

NEXT STEPS

- Summer 2019:
 - Traffic modeling and operational analysis of the five Primary Route Options
 - Review Public Input
 - Access Workshop
 - Historic Resources Survey
 - Second Screening
- Fall 2019:
 - The Locally-Preferred Route Option will be presented at the second Open House

TYPICAL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS



**Advancement from step to step is contingent upon the outcome of the previous step and the availability of funding.*

FREDERICKSBURG RELIEF ROUTE STUDY

The Fredericksburg Relief Route Study is exploring a potential US 290 Relief Route, which would give people the option to travel around, rather than directly through, Fredericksburg. The Study is overseen by the Gillespie County Relief Route Task Force. Support for the Study is provided by the City of Fredericksburg, Gillespie County and the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT).

Project History

The goal of the Fredericksburg Relief Route Study is to identify a locally-preferred option that is consistent with the minimum requirements agreed to by TxDOT, the City of Fredericksburg and Gillespie County. The purpose of the Study is to determine if there is a viable and publicly-supported route option that addresses Main Street traffic concerns.

- The Study, which was initiated in early 2018, is relying heavily on public input to steer the process. To date, three public workshops have been held (May 2018, September 2018 and January 2019).
- Suggestions and input received during the May 2018 workshop were used by the project team to develop “Conceptual Route Options.” In addition, public input was used to refine the goals and objectives of the Study. The Conceptual Route Options, along with the refined goals and objectives, were presented for public review and comment at the September 2018 workshop.
- Using the input received at the September 2018 workshop, the study team worked to refine the routes and reduce the number of options being considered. That effort led to the identification of the eight “Preliminary Route Options” presented at the January 2019 workshop for review and comment.
- Public input received during the third workshop was used, along with engineering criteria and environmental considerations to refine and evaluate route options. Over the last several months, the number of route options has been reduced to five. These five remaining route options (the “Primary Route Options”) are presented here tonight.

The potential locally-preferred option would be the starting point for any future phases of project development, including a detailed environmental study, should the project advance.

Evaluation Process

The goals and objectives, which were refined through public input, directed the Evaluation Criteria used to identify the five remaining Primary Route Options (see insert).

- Raw data was collected (raw data is shown in black in the example below).
- Based on the raw data, each route was ranked from 1-8, with 1 being the best and 8 being the worst. For example, Route A (Blue) had fewest residential displacements and was ranked #1, whereas Route H (Maroon) had the most residential displacements and was ranked #8.

CRITERIA	ROUTE A (BLUE)	ROUTE B (GREEN)	ROUTE C (YELLOW)	ROUTE D (PURPLE)	ROUTE E (GREY)	ROUTE F (ORANGE)	ROUTE G (PINK)	ROUTE H (MAROON)
RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENTS	#1 8	#2 10	#3 13	#4 15	#5 19	#6 28	#7 39	#8 48

- In the event of a tie, both routes received the same ranking. For example, Routes A (Blue) and B (Green) tied with 0 commercial displacements, and Routes C (Yellow) and D (Purple) tied with 2.

CRITERIA	ROUTE A (BLUE)	ROUTE B (GREEN)	ROUTE C (YELLOW)	ROUTE D (PURPLE)	ROUTE E (GREY)	ROUTE F (ORANGE)	ROUTE G (PINK)	ROUTE H (MAROON)
COMMERICAL DISPLACEMENTS	#1 0	#1 0	#3 2	#3 2	#5 3	#7 22	#6 10	#8 29



For more information, visit www.txdot.gov and search keyword "Fredericksburg," scan this QR code, email the Fredericksburg Relief Route Study Team at fredericksburgreliefroute@gmail.com or contact Joe Muck at Joe.Muck@txdot.gov or 512.715.5702.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The chart below shows each goal for the potential Relief Route and the objectives associated with each goal. Paired with each objective are the criteria used to gauge potential impacts associated with the objective. The goals and objectives were adopted by the Gillespie County Relief Route Task Force after considering public input received at the May 2018 public workshop.

GOALS & OBJECTIVES	EVALUATION CRITERIA
PROTECT AND PRESERVE PROPERTY	
Minimize potential displacements (residential and commercial)	Number of homes within the anticipated right of way
	Number of commercial properties within the anticipated right of way
Minimize number of divided parcels	Number of properties that would be divided by the route (leaving a property owner with property on both sides of the road)
Minimize right of way required	Acres of right of way required
Minimize potential for noise and neighborhood impacts	Number of residences within 250 feet of route option (does not include residences located within the anticipated right of way)
ENHANCE ACCESSIBILITY AND MOBILITY	
Facilitate local (intercity) trips*	Not Yet Evaluated
Accommodate bicyclists**	Compliance with TxDOT bike/pedestrian policy (Pass/Fail)
ACCOMMODATE EXISTING AND PROJECTED TRAFFIC VOLUMES	
Reduce the number of trucks Main Street*	Not Yet Evaluated
Help reduce congestion on Main Street*	Not Yet Evaluated
Accommodate projected increases in traffic*	Not Yet Evaluated
ENHANCE SAFETY	
Reduce large truck traffic on Main Street*	Not Yet Evaluated
Reduce potential for vehicle/pedestrian conflicts on Main Street*	Not Yet Evaluated

*Traffic modeling is required to effectively evaluate this objective. Traffic modeling/operational analysis of the five Primary Route Options will occur during the Summer of 2019 and the results considered, during the next stage of the evaluation process as the Primary Route Options are evaluated further.

