

# **PUBLIC MEETING #2 SUMMARY**

## **Collin County Lavon Lake Route Study FM 1378 to SH 78**

**May 19, 2010  
Wylie East High School Auditorium  
3000 Wylie East Drive  
Wylie, Texas 75098**

**Prepared for:  
Collin County**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>1. SETTING .....</b>                          | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>2. ATTENDANCE.....</b>                        | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>3. MEETING DETAILS.....</b>                   | <b>4</b>  |
| 3.1 5:45- 6:30 PM – MEETING SET-UP.....          |           |
| 3.2 6:30-7:00 PM – EXHIBIT VIEWING .....         |           |
| 3.3 7:00-7:25 PM – PRESENTATION.....             |           |
| 3.4 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS .....                    | 7         |
| 3.41 WRITTEN COMMENTS WITH RESPONSES.....        | 15        |
| 3.42 VERBAL COMMENTS WITH RESPONSES .....        | 23        |
| <b>4. HANDOUTS FROM THE PUBLIC MEETING .....</b> | <b>29</b> |
| 4.1 AGENDA.....                                  |           |
| 4.2 POWERPOINT PRESENTATION.....                 |           |
| 4.3 COMMENT FORM/SPEAKER CARD.....               |           |
| 4.4 POSTCARD ANNOUNCEMENT .....                  |           |
| 4.5 SIGN-IN SHEETS.....                          |           |
| <b>5. INDIVIDUAL WRITTEN COMMENTS.....</b>       | <b>30</b> |
| 5.1 E-MAIL COMMENTS .....                        |           |
| 5.2 WRITTEN COMMENTS .....                       |           |
| 5.3 SPEAKER CARDS .....                          |           |



## 1. Setting

Supporting rapid population growth, Collin County has begun a route study to develop consensus on an alignment and preserve a corridor for the future Lavon Lake Bridge, a proposed six-lane divided thoroughfare from FM 1378 to SH 78, in southeastern Collin County.

On Wednesday, May 19, 2010, the second Open House/Public Meeting was held for the Lavon Lake Route Study at the Wylie East High School Auditorium located at 3000 Wylie East Drive, Wylie, Texas 75098. The Open House began at 6:30 p.m. followed by the Public Meeting at 7:00 p.m. in which a project overview and technical presentation was given.

Postcard announcements for this Open House/Public Meeting were mailed to all Collin County residents directly affected by or adjacent to the alternative alignments. A letter of invitation, signed by Mr. Ruben Delgado, Collin County Director of Engineering, was sent to elected and public officials. The Collin County Public Information Office prepared a meeting announcement and display ad that was published in the *Dallas Morning News* on May 2, 2010 and posted on the Collin County web site.

The objectives of the meeting were to present information regarding the history of the project, the evaluation of alternatives, and the draft technically feasible alignment to allow citizens the opportunity to offer input about any facet of the project.



## 2. Attendance

A sign-in table was located at the meeting entrance for attendees to register and obtain handouts. Attendees were encouraged to provide input by completing a speaker card and/or submitting a written comment.

The first attendee arrived at 6:00 p.m. A total of 99 local citizens attended and signed in. The following Collin County and consulting firm representatives were also in attendance:

| <u>Name</u>       | <u>Agency/Firm</u>                    |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Keith Self        | Collin County Judge                   |
| Ruben Delgado     | Collin County Director of Engineering |
| Tracy Homfeld     | Collin County Engineer                |
| Rusty Ozmer       | HNTB Corporation                      |
| Chris Bergeron    | HNTB Corporation                      |
| Scott English     | HNTB Corporation                      |
| Craig Koudelka    | HNTB Corporation                      |
| Jessica Schmerler | HNTB Corporation                      |
| Arrica Hackney    | HNTB Corporation                      |

Attendees had the option of submitting speaker cards and written comment forms the night of the meeting, or providing written comment forms and email comments directly to the County. The public comment period for the Public Meeting began May 19, 2010 and concluded June 2, 2010.

On the night of the meeting, a total of ten speaker cards and one written comment were received. In addition, eight written comment forms and eight email comments were submitted to the County within the public comment period.



### **3. Meeting Details**

#### **3.1 5:45-6:30 PM – Meeting Set-up**

Members of HNTB arrived at the meeting location to set up for the meeting.

#### **3.2 6:30-7:00 PM – Exhibit Viewing**

A registration table was positioned in front of the entrance to the presentation area and open house corridor. As meeting attendees arrived they were given handouts including an agenda, speaker cards and/or written comment forms, and encouraged to sign-in.

Once registration was complete attendees could then view the displayed exhibits for the Lavon Lake Route Study. Exhibits consisted of two alternative alignment maps, a project location map, a project schedule exhibit board, a public involvement process exhibit board and a contact information exhibit board.

Representatives from Collin County and HNTB Corporation answered questions and assisted the public with interpretation of the exhibits.

#### **3.3 7:00-7:25 PM – Presentation**

Collin County Director of Engineering Ruben Delgado opened the meeting with the welcome and introductions. He explained that the purpose of the meeting was to obtain input on the project for further review and development. Mr. Delgado then introduced Collin County Judge Keith Self who briefly discussed the origins of the Project. Judge Self stated that the Project was introduced in the 2007 Collin County Bond Program initiative and that the voters of Collin County had approved the program. In addition, he stated that the County has approved the route study phase of the Project exclusively and does not have funds for further project development phases including construction. He then turned the meeting back over to Ruben Delgado who introduced Rusty Ozmer with HNTB Corporation to give the Project overview and technical update.

Mr. Ozmer presented the technical aspects of the project and opened with the following agenda for the meeting:

- Project Definition
- Project Need and Purpose
- Route Study Process
- Development and Analysis of the Draft Technically Feasible Alignment
- Project Schedule
- Questions and Comments



In outlining the Project Definition, he discussed when the Project was initiated, gave a definition of a route study, and reviewed all of the project development phases. The Project was initiated as a result of the 2007 Bond Program where voters approved funding for a route study across Lavon Lake. A route study develops and evaluates various geometric alternatives to determine the technically feasible alignment for further study and project development. The County has elected to conduct the first phase of project development which is the route study. Currently, the County has no plans or funding available to continue with the next phase of project development. The project development phases of the Project are as follows: 1) Route Study; 2) Design Schematic and Environmental Impact Statement; 3) Right-of-way (ROW) acquisition; 4) Final Design Plans; and 5) Construction. If funding became available as each phase of the Project was completed, the approximate duration to complete all project development phases would be 8 to 14.5 years.

