

Sherman – Denison Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Wednesday, February 7, 2018 @ 9:00 am
Texas Department of Transportation
3904 US 75, Sherman, Texas

Please visit our MPO website www.sdmpo.org for background materials under the “Committees/Meetings” link or under “News and Announcements” at our home page.

- I. Call to order
- II. Acknowledgment of Quorum by Chairman

Action Items:

- III. [Consider approval of the minutes of the MPO TAC meeting of January 17, 2018](#)
- IV. [Recommend Adopting Project Ranking Criteria to the Policy Board](#)
- V. Recess to Executive Session
- VI. Review, Discuss, and Rank Proposals Received for the Grayson County Freight Mobility Plan
- VII. Reconvene Regular Session of TAC Meeting and Motion to Recommend Entering into a Contract with the Highest Ranked Consulting Team to the Policy Board

Information/Presentation Items:

- VIII. Presentation and Discussion on Demographic Data for the Grayson County Thoroughfare Plan
- IX. Announcements
(*Informal Announcements, Future Agenda Items, and Next Meeting Date*)
 - TAC Next meeting February 21, 2018 at 9:00 a.m.
 - MPO Policy Board Next meeting March 7, 2018 at 8:00 a.m.
- X. Public Comment Period
- XI. Adjournment

All meetings of the Sherman-Denison Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Technical Advisory Committee are open to the public. The MPO is committed to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Reasonable accommodations and equal opportunity for effective communications will be provided upon request. Please contact Julie Lollar at the County Judge’s Office at 903.813.4228 at least 24 hours in advance if accommodation is needed.

The above notice was posted at the Grayson County Courthouse in a place readily accessible to the public and made available to the Grayson County Clerk on or before February 2, 2018.

NOTE: The TAC agenda/packet is only distributed digitally, no paper copies will be sent. If you need a printed copy please contact MPO staff.



Clay Barnett, P.E.

1 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
2 SHERMAN-DENISON MPO
3 Conference Room
4 Texas Department of Transportation
5 3904 US 75
6 Sherman, TX 75090
7 January 17, 2018 9:00 a.m.
8

9 **Committee Members Present:**

10 Clay Barnett, P.E., Chairman	Sherman-Denison MPO
11 Clint Philpott, P.E.	City of Sherman
12 Kevin Farley	Small Cities Representative (Pottsboro)
13 Aaron Bloom, P.E.	TxDOT Sherman Area Engineer
14 Judson Rex, AICP	City of Denison

15
16 **Committee Members Absent:**

17 Bill Benton	Grayson County
----------------	----------------

18
19 **Non-Voting Members Present:**

20 Josh Walker	Texoma Area Paratransit System (TAPS)
----------------	---------------------------------------

21
22 **Non-Voting Members Absent:**

23 Barbara Maley	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
24 Nick Page	TxDOT TPP Division

25
26 **Guests Present:**

27 Jeff Whitmire	Grayson County
28 Noel Paramanatham, P.E.	TxDOT Paris District Engineer
29 Dan Perry, P.E.	TxDOT Paris District
30 Julie Rook, P.E.	TxDOT Paris District
31 Colby Shelton, P.E.	TxDOT Sherman Assistant Area Engineer
32 Larry Redden, P.E.	IEA
33 Arun Olarnrat, P.E.	IEA
34 Ed Pultorak, P.E.	Jacobs
35 Matt Craig, P.E.	Halff Associates
36 Samantha Kannenberg	Halff Associates
37 Rich Renton, P.E.	IEA
38 Ryan De LaSantos	IEA
39 Bryan Alldredge, P.E.	IEA
40 Len McManus, P.E.	McManus & Johnson
41 Jill Van Hoewyk, P.E.	Lamb-Star
42 Eric Greenman, P.E.	Lamb-Star
43 Ben Munson	Grayson County RMA
44 Steven Doss	City of Denison

2
3 **I. Call to Order**

4
5 Mr. Barnett called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m.

6
7 **II. Acknowledgement of Quorum by Chairman**

8
9 Mr. Barnett declared a quorum of the Technical Advisory Committee present.

10
11 **III. Review and Approval of Meeting Notes for May 31, 2017 meeting**

12
13 Motion to approve was made by Mr. Farley, seconded by Mr. Rex. Motion carried unanimously.

14
15 **IV. Project Ranking Criteria**

16
17 Mr. Barnett introduced the ranking criteria and stated that they would be used for both the 2019 –
18 2022 TIP as well as the 2045 MTP. He stated that the criteria do meet the requirements of the
19 FAST Act and they primarily utilize the Decision Lens program developed by TxDOT. Mr.
20 Barnett went through the spreadsheet that was distributed to the TAC and explained how to input
21 their rankings. Mr. Barnett stated that he needed this completed and returned by Wednesday,
22 January 24, 2018 in order to tabulate the results.

