US 67 CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN
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Corridor Working Group (CWG) Meeting #1
Meeting Overview and Introductions

- Introductions
  - Name
  - Organization
Meeting Overview

- What is a Master Plan?
- Local Government Panel
- US 67 Corridor Master Plan Development
- Corridor Working Group (CWG) Discussion
- Public Involvement
- Panel and Discussion of Issues Relevant to the Study
- Lunch
- Question and Answer Session
- Moving Forward / Next Steps
- Wrap Up
So why are we here today?
US 67 Corridor Master Plan

- TxDOT in partnership with communities would like to identify and evaluate current and future transportation needs along the US 67 corridor
- Obtain feedback from stakeholders
- Develop a US 67 Corridor Master Plan including recommendations to enhance mobility and safety along the corridor

Study Limits: I-10 west of Fort Stockton to the Presidio / Ojinaga Port of Entry (142 miles)

- No preconceived solutions
- Safety is the primary focus of this study
What is a Master Plan?

- Defines the communities’ vision for US 67
- Policy guide for communities to use when considering improvements to the corridor
- Considers the needs of all corridor users and modes
  - Cars, bicyclists and pedestrians, freight
  - Residents, businesses, and visitors
- Evaluates current and future conditions, needs, and constraints
  - Safety, environmental, economic, community development
- Driven by stakeholders
  - Communities identify needs, issues, and potential solutions
What is a Master Plan?

- Defines corridor challenges and opportunities
- Evaluates possible community sensitive solutions
- Identifies short-, mid-, and long-term transportation improvements:
  - Improve safety
  - Improve quality of life
  - Improve traffic flow
  - Tourism / recreational opportunities
  - Bicycle / pedestrian connections
  - Several other aspects – to be defined by communities
Local Government Panel
Local Government Panel

- Why is this study important to you and your community?
- Why is it important for you to be involved in this study?
US 67 Corridor Master Plan Development
Study Approach/Schedule

2017
- Collect Data
- Bus Tour #1

Spring 2018
- Document Existing Conditions
- Develop Traffic and Safety Analysis
- Complete Needs Analysis
- Develop Goals and Objectives
- Bus Tour #2
- Public Meeting #1

Summer 2018
- Develop Conceptual Alternatives
- Identify Long-term Strategies

Fall 2018
- Evaluate Conceptual Alternatives and Long-term Strategies
- Public Meeting #2
- Bus Tour #3

2019
- Revise Conceptual Alternatives Based on Feedback
- Public Meeting #3
- Develop Draft Corridor Master Plan
- Develop Final Corridor Master Plan

Spring 2018 – CWG Meeting #1 and #2

Communicate Study Purpose and Process, Identify Mobility Issues
Roadway Characteristics

- From I-10 west of Fort Stockton to Presidio Port of Entry
- Length: 142 Miles
- Principal Arterial
- Primarily two-lane undivided highway
- Existing Right-of-Way (100 feet – 200 feet)
- One at-grade and two grade separated railroad crossings in Alpine
- One at-grade railroad crossing between I-10 and US 90
Crashes Along the Corridor 2010-2016

Source: TxDOT’s Crash Records Information System (CRIS)
Total Crashes by Severity – 2010 to 2016

- In-capacitating Crashes: 4 (0.6%)
- Non-in-capacitating Crashes: 28 (4.2%)
- Possible Injury Crashes: 80 (11.9%)
- Non-injury Crashes: 58 (8.6%)
- Unknown Injury Crashes: 11 (1.6%)
- Fatal Crashes: 492 (73.1%)

Source: TxDOT’s Crash Records Information System (CRIS)
Roadway Related Crash Types – 2010 to 2016

- Intersection-related crashes: 90
- Truck-involved crashes: 44
- Rear-end collisions: 17
- Sideswipe collisions: 49
- Head-on collisions: 18
- Pedestrian- and bicycle-related collisions: 6

Note: Crashes can be included in multiple categories.