**All route options satisfied this “pass/fail” criteria. Since all options passed (resulting in an eight-way tie), this criteria were not ranked.

SUPPORTS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Minimizes negative impacts to existing businesses	Number of commercial properties within the anticipated right of way
Maintain accessibility for deliveries to businesses**	Maintains access to existing businesses (Pass/Fail)
Support “new growth” opportunities	Percentage of length where route encompasses existing roadways (requiring frontage roads)
	Percentage of currently undeveloped land at US and State highway intersections (assumes a 1-mile diameter development node around these intersections)

PRESERVE UNIQUE CHARACTER OF DOWNTOWN

Maintain Main Street as a tourist destination and business center**	Maintains Main Street as a tourist destination and business center (Pass/Fail)
Reduce Traffic Noise*	Not Yet Evaluated
Protect Historic resources from residual effects of traffic*	Not Yet Evaluated

PROTECT AND PRESERVE ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES

Minimize potential impacts to Environmental Justice (low income and minority) populations	Percentage of length within Environmental Justice (EJ) areas as identified by United States Census data
Minimize potential impacts to natural environmental features (floodplains, wetlands, and waterways)	Number of river/creek crossings
	Acres of potential wetland impacts
	Acres of potential floodplain impacts
Minimize potential impacts to protected species	Acres of potential impacts to protected or rare habitat or vegetation communities as identified on Texas Parks & Wildlife Department's Natural Diversity Database
Minimize impacts to parks and other known Section 4(f) facilities including historic properties	Acres of public parkland and recreational areas impacted by anticipated right of way
	Number of historic properties impacted by anticipated right of way. (Includes properties that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places as well as properties known to be eligible for listing.)

OTHER EVALUATION FACTORS

Length	Length of route
Facilitates utilization	Preliminary (round trip) travel time savings (in minutes) when compared to traveling on existing US 290
Provides a cost-effective solution	Preliminary cost estimate (in millions)
Public support	Rankings based on survey results and comments received from January 2019 public workshop

*Traffic modeling is required to effectively evaluate this objective. Traffic modeling/operational analysis of the five Primary Route Options will occur during the Summer of 2019 and the results considered, during the next stage of the evaluation process as the Primary Route Options are evaluated further.

**All route options satisfied this “pass/fail” criteria. Since all options passed (resulting in an eight-way tie), this criteria were not ranked.

EVALUATION SUMMARY

	ROUTE A (Blue)		ROUTE B (Green)		ROUTE C (Yellow)		ROUTE D (Purple)		ROUTE E (Grey)		ROUTE F (Orange)		ROUTE G (Pink)		ROUTE H (Maroon)	
Residential Displacements	1	8	2	10	3	13	4	15	5	19	6	28	7	39	8	48
Commercial Displacements	1	0	1	0	3	2	3	2	5	3	7	22	6	10	8	29
Divided Parcels	7	57	5	49	7	57	6	54	3	41	2	36	3	41	1	34
Additional Right of Way Required (acres)	8	537	6	417	7	478	5	358	2	294	1	292	4	311	3	309
Residences Within 250 feet	1	29	2	35	3	45	4	51	5	58	7	83	8	92	6	68
Percent of Existing Roadways Utilized	8	1	6	2	6	2	4	3	1	4	4	3	1	4	1	4
Percent Undeveloped Land at Intersections	1	92.4	2	90.3	3	82.7	4	80.6	5	75.5	7	72.5	6	75.3	8	72.4
Creek Crossings	8	25	7	21	6	18	5	14	4	9	2	5	3	7	1	3
Wetland Impacts (acres)	6	2.4	2	1.5	4	1.9	1	1	5	2	8	5.7	2	1.5	7	5.2
Floodplain Impacts (acres)	7	25.8	8	26.7	5	22.1	6	23	2	10.5	1	8.8	4	20	3	18.3
Natural Diversity Database (NDD) Impacts (acres)	7	.9	1	0	7	.9	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Length (miles)	8	17.3	6	13.8	7	14.9	5	11.4	4	8.6	2	7	3	8.3	1	6.7
Percent of Length Within Environmental Justice Areas	3	1.4	4	1.8	1	0	1	0	5	9.7	6	15.7	7	28.7	8	39.7
Park Impacts (acres)		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0
Known National Register of Historic Places (NHRP)-Eligible Property Impacts		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0
Preliminary Travel Time Savings (minutes)	7	11	8	10	5	12	5	12	1	16	1	16	1	16	1	16
Preliminary Cost (millions)	8	334.6	6	288.3	7	313.8	5	266.8	2	226.3	1	224.9	4	250.9	3	249.9
Public Input	6	14	6	14	6	14	5	10	3	7	3	7	1	2	2	4
TOTAL	87		72		80		64		53		59		61		62	

- Numbers in black represent the raw data in each evaluation criteria category. (e.g. Primary Route Option A (Blue) has 8 Residential Displacements)
- Numbers in orange represent the ranking of each route for each evaluation criteria, with 1 being the highest (best) and 8 being the lowest (worst). (e.g. Primary Route Option A (Blue) includes the fewest Residential Displacements and therefore is ranked 1)
- Public input scores were derived from written comments as well as ratings and comments given by online survey participants.
- The bottom line labeled “TOTAL” represents the sum score for each route. Lower numbers indicate higher ranked routes.
- On the bottom line, the top five (best ranking) options are highlighted in green. These five options are the Primary Route Options that will be considered further.
- Evaluations were based on publicly available data; no field work has been conducted.