

# Mobility Plan Meeting - Northern Area Question Report

Thursday, Sept. 10 6PM

| #  | Question   | Answer(s)   |
|----|--|---|
| 1  | Brian, are you recording these sessions? If so will playback be available?                             | Hi Brian, the sessions are not recorded but the presentation will be available on the City's website. <a href="http://www.cityofdenton.com/mobilityplan">www.cityofdenton.com/mobilityplan</a>          |
| 2  | Will you announce the number of attendees tonight and in future meetings so we can gauge awareness?    | There are 14 current attendees.   |
| 3  | How much of the model is current vs. projected?  | That is difficult to quantify. Most of the roadways shown inside the loop are existing in some form or fashion. Much of the projected (or future) network lies outside Loop 288.                        |
| 4  | What kind of roadway are Carroll Boulevard and the newly-expanded Mayhill?                             | Both Carroll and Mayhill are considered Primary Arterial roadways.  |
| 5  | What is a cyclist's opinion of the primary artery having a bike lane next to it?                       | Staff does not prefer on-street bike lanes on a primary arterial.   |
| 6  | How will downgrades impact TIAs for multifamily?   | Downgrading a roadway from one classification to another will minimize right-of-way needed, reduce the amount of pavement required, and generally reduce the fiscal impact for any type of development. |
| 7  | Why are you downgrading sherman inside of Loop 288 if you expect the volume to double?                 | While Sherman will still carry substantial traffic volumes, we believe that a secondary arterial is more than adequate inside Loop 288.   |
| 8  | What are the plans for Loop 288/Kings row when windsor is extended to Loop 288?                        | King's Row will remain a collector on the 2020 Mobility Plan as it was on the 2015 Plan. No changes are proposed.   |
| 9  | Why does the land owner have to make sacrifices, to satisfy the city of Denton for retail development? | Staff does not fully understand this question, can you please elaborate?  |
| 10 | Will there be any bike access on the 428 freeway plan?   | Yes, but what type bike infrastructure and where it will be located will be decided as staff continues to move through the design phase.  |

# Mobility Plan Meeting - Northern Area Question Report

Thursday, Sept. 10 6PM

| #  | Question  | Answer(s)   |
|----|---|---|
| 11 | CAF will need access roads, but Agave Ranch precludes enough ROW, doesn't it?   | If FM 428 is determined to be a controlled-access facility, the right-of-way needs and how they are satisfied will be determined during the schematic design phase. There are design alternatives which can minimize the right-of-way take.     |
| 12 | Can you say how many access points there will be on 428 between Loop 288 and the Greenbelt?   | It has not been determined at this time. The number and types of roadway crossings and the associated interchange design will be determined during the design phase.  |
| 13 | Would you explain again why Windsor was downgraded?   | The portion of Windsor between Loop 288 and US 77 is limited in right-of-way. Staff does not feel that a secondary arterial is buildable in this area.  |
| 14 | Are there plans to extend Stuart Rd. over/under the loop?   | Not at this time, but as Loop 288 is revised and frontage roads are added, this can be reconsidered.  |
| 15 | There is a self-reinforcing prophecy element of the model. If you have a thoroughfare that presumes a large development then a large development can grow there.                | That is only partially true. Some development will follow the infrastructure, but much of it will follow land availability.   |
| 16 | What is the timeline for the Loop 288 west expansion?   | The current expectation is to have the plans ready to request bids in 2026.   |
| 17 | Why was the Outer loop pulled further south from Shepherd than the current NCTCOG plan?   | This is the latest alignment available from TxDOT. The Outer Loop will transition from Sherman to Milam and intersect IH 35 at Milam.   |
| 18 | What land use assumptions are fed into the travel demand model? Are they the same as the Future Land Use Map, or do they differ from that plan somehow?                         | They are substantially the same. They have been modified, however, to reflect development changes that have occurred since the last update of that plan. The Traffic Engineering staff have worked with Planning staff in making these changes. |
| 19 | Is there any City discussion regarding Clear Creek being a greenbelt throughout the northern section of the 3-part comprehensive plan, in particular between FM428 and FM 2164? | Staff does not have any knowledge of this or any similar plan.  |

