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Project Background – Steps for Project Development

We are here

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

We are here

1. Feasibility Study (2010)
2. Route Study (2013-2014)
3. Environmental Study & Schematic Design
4. Detailed Design & ROW Acquisition
5. Utility Adjustments
6. Construction

Lubbock Outer Route Public Meeting – August 21, 2014
Route Study – Stakeholder Meetings

- Kick-off Meeting – July 2013
- Identify constraints and features, review preliminary options, review draft evaluation criteria– October 2013
- Review revised options for public meeting– January 2014
- Review input from public meeting and refine route options– April 2014
- Review evaluation of route options and identify recommended options– May 2014
- Review input from public meeting and refine route options– July 2014
 Route Study – Public Meeting 1 (February 2014)

- Presented Preliminary Route Options
- 190 Attendees
- 84 Comments
- Presented Recommended Route Options
- 148 Attendees
- 41 Comments
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

- - - - O + + +

Higher Socioeconomic Impact
Higher Environmental Impact
Higher Engineering Constraints or Costs

Lower Socioeconomic Impact
Lower Environmental Impact
Lower Engineering Constraints or Costs
Segment 1 – Current Options
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congestion/Mobility &amp; Safety</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder/Public Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Ranking</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>1st</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 – Preferred Option 1D

Preferred Route Option Map
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Prepared by Jacobs Engineering for the Texas Department of Transportation
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This map was produced for internal use and edited by Texas Department of Transportation in the United States of America. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without written permission.
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
- One of the two most preferred options based on public input
Segment 2 – Preliminary Options (February 2014)
Segment 2 – Revised Options (June 2014)
Segment 2 – Current Options (No change to Revised Options)
## Segment 2 - Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2A</th>
<th>2B</th>
<th>2C</th>
<th>2D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congestion/Mobility &amp; Safety</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic</strong></td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>+28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering</strong></td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder/Public Support</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Rating</strong></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 $37 M
- **Ultimate Construction Cost (2014$)**: $117 M to $119 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 (February 2014)
Segment 3 – Current Options
Segment 4 – Current 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>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option in Segment 3</strong></td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>3E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option in Segment 4</strong></td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>4E</td>
<td>4D</td>
<td>4D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congestion/Mobility &amp; Safety</strong></td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic</strong></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering</strong></td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder/Public Support</strong></td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Ranking</strong></td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Segment 3 – Preferred Option 3C
Segment 4 – Preferred Option 4E
Evaluation – Why Option 3C & 4E?

- Reduces impact to existing residential development along 146th Street west of US 87 and along FM 1585 east of US 87
- Most preferred based on public input
## 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>$117 – 119M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 3</td>
<td>24,000 - 25,000</td>
<td>$54 – 72M</td>
<td>$198 – 219M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 4</td>
<td>15,000 - 16,000</td>
<td>$32 – 51M</td>
<td>$142 – 172M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,000 - 25,000</td>
<td>$171 – 212M</td>
<td>$638 – 696M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include Right-of-way Costs
Preferred Route Option

Preferred Route Option Map

Legend
- Current Route Options
- Preferred Route Option
- Transportation
- Interstate
- Highways
- State Highway
- County Roads
- Local Route
- Jobs/Industry
- Schools
- Community Resources
- Fire Station
- Police Station
- Hospital
- City Recreation
- State/Local Infrastructure
- Postal/County
- Land Use
- Residential
- Schools
- Houses of Worship
- Natural Landscapes
- Floodplain
- Cultural Resource
- National Registered Historic Places
- State Historic Sites
- County Historic Sites
- Low Income & Minority Populations
- 16 Income & Minority Populations
- Hazardous Materials
- Landfill
- Oil Storage Tanks
- Utility Surface Rights
- On-Site Treatment
- Prime Farmland
- Parks/Conservation Areas
- Ponds
- Wetlands
- Water Resources
- Public Water Supply
- Wells
- National Hydric Areas
- National Waterways
- National Waterway
- 100 year Floodplain

Prepared by Jacobs Engineering for the Texas Department of Transportation
We are Here

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>2010-2014</th>
<th>2-5 Years</th>
<th>2-4 Years</th>
<th>1-3 Years</th>
<th>2-4 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility and Route Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental and Schematic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain right-of-way and relocate utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Funding must be identified and secured before each step in the process 10 to 20 years for project implementation
Written comments to be sent by September 2, 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
Website:  http://www.txdot.gov/inside-txdot/projects/studies/lubbock/outer-route.html

Please provide your name and address at the sign-in table if you would like to be included on the project mailing list.
Open Comments

- To present your comments related to the Lubbock Outer Route, please fill out a speaker card and return it at the sign-in table.