In reviewing the Project Need and Purpose, he discussed the projected increase in population and employment growth in the County by the design year 2030 and the ultimate build out year 2039. Projected traffic volumes and demographics for the year 2030 and 2039 are significant design elements taken into consideration for the Project. In reviewing the projected growth area maps in Collin County from 2007 to 2039, southeast Collin County continues to grow at a rapid pace. Based on these projections, the County as well as the Region should continue to develop and implement long range planning projects. The County has identified its short and long range planning projects on the Collin County Thoroughfare Plan 2007 Update where a “place holder” was depicted on the thoroughfare plan for the Project. The Project has been depicted on the County’s thoroughfare plan since 2002. The Project will consist of a major arterial six-lane divided roadway with a center median located within 120 feet of proposed ROW. The Project’s Need and Purpose objectives have been defined as follows:

- 1) Identify a technically feasible alignment to accommodate the growing east-west transportation needs resulting from population growth and development;
- 2) Provide direct access to/from US 75, the peninsula, and the future Outer Loop for greater mobility and emergency access;
- 3) Provide an alternate east-west route other than US 380 and SH 78 in southeastern Collin County to mitigate for congestion levels.

Mr. Ozmer then discussed the Route Study Process, which is the overall work plan to complete the Project. The steps to complete the route study are as follows:

- 1) Data Assembly and Review
- 2) Develop Alternative Alignments
- 3) Public Meeting #1
- 4) Public Meeting #2
- 5) Public Hearing
- 6) Develop the final report.



During the Data Assembly and Review phase of the Project, the study team developed an environmental constraints map which depicted sensitive areas such as schools, cemeteries, parks, and wetlands to help assist in avoiding or minimizing impacts during alignment development. Also, the study team coordinated and/or met with the City of Lucas, Town of St. Paul, City of Wylie, North Texas Municipal Water District, Texas Archeological Research Laboratory, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to ensure that the appropriate entities have input and were kept apprised of the Project status. For the alternative alignment development, the study team developed alignments that met the geometric criteria, avoided and/or minimized impacts to environmental features, minimized impacts to the number of parcels and homes affected, and utilized existing and/or future roadway networks.

The first Public Meeting was held on October 7, 2009 at the City of Wylie Municipal Complex. Based on comments received at the meeting, the study team developed an additional alternative alignment which utilized existing FM 3286 to the north. Mr. Ozmer reviewed the initial alternative alignments shown at the first Public Meeting and then discussed the updated alternative alignments which included the FM 3286 alignment to the north.

After reviewing the updated alternative alignments, he discussed the alternatives evaluation of the three main alignments which are the North (Purple Alignment), Middle (Green Alignment), and the South (Red Alignment). The alternative alignments were evaluated based upon the evaluation criteria comprised of enhanced mobility/safety, cost effectiveness, engineering feasibility, environmental features, and public involvement. The rating system used in the evaluation matrix was based on a five level rating scale that ranges from double negative (significant negative effect) to a double positive (significant positive effect). Mr. Ozmer reviewed the ratings for each of the alignments relative to the evaluation criteria. He also added that the challenge in determining the draft technically feasible alternative is achieving the right balance or “optimal solution” between the various categories of enhanced mobility/safety, cost effectiveness, engineering feasibility, environmental features, and public involvement. Based on the results of the alternatives evaluation matrix in determining the optimal solution, the study team recommended the draft technically feasible alignment as the South alignment depicted in red on the alignment exhibits. Mr. Ozmer noted that the South alignment is a general representation of the proposed alignment and that geometric refinements will occur through subsequent project development (design schematic, ROW acquisition, and final design). He also stated that the draft technically feasible alignment is contingent upon Commissioners Court approval.

Mr. Ozmer reviewed the Project Schedule, and then discussed various ways for the public to become involved. Attendees were encouraged to attend the Open House or Public Meeting, mark comments or suggestions directly onto the maps, submit comment cards at the meeting or mail them to the study team, contact Mr. Ruben Delgado at the County, or visit the Collin County website where information is posted regarding the Project. At the end of the Project



overview and technical update, Mr. Ozmer opened up the meeting for public comments and questions, but stated that no responses were to be given during the meeting. However, he informed all meeting attendees that all verbal and written questions/comments received by June 2, 2010 would be addressed in the Public Meeting Summary. Ruben Delgado served as the moderator during the public questions and comments period of the meeting.

### 3.4 Summary of Comments

**The public comment period for the second Public Meeting began May 19, 2010 and concluded June 2, 2010. However, the following thirty-six comments received by e-mail from November 2, 2009 to May 19, 2010 have been added to this summary. All comments are presented as submitted by the writer, without corrections made.**

1. Please add me to the mailing list for all future meetings about the Lavon Lake Bridge Study.

I also wish to make my view on the bridge totally clear. All of the current plans are unacceptable. I have already seen radical changes to the area I have lived in for 15 years and the changes are NOT for the better. I do not understand why this county wants to destroy every piece of natural land that is remaining. Areas such as Frisco that used to be beautiful are now ugly concrete covered creations.

I do not want a bridge across Lavon Lake no matter where you choose to locate it. Please abandon this bridge plan. Instead, spend our transportation dollars more wisely to improve the land based road system around the lake. Toll or no toll, the bridge is an extravagantly wasteful plan that ruins the only lake in Collin County.

2. Please add me to the mailing list for all future meetings about the Lavon Lake Bridge Study. I also wish to make my view on the bridge totally clear. I do not want a bridge across Lavon Lake no matter where you choose to locate it. Please abandon this bridge plan. Instead, spend our transportation dollars more wisely to improve the land based road system around the lake. Toll or no toll, the bridge is an extravagantly wasteful plan that ruins the only lake in Collin County.
3. I would love to see many bridges across Lake Lavon. I drive from Nevada to Frisco to work. Does this absolutely have to be a toll bridge though? I would like to see one from Hwy 78 to the Pizza Getti that runs across the lake to the other side and a loop that heads in both Wylie and Princeton directions.

I have lived here all my life, but the traffic and that commute every day is something I must do to eat.



Please send me any info you have.

4. Please add me to the notification list for all future meetings about the Lavon Lake Bridge Study. Please abandon this bridge plan. Instead, spend our transportation dollars to improve the land based road system around the lake. Toll or no toll, the bridge is an extravagantly wasteful project. Lake Lavon is far more of an asset to Collin County without a bridge cutting it in half.
5. Please add me to the mailing list for all future meetings about the Lavon Lake Bridge Study.

I also wish to make my view on the bridge totally clear. I do not want a bridge across Lavon Lake no matter where you choose to locate it. Please abandon this bridge plan. Instead, spend our transportation dollars more wisely to improve the land based road system around the lake. Toll or no toll, the bridge is an extravagantly wasteful project that ruins the only lake in Collin County.

I am certain you've been receiving many emails stating this exact wording. That is because our thoughts are the same, we all feel this way and these words express it clearly.