Source: TxDOT’s Crash Records Information System (CRIS)
Preliminary Crash Summary

- From 2010 to 2016, there were:
  - 673 total crashes along the corridor
  - 496 property damage only crashes
  - 166 injury crashes causing 280 injuries
  - 11 fatal crashes resulting in 14 fatalities

- All pedestrian and bicycle reported crashes are in Alpine and Marfa

Source: TxDOT’s Crash Records Information System (CRIS)
## Population Growth (2010 – 2040)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pecos County</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewster County</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidio County</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Davis County</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>25,100,000</td>
<td>40,500,000</td>
<td>15,400,000</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statewide Analysis Model – Third Version (Sam-V3)
### Employment Growth (2010 – 2040)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2010 Employment</th>
<th>2040 Projected Employment</th>
<th>Employment Growth (2010 – 2040)</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pecos County</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewster County</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidio County</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Davis County</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>10,800,000</td>
<td>18,400,000</td>
<td>7,600,000</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statewide Analysis Model – Third Version (Sam-V3)
Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities – Alpine

Source: Google Earth; CDM Smith Field Study
Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities – Marfa

Source: Google Earth; CDM Smith Field Study
Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities – Presidio

Source: Google Earth; CDM Smith Field Study
Historic Traffic Volumes

Source: TxDOT Statewide Planning Map
2017 Average Daily Traffic and Truck Percentages

Source: 2017 US 67 Data Collection (November 6, 2017)
In 2015, US 67 carried:
- About 89,000 tons of truck freight, valued at more than $71 million

In 2015, Union Pacific and Texas Pacifico railroads carried:
- 10.9 million tons of cargo valued at more than $31 billion
- Most of this freight was on the Union Pacific mainline
- Texas Pacifico handled less than 375,000 tons / $200m

Source: TRANSEARCH
So why are you here today?
Corridor Working Group (CWG) Role

- Provide input on study approach and effective public participation and presentation of results
- Help identify key focus group members
- Communicate recommendations to public
- Assist with plan implementation
Corridor Working Group Expectations

- Your participation on CWG meetings (anticipated quarterly)
  - Meetings can be in person, conference calls, or via the web
  - Can send a proxy
- Participation in public meetings / community events
- Continued involvement for two years
- Provide input throughout the process
Corridor Working Group: Interviews and Focus Group Input

- Potential Focus Groups
  - Natural Resources / Environmental
  - Economic Development — Tourism / Business and Commerce
  - Private Landowners (Ranchers, Farmers, etc.)
  - Local Media and Press
  - Emergency Management
  - Community Organizations, Non-Profits, and/or Advocacy
  - State and National Parks
  - Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety
  - Border Trends and Issues
  - School Districts
  - Others?
Public Involvement

- Planned outreach tools
  - Media
  - Community / public meetings
  - Social media
  - Website
  - Brochures and handouts
  - Mindmischer and Metroquest
  - Geo-engagement tool
  - Any other suggestions?
US 67 Bus Tour Summary

- Held on December 12, 2017
- Tour began in the northern part of the study area and progressed through the communities of Alpine, Marfa, and Shafter and Presidio
- Returned to Alpine to conclude the trip
Public Involvement

- Public Meeting Series #1 – Spring 2018
  - Communicate study purpose and process
  - Identify corridor mobility issues

- Public Meeting Series #2 – Fall 2018
  - Present conceptual alternatives

- Public Meeting Series #3 – 2019 (time frame TBD)
  - Agenda TBD
Panel and Discussion of Issues Relevant to the Study
Open Discussion – Discussion of Issues Relevant to the Study

- Safety Analysis
- Highway Widths / Right of Way (ROW)
- Bicycle / Pedestrian Facilities
- Passing Lanes
- Speed Limits
- Intersection Considerations – Unsignalized and Signalized
- Recreational Issues
- Other Issues
Safety Analysis
Safety Analysis

- Safety analysis typically entails
  - Review historic crash data
  - Identify types of crashes, conditions leading to crashes, and identify trends
  - Calculate crash rates and compare with statewide averages