# Mobility Plan Meeting - Northern Area Question Report

Thursday, Sept. 10 6PM

| #  | Question   | Answer(s)  |
|----|--|--|
| 20 | Is there a partnership with TXDOT on keeping wide shoulders for bicyclists on rural roads?   | Yes, due to some recent activity, staff is working with TxDOT to ensure adequate room remains for cyclists after roadway widening occurs.  |
| 21 | What is the TXDOT R.O.W. for FM 428?   | The current right-of-way appears to be approximately 100 feet. The right-of-way needed for any proposed expansion to a controlled-access facility will be determined during the design phase.  |
| 22 | Can you provide contact information at COG and TXDOT to express our concerns on the Outer Loop?  | Yes, staff will provide that after the meeting.  |
| 23 | Are the proposed Road boundary alignments shown on the map set or are they flexible? Some roads shown affect existing homes negatively that are located within the County. And does the County have any say of approval or denial of the road boundaries being proposed? | The roadways shown on the Plan are indeed flexible. They can move up to 1,000 feet without requiring a Mobility Plan amendment. They are intended to show needed connectivity in a general manner, not represent a specific alignment. |
| 24 | Is Stuart Road planned to provide a crossing of loop 288, or will people need to cross loop 288 at 2164 or 428? Same question for Windsor across I35 on the northwest side.  | Stuart is not proposed to cross Loop 288 at this time. Windsor, however, is shown to cross IH 35 and staff is currently working with TxDOT to include this in the redesign of IH 35.   |
| 25 | What are your plans for Warschun Rd. and Gribble Springs?  | There are currently no plans to change any existing portion of Warschun Road and Gribble Springs may or may not be used as a part of a north-south secondary arterial.   |
| 26 | Why not move the roadway from 428 to Milam Rd. at least 1.5 to 2 miles farther north? That would put the roadway through open ranch land affecting fewer people.   | That alignment was established through an alignment alternatives analysis conducted by NCTCOG and TxDOT.   |

# Mobility Plan Meeting - Northern Area Question Report

Thursday, Sept. 10 6PM

| #  | Question   | Answer(s)  |
|----|--|--|
| 27 | <p>The outer loop proposal appears to have moved south enough to totally disturb and ruin the quality of life of 100's of family's and quality farms, as well as 2 quality airstrips which are registered with the FAA. Why would you even consider that when the "true undeveloped land is north of the 2020 plan. The 2020 plan ruins many family's plans of a quiet, peaceful environment in the Greenvally area. Not to mention any ability to sell lots or land around their homes due to proposal.</p> | <p>That alignment was established through an alignment alternatives analysis conducted by NCTCOG and TxDOT.</p>  |
| 28 | <p>On the 2014 and 2020 comparison slide, is the map from the screenshot for the 2020 draft plan publicly available? The publicly available map only shows on-street and off-street. It doesn't differentiate between bike lane and shared lane.</p>   | <p>Staff will make that information available.</p>   |
| 29 | <p>BIKE: For off-street, how do you separate pedestrians from cyclists?</p>  | <p>The current width of the Denton sidepaths is 10-feet. Considering that our minimum sidewalk width is 5-feet and with the potential for 2-way pedestrian and bicycle traffic, we are hesitant to include any separation other than markings. As we move forward with the update of our Transportation Criteria Manual and the specifications for sidepath design, we will consider a wider sidepath requirement (perhaps 12-feet) to allow for safe physical separation of pedestrians and cyclists.</p> |
| 30 | <p>There are some exceptionally wide residential streets in Denton that have no sidewalks. These streets are wide enough to fit 5-6 cars side-by-side.</p> <p>Is it possible to repurpose excess road width for sidewalks instead of taking that ROW from people's front yards? If the city planned to narrow specific oversized streets to add sidewalks, would that plan live in the Mobility Plan or would it live somewhere else?</p>  | <p>Yes. Staff does consider on-street multipurpose lanes as a viable solution to providing pedestrian and bicycle access.</p>  |
| 31 | <p>Can you send out a link to TXDOT website that shows Denton Outerloop Planning? I can't find it on their site. Not showing on any 20-year planning or earlier.</p>   | <p>Yes, staff will provide that after the meeting.</p>   |

# Mobility Plan Meeting - Northern Area Question Report

Thursday, Sept. 10 6PM

| #  | Question  | Answer(s)  |
|----|---|--|
| 32 | Do you have a tentative date for plan finalization?   | Staff's current estimate is to have the final report complete later this year and be brought for consideration by City Council by the end of this year or early 2021.  |
| 33 | Can you explain the "chicken and egg" parallels between mobility planning, traffic projections, and developer/development plans?                        | While some development/developers follow this approach, many do not. Retail or commercial development more often will occur where the traffic is, hoping to grab some of those drivers as potential customers. Residential development, however, more often follows the land...how attractive it may be or how affordable it is. |
| 34 | When is the FM428 feasibility study going to be completed?  | We do not have that information, but will ask TxDOT for an estimate.   |
| 35 | What is driving the need for the proposed freeway north of Hartlee Field Road crossing Trinity Elm Fork and connecting to Rhoads Road near Krugerville? | This is a piece of the "Integrated Corridor" being developed by the North Central Council of Governments and TxDOT. The corridor includes this new roadway coming from Collin County and intersecting FM 428, FM 428 itself, Loop 288 and IH 35.   |
| 36 | Do you prefer feedback on the map or other mechanism?   | We will leave that up to you. Use whichever means is most comfortable. We just want to make sure we do get your feedback.  |