No Bridge!!

6. Please add me to the mailing list for all future meetings about the Lavon Lake Bridge Study.

I also wish to make my view on the bridge totally clear. I do not want a bridge across Lavon Lake no matter where you choose to locate it. Please abandon this bridge plan. Instead, spend our transportation dollars more wisely to improve the land based road system around the lake. Toll or no toll, the bridge is an extravagantly wasteful project that ruins the only lake in Collin County.

7. I would like to let you know that I live in Nevada and own property around the lake and that I am 100% against the bridge that Collin County is proposing. I would like to go on record as saying "NO BRIDGE!"
8. I would like to make sure I receive a notice concerning meetings for any plans for a bridge across Lake Lavon. I am strictly against any such tax paid project.
9. Mr. Delgado,

Please add our address to the list to receive notification of meetings concerning the Lake Lavon bridge. Please list us as opposed to any new bridge across Lake Lavon.



10. Please send us a postcard notification of the upcoming May 19th meeting. I want our name put on the mailing list. We do not want the bridge. One route goes right through our property.
11. Please add me as a no bridge member requesting I receive all mailings about meetings on this subject-thank you
12. Please send me postcard notification for the May 19th public meeting at Wylie High School and also please include me in the mailings.

You can add my “no bridge” status be added to the record for the May 19th public meeting.

13. Add my name to the “no” list for the bridge.
14. As a Collin County resident and taxpayer, I oppose any and all plans for a bridge over Lake Lavon. This is a complete waste of our tax dollars.
15. I hereby state that I, a senior citizen in Collin County, am totally against this bridge project. We do not need to be spending our money on projects that aren’t an emergency. These economic times are hard enough without trying to add to the taxpayers. **DO NOT BUILD OR CONTINUE TO STUDY THE LAKE LAVON BRIDGE PROJECT.** Save our taxes for necessary projects needed in our county.
16. Mr. Delgado, I am definitely against a bridge over Lake Lavon. I am a Fairview resident. I would like to be put on record as being against this bridge and/or any bridge over Lake Lavon. We need to preserve this lake and this kind of expenditure is also a complete waste of money.
17. I vote AGAINST putting another bridge over Lake Lavon.
18. I am in agreement that this is just another waste of taxpayer’s money. I am against the project.
19. Dear Mr. Delgado;

I am in complete agreement with the opposition to building a bridge over Lake Lavon. And, I agree that repairing existing roads and creating a plan for new roads that go around the lake is both economically feasible and environmentally friendly.

Although I am in state of poor health and not able to get “Out and About”, I have an established network of politically active friends, neighbors, church members and Marine Cops retirees. These folks are truly concerned about the dysfunctional manner in which



the bureaucrats are leading our cities, counties, states and country. We share the common belief that the bureaucrats at all levels of government are more concerned about themselves and the power that they wield than the welfare of our great nation.

To be concise, together we can stop them and my associates and I will help you in any way that we are able.

20. We're AGAINST the bridge. Stop spending money irresponsible.
21. I wish to be added to the list of those concerned citizens that are strongly against the subject project. I have lived in Collin County all of my life and I grew up in the very area where the proposed routes are located. Although I no longer live in this area, I am a county citizen living in McKinney and think it is a total waste of taxpayer dollars to undergo this massive project. I urge that better planning be used to go toward improving the flow of traffic within the county via existing corridors rather than establishing a route that is extremely expensive and captures more private lands for public use with no real benefit.
22. As a Collin County resident I am strongly opposed to any Lake Lavon bridge as it is a waste of taxpayer funds at a time we cannot afford to waste those funds.
23. *(E-mail thread part 1 of 3)*

Why is the study hurtful? Have you reviewed the last Collin County mobility Plan and the population growth figures? If so, you will have noted the project population growth numbers.

We all understand that these growth numbers aren't for next year but they are coming, in the near future. If these projects are on target as they have been in past projections. What is your substitute for the bridge?

I can understand being opposed to various projects due cost or impacts on more people than what it helps. However, I believe that there is need to make sure that Collin County examines all the facts.

Once Collin County has had Public hearings and shares their studies, with the people. Then, I believe if you can refute their studies and conclusions I think you should mobilize your opposition. However, the County having the educational hearing is a plus in our system of government.

Thanks for listening to another point of view.

*(E-mail thread part 2 of 3)*



I would like to add additional information since this issue has been so misrepresented. The "study" being conducted was not because Collin County officials decided this was how they wanted to spend your tax dollars. It was decided by the voters of Collin County. Many interested citizens on the eastern side of the county have for years talked about the need to move people east to west. If you live in Wylie you have Hwy 544 or in Farmersville Hwy 380. Half way between those two cities has had major growth. People build nice homes and after being her a year or so they move back to the city because they have only one road, Hwy 78. They have to travel several miles south or north out of the way to get to 380 or 544 so they can go west to the other side of the county. Hwy 78 has been inadequate for this much traffic for years.

Now the other part of this bridge issue. I have served on the Collin County Transportation Committee in the past. After years of hearing people complain about traffic on the east side and requesting a study for a bridge, the county had the responsibility to listen to the citizens. They put the expense of the bridge study on a bond election to let all the voters of Collin County have a say in whether this project would someday be feasible. That was their job. I did not think the bond would pass and was very surprised it did. That being said, Collin Co. Officials are spending the money voted on by the voters to do this study. Your battle is not with your county government. It is with your neighbors all over the county who asked and then voted money to be spent on this study. Before folks start or believe rumors they should do a little research. This recent election showed me how many false rumors were being spread and the masses that fed them could have voted against that bond if they had taken time to be informed.

*(E-mail thread part 3 of 3)*

You are making my point. This is what frustrates me because I know that Collin County has been trying to be forthright and not hiding anything. However, if I don't check the facts and issues I can't blame anyone but myself.

Also, you don't beat up the messenger at the meetings when they try to let people know what and why something is before them. The whole purpose of the public input is to get a feel for what the community is thinking about the project.

24. I support the bridge project, sorry to see this get caught up with political groups.
25. You can put me down as opposed to this bridge. Feel free to count my nay vote against all other discretionary spending for the next few years. thx.
26. A request to be put on public record as being against this bridge plan.
27. Dear Mr. Delgado,



I am a Collin Co. resident living in the Lake Lavon area, and I want to take a brief moment to express my position on the bridge project. I am against expending unnecessary energy and resources. Thank-you.

28. Please put me on record as opposing this bridge.

29. hello

we do not need a bridge over lavon

30. For the record, I am not in favor of a bridge across Lake Lavon. Especially with the bad economy. How could our county government even think about such a thing. And, spending many dollars in studies. So, I just say NO to the bridge.