- Review safety for all modes of travel
  - Pedestrian and bicycle safety
  - Transit facilities safety
  - Rail-road crossings
Safety Analysis

- Importance of a safety analysis
  - Identify TxDOT-approved roadway characteristics
    - Sight distance and clearances
    - Median type
    - Shoulder widths and clear zones
  - Improve design to accommodate oversized vehicles
  - Encourage safe driving practices
    - Safety programs and campaigns
  - Improve signage
Highway Widths / ROW
Highway Widths / ROW

- **Highway Width**
  - Current width of two-lane sections limited to 36 feet south of Marfa
    - One 12 foot travel lane per direction
    - 6 foot shoulder
  - Width is narrow for oversized vehicles such as towed mobile homes
  - Shoulder too small for disabled vehicles

- **Right-of-way (ROW)**
  - ROW width varies from 100 to 200 feet along the corridor
  - Improvements in narrow areas may require new ROW
Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
Bicycle Facilities

- **Considerations**
  - Bicycle lanes separate slower bicycle traffic from vehicular traffic for smoother traffic flow
  - Shared-use paths might be an option where right of way is available
  - Shared-used paths and dedicated bicycle lanes should meet design criteria
Pedestrian Facilities

- Considerations
  - Crosswalks designate right-of-way for motorists to yield to pedestrians
  - Improperly located / designed crosswalks give false sense of safety
  - Intersection crosswalks safer than midblock crosswalks
  - Ramps and sidewalks must be ADA-compliant
Passing Lanes
Passing Lanes

- Considerations
  - Effective method for improving traffic operations on two-lane roads
  - Lower cost than reconstructing roadway to four lanes
  - Act as truck climbing lanes on steep grades
  - Proper length and spacing is critical for efficient operation
  - Construct at locations where sight-distance requirements for passing are not met
  - Proper signing at beginning and end
Speed Limits
Speed Limits

- Considerations
  - Posted speed limits typically based on the 85th percentile speed
  - Maximum speed on Texas highway system – 70 mph
  - Alteration of speeds to be supported by traffic engineering study
  - Highway speed limits reduced in and around cities and towns
Intersection Considerations
Intersection Considerations – Unsignalized

- Stop signs are used when:
  - Street entering a through highway
  - Unsignalized intersection in a signalized area
  - High Speed, restricted view, crashes, delays
  - Comparable volumes on main and side street

- Roundabouts:
  - FHWA proven safety countermeasure
  - Less maintenance
  - Aesthetically appealing

Source: 2011 Texas MUTCD, FHWA
Intersection Considerations – Signalized

- Consider delay, safety, capacity and efficiency
- Currently 8 TMUTCD signal warrants
- Efficient operations for all modes – autos, trucks, pedestrian, transit
Recreational Issues
Recreational Issues

- One rest stop currently available between Marfa and Alpine.
- Strategically-placed scenic viewpoints / rest areas serve as safety features (Driver fatigue is major cause of serious traffic accidents resulting in 1,500 fatalities and 71,000 injuries in the U.S. each year).
- Biking, pedestrian, and transit facilities may help support tourism.

Other Issues
Lunch


Online Geo-engagement Tool - Crashes
Online tools: MindMixer

- Online community engagement tool: http://us67.mindmixer.com/
- Gathers input via:
  - Social media
  - Surveys and polls
  - Map-based tools
  - Photo-sharing
- Promotes community-driven idea generation, goal-setting, and prioritization
Moving Forward / Next Steps

- Community Events
  - Safety Event - Alpine Civic Center,
  - March 24, 2018, 10:00 AM to 1:00 PM
- Next Corridor Working Group (CWG) Meeting
  - April 2018
Wrap Up

Rebecca Reyes
TxDOT Project Manager
915.790.4205
Rebecca.Reyes@txdot.gov

Chris Weber
TxDOT Alpine Area Engineer
432.837.3391
Christopher.Weber@txdot.gov

Project website:

Thank You!!!