

Meeting Notes

PROJECT: SH 34 Corridor Study
ATTENDEES: SH 34 TAC
Refer to Sign-in Sheet

Proj #: 0173-04-026

LOCATION OF MEETING: Kaufman, Texas

DATE/TIME OF MEETING: October 27, 2005
2:00 PM

The following is our understanding of the subject matter covered in this meeting. If this differs from your understanding, please notify us within five working days.

Stephen Endres, Project Manager for the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), welcomed the SH 34 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) attendees and asked if there were any questions/comments regarding the August 25, 2005 Minutes. Following Stephen Endres, the attendees introduced themselves and briefly explained their interest in the project.

Matthew Craig, with Halff Associates, provided a brief history/summary of the project to date. He referred to the SH 34 Alternatives and Constraints Map (hand out) and introduced two 'new' alternative alignments as a result of the CAG review/comments: 1996 LPA South Offset and 1996 LPA Offset. He then introduced the *Draft Analysis of Conceptual Alternatives* (DACA) and briefly discussed each of the constraints per conceptual alternative alignment.

Social and Economic Effects – Constraints were quantified such as number of displaced homes and number of nearby structures. Although the number of nearby structures is not a true impact, it does provide a measure of the number of structures or density of the corridor along the particular alignment.

Environmental Effects – Constraints per alternative alignment were briefly discussed. Regarding the evaluation of the woodland areas, aerial photographs were used to identify/quantify dense woodlands. A few archeological sites were identified; however, they were not mapped to safeguard against unauthorized visits, etc.

Other Effects – Difficulty/disruption in construction per alternative alignment was briefly discussed. The “-” designation on the DACA indicates the worst possible score/scenario per alignment. [Refer to Draft October 27, 2005, DACA.]

Costs – 2005 dollars were used to estimate the costs associated with each alternative alignment. A 200% contingency was built in the Right-of-Way costs. The Kaufman County Central Appraisal District property values were used and a factor of 3.0 was added to the total costs.

A question was asked about the various alignments as far as any one being preferred over the others. Mathew Craig stated that based on the DACA, there are three alignments preferred thus far:

- 1996 LPA Offset
- Railroad
- 1996 South Offset

The communities within the SH 34 Corridor study area did not want the existing SH 34 improved. Moreover, it was determined that improving the existing SH 34 would not be cost effective. It would take

approximately 6 times the cost to improve an existing roadway as opposed to building a new alignment.

A question was asked about the need or importance of a travel forecast. It was determined that approximately 63% of the current traffic on SH 34 would divert to a new alignment. Approximately 78% of the current truck traffic would divert to a new alignment. Phasing the construction of a new alignment based on the traffic might be considered. A four-lane roadway could be constructed first with the space to expand to a future six-lane roadway when the need arises.

Trans Texas Corridor update – The public hearing and release of the Environmental Impact Statement should be in the spring of 2006. It is still going through the environmental process.

Public Involvement – Mathew Craig reiterated that the Project Website was accessible online and provided the web address [www.34corridor.org]. He mentioned that the Community Advisory Group met on September 22, 2005, and will meet on October 27, 2005 in the evening. He informed the attendees of the forthcoming public meetings scheduled for November 8 & 10, 2005.

Following the presentation, Stephen Endres of TxDOT asked for additional questions, input, etc. The next meeting was scheduled for 2:00 pm, December 22, 2005, at the Kaufman Fire Station.

These notes are only summaries of key points of the meeting and are not meant to be used as a transcript of the meeting.

REPORTED BY: Jonathan Stewart – Civil Associates, Inc.

Copy to:

File 2396

G:\2396-HALFF_SH34\MEETING MINUTES\CAI_MTG_NOTES_10_27_05.DOC