31. I am against a bridge across Lake Lavon. In this financial climate, that is one of the last priorities Collin County or Lake Lavon need. Twenty years from now, look at the option again.

32. Dear Gentlemen:

We will not be able to attend the meeting on Wednesday, May 19, as that is a church night for us, however, I would like to let all of you know that, WE DO NOT WANT ANOTHER BRIDGE ACROSS LAKE LAVON AND REQUEST THAT ALL LINES BE DROPPED ACROSS THE LAKE AND STOP THE SPENDING FOR SURVEYS. In our opinion, this money can be used more wisely by widening existing roads and making changes that would allow a better flow of traffic on some of these roads.

33. All,

- I am not in favor of any route for a bridge cutting across Lavon Lake.
- Please stop the study and remove all the bridge route lines from the county's maps.

I have voiced this position in previous meetings and would ask that you include my comments as a matter of public record for the May 19, 2010 Collin County Public Meeting.

34. Please stop the bridge and hub

35. I am not in favor of any route for a bridge cutting across Lavon Lake. Please listen to the citizens in the area, stop the study and remove all the bridge route lines from the county's maps.

Please include my comments as a matter of public record for the May 19, 2010 Collin County Public Meeting.



36. I am not in favor of any route for a bridge cutting across Lavon Lake. Please listen to the citizens in the area, stop the study and remove all the bridge route lines from the county's maps.

Please include my comments as a matter of public record for the May 19, 2010 Collin County Public Meeting.

**In addition, the following two comments received after the public comment period by e-mail from June 18 to June 19, 2010 have been added to this summary. All comments are presented as submitted by the writer, without corrections made.**

1. Mr. Jaynes,

I was very disappointed in your comments on the Lake Lavon Bridge Project story that aired on the NBC 5:00 news on June 18.

At this point, I can only come to two possibilities: one is that you are not aware of what was said at the public meetings that were held in October of 2009 and May of 2010. I was at the May 2010 meeting and I know you were not present. If you had reviewed the audio recordings you would see that opposition to this bridge is widespread. You claim that “The hope is that in 20, 30 or 40 years -- when people out there are demanding it -- we will have had the foresight enough to find a place for it.” We do not want this bridge now, in 20 years, 30, or 40 years.

The second possibility is that you are aware of the opposition, but don't care. Those of us who stand to lose our property and who have seen the value of our land drop do not appreciate having our voice continually ignored. The residents of the eastern side of Lake Lavon do not appreciate having this bridge shoved down our throats. As said at the May 2010 meeting, you are elected, “to represent us, not rule us.” This bridge primarily affects Precinct 2, which is not what you represent. Given that you are voting on something that will affect more than just your precinct, you should consider the viewpoints of those who will be directly impacted by this bridge.

The Lake Lavon Bridge Project Feasibility Study was buried within a huge 2007 bond that contained a multitude of county transportation projects. “Feasibility” is defined as “the degree to which something can be carried out or achieved.” Between the \$470 million price tag, the aforementioned opposition by the residents who will be most affected, and the Army Corps of Engineers (which manages Lake Lavon) not supporting the bridge, there is nothing “feasible” about this project. The Feasibility Study should end with nothing more said or done. Instead, the county commissioners will soon be voting upon a study that includes a preferred route as part of the results. The fact that



they are shoving any route down our throats as part of a feasibility study shows a violation of the trust we have given to our public servants.

Much ado has been made during this bridge debacle about the projections showing Collin County growing to 2 million people in the years to come. The part of those projections that is carefully avoided by bridge advocates is that the county's own maps show the vast majority of that growth on the west side of Lake Lavon. Growth is projected to be concentrated in Plano, McKinney, Frisco, and other places where there is a Starbucks on every corner and a grocery store 2 minutes away. There is some growth projected for the east side of Lake Lavon, but it pales in comparison to the west side, and is not nearly enough to justify spending \$400-\$500 million dollars on a bridge.

I encourage you and the Commissioner's Court to concentrate on more cost-effective, land-based measures. Highway 78 is the key, and maintaining and expanding this already existing road is a much more logical place to start instead of a half a billion dollar bridge

2. I say no to Lake Lavon bridge. Don't need it or need to spend on it.

**The following written comments were provided on the "Lavon Lake Route Study" alignment exhibits during the Open House and Public Meeting:**

**General**

- Seven general "no bridge" comments
- One comment noting that on the west side of the lake, south of the red alignment, there is only one cemetery on St Paul Road
- One comment for a proposed north-south bridge connecting the peninsula to SH 78 south of Lavon Lake utilizing FM 982, SH 78, and SH 205 for an alternative north-south corridor. This would relieve traffic off of US 75 and promote development going north to U.S. 380
- One comment noting Scenic Point subdivision on the eastside of Lavon Lake is mislabeled
- One comment noting "Please stay off of Parker Rd" (outside of the project limits)
- One comment noting "Protect Parker" (outside of the project limits)
- One comment that proposes an alignment under the TxU power lines west of the lake
- One comment noting, "If there is no money why continue? No bridge"
- One comment noting "No to government overreach"
- One comment noting "Let us raise our children peacefully"
- One comment noting "We keep saying No, why won't you listen?"
- One comment noting "Would you like to lose your house for a road?"



### **Teal Alignment**

- Eight comments noting “no bridge”

### **Green Alignment**

- Four comments noting that the alignment as preferred
- One comment noting that the alignment is impacting their property along CR 437 and proposes to shift the dark purple alignment to the east
- Three “no” comments

### **Red Alignment**

- Two “no” comments
- One comment noting that the alignment is impacting their property at CR 438

### **Blue Alignment**

- Three “no” comments
- One comment stating that the alignment is impacting their property at CR 739

### **Light Purple Alignment**

- Two “no” comments

### **Yellow Alignment**

- One “no” comment

### **Grey Alignment**

- One “no” comment

## **3.41 Summary of Written Comments with Responses**

**The following comments represent one written comment received during the Public Meeting and 15 additional written comments received from May 19, 2010 to June 2, 2010. All comments are presented as submitted by the writer, without corrections made.**

**Note: As previously stated, the public comment period for the second Public Meeting began May 19, 2010 and concluded June 2, 2010. All comments received during the public comment period were addressed with responses.**

- 1) My comments are the same as last time. I don't have the money to move and the Hunt family doesn't need any more money. I and my husband planned on living in our home for the next 30-40 years and then leaving it to our children, but if we are living less than a block from a tollway I hope the Hunts and whoever builds the tollway has a lot of cash because I will fight this. Tollways are built to make money, not for the easy movement of traffic. If they were the Dallas North Tollway would have been fixed years ago.*



Response: Comments are noted for the record.

