options

Lubbock Outer Route
DRAFT
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Funding must be identified and secured before each step in the process.
Written comments to be sent by June 27, 2014

Submit a comment card at the meeting today or send your comments by:

- E-mail: steven.warren@txdot.gov
- Fax: (806) 748-4380
- Mail: 135 Slaton Road, Lubbock, TX 79404-5201

Please provide your name and address at the sign-in table if you would like to be included on the project mailing list.
To present your comments related to the Lubbock Outer Route, please fill out a speaker card and return it at the sign-in table.