23
24 **V. Schematic Design of US 75**

25
26 Mr. Bloom gave a brief overview of the progress made on the project to date and introduced Mr.
27 Larry Redden, P.E. from IEA, the project manager for the project. Mr. Redden introduced his
28 team. Mr. Redden explained that we had an overview of the project as well as plan sheets. He
29 then turned the meeting over to Mr. Bryan Alldredge, P.E. to walk through the plan sheets. Mr.
30 Alldredge explained that the roadway was designed for 75 mph with freight height bridges at
31 18.5’. Mr. Alldredge explained that the Travis Street crossing would be reconfigured to a typical
32 intersection. Mr. Redden explained that these plan sheets were a less than 30% and that any
33 comments would be taken into consideration. Mr. Rex asked what the typical ramp spacing for a
34 project like this was. Mr. Alldredge replied that the spacing is typically 2000’ with 1500’ being
35 the minimal spacing with an auxiliary lane. Mr. Rex asked about driveways. Mr. Alldredge
36 replied that 99% of the existing driveways would be maintained. Mr. Rex asked about new
37 driveways. Mr. Bloom replied that the TxDOT access management would apply. Mr.
38 Paramanathan explained that the cities that had an agreement with TxDOT could determine the
39 location of the driveways. Mr. Barnett asked about the large open space left by the Travis Street
40 reconfiguration. Mr. Paramanatham replied that it had been considered surplus, but that they
41 would need to look at it in detail at the conclusion of the project. Mr. Barnett asked about the
42 large amount of flood plain on the west side of US 75 at Post Oak Creek and asked if there was
43 anything that could be done to lower the amount of storm water that is backed up onto the
44 adjacent properties. Mr. Redden explained that a detailed hydraulic analysis would be conducted
45 at a later date. Mr. Paramanatham explained that no construction could occur in the floodway.
46 Mr. Paramanaantham explained that although the plans showed three lane frontage roads, only

1 two are anticipated to be initially constructed and that the plan shows the ultimate design. Mr.
2 Alldredge explained that the pedestrian bridge would be removed and an at-grade crossing would
3 be added across the frontage road. He also explained that the railroad bridge must be removed to
4 accommodate this alignment. Mr. Paramanatham explained that it was a UP line that was
5 utilized only for parking rail cars. Mr. Alldredge explained that the bridge would need to be
6 raised 11' in order to accommodate the new alignment. Mr. Redden explained that the
7 pedestrian bridge would need to be something they would visit with the school district about. Mr.
8 Barnett explained that Piner was being changed to include 6th grade students in the future. He
9 asked about the area under the bridge near Pecan Street. Mr. Redden stated that there were
10 options such as parks. Mr. Paramanatham stated that TxDOT would discuss those options with
11 the City of Sherman at the conclusion of the project. He explained that the City of Dallas has
12 multiuse areas under their bridges. Mr. Barnett mentioned that there would need to be crossing
13 guards at the new at-grade crossings. Mr. Alldredge stated that beacons could be added to bring
14 the new crossings to drivers' attention. Mr. Alldredge state that very little right-of-way would be
15 needed for the project and that most of it consisted of corner clips near intersections. Mr.
16 Alldredge explained that an exception to the 75 mph design speed would need to be obtained for
17 this area due to the height of the traffic railing in the median and that this condition also exists
18 for most of the horizontal curves. Mr. Barnett asked if there could be a bridge near SH 91 in
19 order to reduce the amount and cost of retaining walls in this area. Mr. Paramanatham
20 explained that there were a lot of considerations on whether retaining walls or bridges would be
21 utilized, but that they would keep the options open in this particular location. Mr. Barnett asked
22 if it was possible to keep the north bound direct connect to SH 91 in order to avoid folks having
23 to exit at Travis Street and go through the Travis Street traffic signal in order to turn on SH 91.
24 Mr. Pultorak stated that the intersection could be changed to a diverging diamond. He stated that
25 the traffic signal at Travis Street could handle the traffic for Travis Street, SH 91 and Taylor
26 Street. Mr. Alldredge stated that it would be very difficult to accommodate from a geometry
27 standpoint. Mr. Redden stated that they would examine options at this location to keep the direct
28 connect from NB US 75 to SH 91. Mr. Barnett asked if there would be a traffic signal on the
29 west side of Taylor Street. Mr. Alldredge stated yes. Mr. Alldredge stated that the SB US 75
30 frontage road bridge at US 82 would need to be replaced in order to raise US 82 out of the
31 floodplain. The NB US 75 frontage road bridge would need to be replaced in order to remove all
32 of the large humps adjacent to the bridge. He stated that the frontage roads would be widened to
33 three lanes around the intersection. Mr. Alldredge stated that Texas "U"s would be added on
34 each side of the Loy Lake Bridge. Mr. Alldredge stated that the US 82/FM 131 would be
35 reconfigured to remove the jug handles. He also pointed out that there was a large right-of-way
36 take in this area. Mr. Alldredge stated that all of the driveways would be maintained except the
37 second driveway east of Travis Street on EB US 82 frontage road. Mr. Renton stated that
38 although the direct connectors were not warranted at this time, the design would accommodate
39 them in the future. Mr. Barnett pointed out that Fallon Drive was designated as a 6 lane
40 thoroughfare and that the bridge should be designed to accommodate this. Mr. Renton stated
41 that the bridge would be expanded to accommodate six lanes. Mr. Barnett stated that a bridge
42 should be included for Blue Flame Road as well. Mr. Alldredge stated that the off ramp for NB
43 US 75 was moved to the south in order to allow turning movements into the driveway for TMC.
44 Mr. Alldredge stated that the Spur 503 intersection was reconfigured for a standard intersection.
45 Mr. Barnett asked if the roadway was changed to a standard 6 lane thoroughfare that the surplus
46 right-of-way could be abandoned. He further stated that if the roadway were changed to a