2) *To Whom It May Concern,*

*My name is [name removed] and, along with my husband [name removed] and our three children, reside at [address removed] on the west side of Lake Lavon. I am completely opposed to ANY bridge over Lake Lavon. I also protest the continuation of Aztec Trail's north / south route that will take away my property, as well as my parents – [names removed] – property at [address removed], where we have ponds, our road & our barn, as well as trees and vegetation. Taking 100' right of way from our properties would mean we lose 1/4 of our land, and our ponds. This is outrageous that you would take a family's land when the property to the east of my fence line is 100's of acres of undeveloped land. If Aztec Trail is to continue north from Parker Rd, it should NOT be done in a manner that would disrupt the land, homes and families currently living on Aztec Trail, when to the east there is plenty of undeveloped land available. I realize I stated this twice – that was so that you clearly understand my position.*

*No Bridge and No Aztec Trail extension through [addresses removed]!!!!!!*

*Also, I would like to know where the bond funds that were not used for the study went - \$500,000.00 of which we were told only \$300,000.00 were spent on the route study.*

*Thank you*

Response: The north/south expansion of Aztec Trail is not part of the route study across the lake. In terms of the bond monies for the Project, bonds were only sold for the actual cost of the route study which was \$367,000.

3) *We wish to have our statement entered into public record for May 19, 2010 public meeting concerning the Lavon bridge: As property and homeowners directly effected by the proposed bridge; we are against building it. To those officials elected to represent our interests – you must do just that. You must represent our wishes and interests, not yours.*

Response: Comments are noted for the record.

4) *Please add my comments to the public record for the Lavon Lake Bridge Study. I do not want a bridge across Lake Lavon, we need to improve the roads we have.*

Response: Comments are noted for the record.

5) *No bridge.*

Response: Comments are noted for the record.



6) *I don't know why you keep spending our money on a study that we have repeatedly said we don't want. You wiggled your way into this study by adding it to something else. That seems to be how government works and it is not right. You keep giving us different routes to choose from, but you aren't listening. WE DON'T WANT A BRIDGE! The money you are wasting is a lot of money that could be wisely used elsewhere. You keep insisting on commercializing ALL of Collin County. Can't we have a little bit of country in Collin County? We are only talking about the small eastern portion of Collin County. Most of Collin County residents will never use this bridge and yet all residents will be paying for it, some with their homes. We have even voted out some of the officials that wouldn't listen to us. Please stop spending our money on something only you want. You are supposed to be working for us. And we have clearly stated, many times, NO BRIDGE!*

Response: Based on the 2007 Collin County Bond Program, voters approved funding for the Lavon Lake Route Study. In the spring of 2009, the Commissioners Court elected to have the route study completed in its entirety. In order to complete the route study, public involvement efforts are an integral part of the study process in which many citizens share their views “for” and “against” the project. Both views for the project are required to be documented through the public meeting summaries and final report submitted to the County.

7) *To the County Commissioners, regarding the Lavon bridge.*

*I would like to express my disapproval toward building a bridge across Lake Lavon that was part of a set of recommendations to the county on reducing traffic congestion. My disapproval stems from several ideas that I wish to explain to you. It is my hope that you will consider these ideas as you vote against any future work toward placing a bridge across Lake Lavon.*

- 1. I have read the existing road study. It is a set of recommendations by an impartial group of engineers. I have not heard of any positive recommendations from a local evaluation of the situation by the county engineers, officials and the public. Impartial recommendations always need to be weighed against the desires of the communities and the local people in charge. Recommendations do not always need to be followed. Do not confuse a recommendation with a requirement.*
- 2. The recommended bridge is based on a connection to an undeveloped road (chapparel) starting at US75 and extending east. Current routes now have the bridge connecting to Parker which has a much more restricted route to US75. Increasing flow for one segment will not help reduce congestion when other segments become overloaded. The traffic flows need to be reviewed if changes to the route are going to be done.*
- 3. The road recommendations are made without consideration of costs. Given our reduced funding availability for roads, someone has to begin considering how*



*much roads cost compared with their expected traffic flows. Without consideration of cost / drivers / mile, all roads would seem reasonable. I'm told bridges across lakes are much more expensive than roads (10x). If higher traffic capacity is necessary, consideration needs to be allowed for less expensive options than a bridge. The public has suggested making 78 a restricted access road and even adding an upper lane deck for additional capacity.*

- 4. The bridge recommendation did not consider a toll road. Toll roads were recommended for other roads. Considering a toll bridge should require an updated evaluation of the road for need. Costs need to be considered. Toll roads should be considered infinitely costly since tolls are never removed. Realize that a toll road does take money from the region that could be used for other purposes.*
- 5. Long term traffic consideration is not the only issue that needs to be considered when planning for roads. Needs and desires of the communities need to be weighed, especially including best use of natural resources.*
- 6. The desires of the developers need to be slightly discounted. Land, lakes and resources once developed usually aren't redeveloped. Thus great care needs to be exercised as you plan for the future. There will always be developers available to build something. But there won't always be land and resources available.*
- 7. Texas Parks & Wildlife list 168 major lakes Lake Lavon is one of the 31 lakes in the North Texas Region. We should protect this great natural resource for everyone. I hope that you take into consideration these ideas as you review other recommendations and decide what is to be done. Please understand the decision should be difficult.*

Response: In order to provide increased transportation mobility, the County must evaluate widening existing roadways where feasible as well as planning for long range improvements to accommodate for the increase in projected employment and household growth throughout the entire County. The County has been proactive in continuing to plan for long range improvements and not waiting until corridors become extremely dense with development, congestion, and sensitive receptors that could potentially preclude a feasible alignment. The challenge in determining the technically feasible alternative is achieving the right balance or “optimal solution” between the various categories of enhanced mobility/safety, cost effectiveness, engineering feasibility, environmental features, and public involvement. In terms of protecting wildlife and the lake’s other natural resources, these items will be addressed in the future project development phase of the design schematic and environmental document. Based on federal regulations, all appropriate criteria of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) will be met in all future development phases of the project.

- 8) This bridge study will have a valuable outcome if Collin County Commissioners listen to the public outcry against it.*



*Do not place a route across Lavon Lake that **represents an unwarranted half billion dollar burden** on the Thoroughfare Plan and the Collin County tax payers.*

*October 7, 2009, HNTB's Public Meeting presentation included these NCTCOG maps below as their "Projects Need and Purpose."*

*NCTCOG explained to us that **these maps actually show what traffic would look like in 2030 without building any new Lavon Bridges**. Traffic around the lake virtually remains the same from 2009 to 2030 just by completing the other road projects.*

*On March 26<sup>th</sup>, citizens informed HNTB and Collin County Engineering that their "Project Need and Purpose" slide actually demonstrates **NO NEED** for a bridge. These slides were subsequently removed from HNTB's May 19<sup>th</sup> public meeting presentation.*

*Changing the presentation does not make the map go away or its data become less valid.*

***This data shows there is NO NEED for a bridge, therefore there is NO NEED to draw this route.***

*Please add my comment to the Lavon Lake Bridge Study public record.*

*Please note: images removed for formatting consideration – please see appendix*

*Response: Comments are noted for the record.*

- 9) *CR 546 is preferred route, I believe this route already has many easements provided, has less property owners to negotiate with, and would replace Pebble Beach Road which is in need of repair while short on actual bridge – thus reducing cost. Run the numbers. Thank you!*

*Response: The green alternative alignment utilizes CR 546 on the east approach of the lake. In terms of the number of parcels and houses impacted compared to the draft technically feasible red alignment, the green alignment has significantly greater impacts.*

- 10) *Dear Mr. Delgado,*

*Thanks for all of your efforts on the project. We support you all the way and our preference is the Parker Road Route which we hold an interest on the south side of Parker, approximately 200' frontage, plat attached.*

*Depending upon the amount of land you need, which we will need a couple of entry apron approaches and I'm sure you will need some ROW. We would be interested in*



*discussing how much you need and if a limited amount we would consider a swap of ROW for the curb entries and if you would extend the widening on Parker further east to include our tract in the next phase.*

*My card and plat is attached. We'll wait to hear from you.*

Response: Comments are noted for the record.

*11) I am glad to have had the opportunity to speak to you at the May 19, 2010 Public Meeting. We do agree that an East-West 6 lane road from US 75 to State Hwy 78 is needed in the future. At the meeting with Collin County Commissioners Court, we have a couple of suggestions that may help the Commissioners favor the proposed route.*

- 1. The proposed route along TXU Power Line is our preferred choice - connecting to County Road #302. The present homeowners know the TXU line and can easily see the right-of-way. Parker Road is not a good choice.*
- 2. We propose that your team show pictures and traffic counts on FM #544 during peak usage. It, #544, is one of the busiest E-West routes in Collin County. Sooner than we think, more roads will be needed to move the public.*

Response: The study team will evaluate the feasibility of the proposed route along the TxU power line. However, the draft technically feasible alignment ties into the adjacent Parker Road improvements being completed by TxDOT and the County. FM 544 is not associated as part of the route study.

*12) I am the manager and principal owner of Peninsula Property 156, LLC, which owns a 1456 ac. Tract on the east side of FM 982. This property was formerly owned by and shown on your map as, HHEX SpinCo, LLC. The proposed alignment as presented falls along the south boundary of our property WE ARE IN FAVOR OF AND SUPPORT THIS PROJECT AND ALIGNMENT!*

Response: Comments are noted for the record.

*13) I found this study defective in a number of ways:*

- 1. The Question asked of the people is: Where do you want the Bridge? What about land based solutions?*
- 2. Where in the study task is the trade off of bridge vs. land based solutions?*
- 3. The population densities presented in the May 19<sup>th</sup> meeting do NOT demand a bridge be built. As one person put it, the projected total 2030 populations of the major towns in Eastern CC do not exceed the current population of Allen? How does that demand a bridge?*
- 4. The treatment of the so called "Purple Route" is very suspect.*



- a. *Compatibility with other projects? You already have HWY 78 widening from Garland to Farmersville with 7 lanes. Who needs a Bridge?*
  - b. *The East-West traffic can use HWY 360 in the North and 544 & George Bush to the South; and don't forget the planned connection of Park Blvd to HWY 78!*
  - c. *Connection to the Peninsula? Yes, use Bethany-Lucas Road to 982. You already have the 120ft ROW! IF ever needed, a connection to HWY 78 can use conventional Bridges in shallow water!*
  - d. *The Red Route has to start from Scratch with ROW acquisition all the way from Parker to HWY 78, plus the eastern bridge goes over the deepest water in the lake!*
5. *Even a line does irreparable harm to folks on or under the line! We want NO bridge. Any bridge and any line will destroy the Lake we love, and serious damage to existing property owners who want to be left alone!*
  6. *Don't forget: one commissioner lost his job over this very subject. It can happen again!*

Response: The Project's Need and Purpose is defined as: 1) Identify a technically feasible alignment to accommodate the growing east-west mobility needs resulting from population growth and development; 2) Provide direct access to/from US 75, the peninsula, and the future Outer Loop for greater mobility and emergency access; and 3) Provide an alternate east-west route other than US 380 and SH 78 in southeastern Collin County to mitigate for congestion. In order to meet the Project objectives, alternative alignments were developed and evaluated over the lake to provide an alternative route based on future traffic projections which indicate operational deficiencies in the existing east-west US 380 and SH 78 corridors. The purple alternative alignment which utilizes existing FM 3286 was developed and evaluated based on the Project evaluation criteria. Through the comparative analysis shown in the evaluation matrix, the purple alignment had a significantly higher construction cost, ROW impacts, and environmental impacts in comparison to the draft technically preferred red alignment. In order to complete the route study, public involvement efforts are an integral part of the study process in which many citizens share their views "for" and "against" the project. Both views for the project are required to be documented through the public meeting summaries and final report submitted to the County.

*14) In my opinion this bridge is unnecessary, the people of Collin County don't want it nor can we afford it.*

*It doesn't take an engineer to see the cheapest way to ease the traffic from the East side of Lavon Lake would be to go around the South end of the lake and join 78 to join with the expressways.*



*What this bridge study has done is frozen land sales in the Lake Lavon area. I need to spend money on improvements on my house but I am afraid to because of the proposed routes. There is a lady on CR 739 who's husband recently died and she wants to sell her house but can't because one of the routes comes right down CR 739.*

*I think Collin County has not publicized these meetings with mailings or on local news media on purpose. Its funny to me that the "Penny Saver" publication can find its way to every mailbox in the county but you don't do better with your mailings.*

*Don't you get it, the American People are tired of government spending money we don't have.*

*Mr. Hoagland gets it and come November there will be a lot more get it*

Response: The County has only committed to completing the route study and not building the bridge. The Commissioners Court will be the ultimate ruling and decision making body to approve the technically feasible alignment. Currently, there is no funding for future project development steps other than the route study. In order for the Project to advance to the next step of project development, funding must be available. If funding became available, the approximate duration to complete all phases of project development would be 8 to 14.5 years. In advance of the Public Meeting, the County sent out postcards to affected property owners, letters to elected/public officials, posted an advertisement in the Dallas Morning News, and posted the notice on the Collin County website. The County makes every good faith effort to communicate Public Meeting notices to the general public.

*15) 1) The current bride routes proposed are not needed due to the bridges on 3286. The 3286 bridges could be expanded to the divided 4 lane originally proposed for 3286. Expansion to 78 should be an extension of the 3286 system.*

*2) A N/S bridge taking off from the south end of 982 west of the Baptist Encampment extended to Hwy 78 would be a better route over the 2 proposed E/W bridges.*

*Advantages: A) 1/3 the distance should be around 1/3 the cost, B) no land (private) taken, C) 982 already has access dedicated to its expansion in width, D) traffic from Hwy 205 would not need to go to Hwy 75 in order to get to Allen, McKinney, Princeton, and McKinney Airport, E) will reduce traffic growth on Hwy 75, F) will lead to the development of the land south of Princeton that forms the Branch peninsula, this will increase the tax base for Collin County.*

Response: The purple alternative alignment which utilizes existing FM 3286 was developed and evaluated based on the Project evaluation criteria. Through the comparative analysis shown in the evaluation matrix, the purple alignment had a significantly higher construction cost, ROW impacts, and environmental impacts in comparison to the draft technically preferred red alignment. A proposed north-south



bridge does not address the Project's Need and Purpose which is defined as: 1) Identify a technically feasible alignment to accommodate the growing east-west mobility needs resulting from population growth and development; 2) Provide direct access to/from US 75, the peninsula, and the future Outer Loop for greater mobility and emergency access; and 3) Provide an alternate east-west route other than US 380 and SH 78 in southeastern Collin County to mitigate for congestion.

- 16) *The proposed bridge across Lake Lavon is a disaster at many levels.*
- 1 – *Economic – too expensive – limited access road alternative.*
  - 2 – *Ecological – harmful to the environment, both water & fish.*
  - 3 – *Quality of Life – will forever change, adversely the community.*
  - 4 – *The bridge is not needed as 6 lanes is ridiculous, excessive.*
  - 5 – *The citizens around the Lake do not want this bridge.*

Response: Comments are noted for the record.

### 3.42 Summary of Verbal Comments with Responses

**The following thirteen verbal comments were received at the Public Meeting, May 19, 2010.**

**Note: As previously stated, the public comment period for the second Public Meeting began May 19, 2010 and concluded June 2, 2010. All comments received during the public comment period were addressed with responses.**

- 1) *I am protesting against the teal alignment which runs through my 120 year old family farm. Two-thirds of the farm has already been condemned for the lake and the power plant, and I would not like for that alignment to run through my property.*

Response: Based on the evaluation of the alternative alignments, the draft technically feasible alignment is the red alignment which will be presented to Commissioners Court for approval.

- 2) *Why is the bridge is still being discussed? On October 7th community members announced that they did not want this bridge. The cost is too high. On April 6, 2010, at a meeting held at Clemson Elementary, Commissioner Hoagland noted that the proposed \$400 million cost of the bridge was very expensive. How can the bridge lock in a placeholder for the future, when the cost will not go down over the next 20-30 years? It will still be too expensive.*

Response: Based on the 2007 Collin County Bond Program, voters approved funding for the Lavon Lake Route Study. In order to complete the route study, public involvement



efforts are an integral part of the study process. Contingent upon approval from the Commissioners Court, the technically feasible alignment would be incorporated into the next Collin County Thoroughfare Plan update and serve as a placeholder on the so that future development and other roadway improvements can be planned accordingly.

- 3) *In support of future growth and property development, I propose a north-south bridge from the tip of FM 982 across the lake joining SH 78, which would open up the north-south corridor from 205 letting Rockwall and the whole east side of Dallas transfer up through FM 982 to US 380 into the McKinney airport. That would bring growth in a natural pattern to that peninsula and would not take any eminent domain land because it would all be on government land to start with. There is an inconsistency of land and property values in various Lake Lavon areas. A local tax assessor even commented that depressed land value is a result of the opinion that the area south of Princeton and a portion of the east side of the lake, is looked upon as the area of armpit of Collin County. What is behind this statement? Is this why there is no property development? Why has a north-south bridge not been considered further?*

Response: In regard to the comments from the local tax assessor, the County cannot speculate on the meaning or intent of the statement. In terms of property development, there are many determining factors for development, one of which is the adjacent transportation infrastructure. A proposed north-south bridge does not address the Project's Need and Purpose which is defined as: 1) Identify a technically feasible alignment to accommodate the growing east-west mobility needs resulting from population growth and development; 2) Provide direct access to/from US 75, the peninsula, and the future Outer Loop for greater mobility and emergency access; and 3) Provide an alternate east-west route other than US 380 and SH 78 in southeastern Collin County to mitigate for congestion.

- 4) *I have conducted some research in the past month on all of the activities that HNTB has done and would like to point out that the population growth map does not justify the development of a bridge, as it does not indicate much development in the southeast corner by 2030. Another concern is that there have been many meetings held with developers, such as Hunt, regarding this project, which is a clear indication that the routes were not developed for the purposes of people, but rather for the benefit of developers. There are laws against government taking private property for public use, or private use. This project seems like the next best thing for developers; they buy private land bordering Hunt properties, for instance, and then turn that land into a road for the benefit on Hunt.*

Response: Based on the projected population growth through 2030 and 2039, the County has developed planned improvements such as the Lavon Lake Project to accommodate for the rapid increase in employment and household growth. The alternative routes were



developed using geometric design criteria as well as avoiding and/or minimizing impacts to sensitive receptors where feasible, and not for the benefit of developers.

- 5) *I am pleased to see the addition of the fifth route, but displeased to see that the route did not get very many points in the evaluation. Certainly getting to FM 982, which is already being widened southward from Princeton, opens up the peninsula in an east-west route from FM 982 back west through Lucas to Allen. That would open up the western route out of the peninsula. Why is there a need to go further east when SH 78 is already being widened all the way to Farmersville? Stick to existing right-of-way and don't damage property values. It was said earlier that this project was included in the 2007 bond package, but voters did not have a line item veto for what was in that bond package. The lake should not be considered an obstacle to be pushed aside, but rather a resource to be protected. Bridges don't do anything to protect the wildlife or encourage the entertainment uses of a lake such as boating and fishing.*

Response: In order to provide increased transportation mobility, the County must evaluate widening existing roadways where feasible as well as planning for long range improvements to accommodate for the increase in projected employment and household growth throughout the entire County. In terms of protecting wildlife and providing for boating in the lake, these items will be addressed in the future project development phase of the design schematic and environmental document. Based on federal regulations, all appropriate criteria of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) will be met in all future development phases of the project.

- 6) *Why is the bridge still being considered when the citizens in the county that are most effected have already said 'no' on many occasions?*

Response: Based on the 2007 Collin County Bond Program, voters approved funding for the Lavon Lake Route Study. In the spring of 2009, the Commissioners Court elected to have the route study completed in its entirety. In order to complete the route study, public involvement efforts are an integral part of the study process in which many citizens share their views "for" and "against" the project. Both views for the project are required to be documented through the public meeting summaries and final report submitted to the County.

- 7) *I still vote no to all routes. Collin County cites inevitable growth as the reason that this bridge and even the HUB should be planned. According to Collin County's own ultimate population prediction statistics, Lavon, Nevada and Josephine all together will have 26,000 less people than the City of Allen, and that's the ultimate build out. The 2009 numbers show that Collin County grew by 19,350; Lavon accounted for 300 of that total, just 1.6 percent of Collin County's total growth. Neither of these statistics indicates an explosive growth for the area. The presence of a bridge and a HUB plan does not*



*prepare for growth, it inflicts growth on the small cities and they won't be able to sustain it or support it. Collin County says that voters wanted a bridge study when they voted for the 2007 bond package. This was a huge miscommunication. Based on a community survey, 95 percent of voters admitted they had no clue that the bridge study money was in the package, and since they didn't know the money was there they unwillingly gave their approval. Even citizens that did read the printed media thought that it had to do with replacing the old bridges. Collin County admits that there is no specific traffic study that argues the need for a Lavon Lake bridge, and in contrast NCTCOG maps show that the completion of roadways like SH 78 and US 380 will keep the traffic congestion east of the lake no worse than it is today. In addition, if Collin County was to add to the plan improvements for US 380 and SH 78, this will more than take care of future traffic needs at a much more reasonable cost. The lake is one of the few remaining recreational areas that North Texas has and a bridge will take away from the beauty of this resource. If Collin County gets its way Lavon Lake will become an expressway rather than a getaway.*

Response: In order to provide increased transportation mobility, the County must evaluate widening existing roadways where feasible as well as planning for long range improvements to accommodate for the increase in projected employment and household growth throughout the entire County.

- 8) *It is difficult to predict future population growth. Doesn't it make more sense to build after population starts to grow so that you know it is actually going to happen instead of wasting taxpayer dollars on something that might not ever be needed? In 2007 there was an election to do a feasibility study, not to build a bridge. Since there is no funding for this project, will the proposed bridge become a toll bridge, or will the county seek out of the country funding? The lake needs to be kept natural, the people want no bridge.*

Response: In order to provide increased transportation mobility, the County must evaluate widening existing roadways where feasible as well as planning for long range improvements to accommodate for the increase in projected employment and household growth throughout the entire County. The County has been proactive in continuing to plan for long range improvements and not waiting until corridors become extremely dense with development, congestion, and sensitive receptors that could potentially preclude a feasible alignment. Currently, there is no funding for future project development steps other than the route study. However, if the Project became feasible from a toll/revenue and financing perspective, a toll provider could potentially elect to complete all applicable project development steps and construct the Project. Financing from outside the United States could be a future possibility.

- 9) *The route utilizing CR 546 seems to be a more viable option because there is a lot more land to take and less houses and families to destroy. Has this been considered?*



Response: Yes, the green alternative alignment utilizes CR 546 on the east approach of the lake. In terms of the number of parcels and houses impacted compared to the draft technically feasible red alignment, the green alignment has significantly greater impacts.

- 10) *What were the fundamental assumptions made that led to the decision to build a bridge? Have trade-offs such as using other roads to divert traffic been discussed, or have any traffic studies been conducted? Ultimately, who is going to sign off on this bridge? Who will appropriate the money for the bridge, or will the bridge turn into a toll road since there is no funding remaining? If more and more people come to the area, current property value will decrease. It's better to have controlled growth so that people will want to come here because there aren't a lot of homes.*

Response: The County has only committed to completing the route study and not building the bridge. The computer model used to update the thoroughfare plan in 2007 incorporated all of the existing and proposed roadways in the County. The Commissioners Court will be the ultimate ruling and decision making body to approve the technically feasible alignment. Currently, there is no funding for future project development steps other than the route study. However, if the Project became feasible from a toll/revenue and financing perspective, a toll provider could potentially elect to complete all applicable project development steps and construct the Project.

- 11) *Although I do not live in this area, as a Plano resident, my tax dollars will ultimately contribute to this bridge. Since this seems to be such a controversial project, I should have received an announcement regarding this meeting instead of reading a random e-mail about it. Why is the bridge still being considered if the people that actually live here do not want it?*

Response: In advance of the Public Meeting, the County sent out postcards to affected property owners, letters to elected/public officials, posted an advertisement in the Dallas Morning News, and posted the notice on the Collin County website. The County makes every good faith effort to communicate Public Meeting notices to the general public. Based on the 2007 Collin County Bond Program, voters approved funding for the Lavon Lake Route Study. In the spring of 2009, the Commissioners Court elected to have the route study completed in its entirety. In order to complete the route study, public involvement efforts are an integral part of the study process in which many citizens share their views “for” and “against” the project. Both views for the project are required to be documented through the public meeting summaries and final report submitted to the County.

- 12) *One of the proposed routes will go right through my land, but I never received notification of this meeting. More people would have shown up if they had received the announcements that they should have.*



Response: In advance of the Public Meeting, the County sent out postcards to affected property owners, letters to elected/public officials, posted an advertisement in the Dallas Morning News, and posted the notice on the Collin County website. The County makes every good faith effort to communicate Public Meeting notices to the general public.

*13) Why isn't it being discussed to fix the already existing roads? Safety has been mentioned; what is safe about pulling out onto a six-lane highway to get on to SH 78? Is there something else behind the idea of this bridge such as a shipping depot? Leave the country alone, it's not supposed to be easy to get to.*

Response: In order to provide increased transportation mobility, the County must evaluate widening existing roadways where feasible as well as planning for long range improvements to accommodate for the increase in projected employment and household growth throughout the entire County. The County has been proactive in continuing to plan for long range improvements and not waiting until corridors become extremely dense with development, congestion, and sensitive receptors that could potentially preclude a feasible alignment. All of the alternative alignment developed for the Project met the geometric design criteria which translate into safety. Another measure of safety that was quantified in the evaluation is the number of skewed and perpendicular intersections for each of the alternative alignments. The Project is a stand along proposed improvement and is not related to the “shipping depot”.



## **4. Handouts from the Public Meeting**

- 4.1 Agenda**
- 4.2 PowerPoint Presentation**
- 4.3 Comment Form/Speaker Card**
- 4.4 Postcard Announcement**
- 4.5 Sign-In Sheets**



## **5. Individual Written Comments**

- 5.1 E-mail Comments**
- 5.2 Written Comments**
- 5.3 Speaker Cards**