1 standard 6 lane thoroughfare with standard driveway access that it could spur development along
2 this corridor. Mr. Rex concurred with this assessment. Mr. Rex asked is the Loy Lake bridge in
3 Denison would be reconstructed. Mr. Alldredge stated that it would be in order to accommodate
4 the freight requirements. He asked if it would be widened to accommodate additional lanes in
5 the future. Mr. Alldredge confirmed that it would be designed to accommodate six lanes in the
6 future. Mr. Barnett stated that we wanted to insure that there was sufficient space under the
7 Crawford Lane Bridge to accommodate a six lane thoroughfare. Mr. Renton stated that if it
8 could not be justified in the 30 year time frame that they could not show it in the preliminary
9 design because it would require additional right-of-way. He stated that they would show it in the
10 schematic design though. Mr. Rex asked what would be involved in widening north of FM 120.
11 Mr. Alldredge stated that the lanes were configured to easily widen to six lanes in the future.
12 Mr. Redden concluded the presentation by stated that the design team has taken detailed notes of
13 the discussion and will look at them and present some options to TxDOT. This will be
14 completed in the first part of February. He stated that we would have a public hearing on March
15 22, 2018. Mr. Redden stated that they would continue to work on the project in order to meet the
16 FY 2020 let date. Mr. Barnett reiterated that we have funds allocated for FY 2020 let date that
17 “go away” if the project is not let on schedule. Mr. Redden thanked the TAC for their input. Mr.
18 Barnett stated that it was obvious that the design team had put a lot of thought and effort into the
19 design and thanked them for their effort. Mr. Redden thanked him for his kind words and stated
20 that they were working through the railroad issue. Mr. Craig reiterated that the public hearing
21 would be on March 22, 2018 at the City of Sherman Municipal Ballroom. He stated that there
22 would be some public notice materials distributed and asked that the TAC distributed this
23 information. He stated that they were working on a stakeholders list and that it currently
24 contained 500 addresses of adjacent property owners and elected officials. He asked that if there
25 was anyone specifically we would like to add to the list to let him know. He stated that the
26 official notice would be advertised in the Herald Democrat. Mr. Renton stated that we would
27 show both the interim design and ultimate design at the public hearing.

28

29 **VI. Announcements**

30

31 Mr. Barnett stated that the next meeting of the Policy Board is on January 22, 2018 at 8:00 a.m.
32 and the next meeting of the TAC will be January 31, 2018 at 9:00 a.m.

33

34 **VII. Public Comment Period**

35

36 No citizens appeared before the Technical Advisory Committee.

37

38 **VIII. Adjournment**

39

40 Having no further business, Mr. Barnett adjourned the meeting at 10:31 am.

41

42

43

44 _____
Clay Barnett, P.E., Chairman, SDMPO Technical Advisory Committee

SHERMAN-DENISON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO)
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
AGENDA ITEM IV
ACTION ITEM

February 7, 2018

Recommend Adopting Project Ranking Criteria to the Policy Board

BACKGROUND:

TxDOT has acquired a program named Decision Lens to assist in the ranking of projects. Utilizing this information, a spreadsheet containing the project ranking criteria was sent to the TAC on December 21, 2017 along with a request that they complete and return their thoughts on how projects should be ranked by January 24, 2018. The information returned to staff was averaged and is included as an attachment.

The approved project ranking criteria will be utilized to rank the projects for the 2019 – 2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as well as the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Program (MTP).

ACTION REQUESTED:

Recommend adopting the Project Ranking Criteria to the Policy Board

ATTACHMENTS: *click underlined items for attachment*

- [Project Ranking Criteria](#)

Performance Measures

Numbers you fill in
Must add up to 100%

Main Performance Measure	Submeasure 1	Submeasure 2	Main Performance Measure Weight	Submeasure 1 Weight	Submeasure 2 Weight	
Safety	Crash Count	Estimated Impact on Fatal and Incapacitating Injury Crashes	30.75%	32.50%	65.00%	
		Estimated Impact on Total Crashes			35.00%	
	100%					
	Crash Rate	Estimated Impact on Fatal and Incapacitating Injury Crash Rate		46.25%	65.00%	
		Estimated Impact on Total Crash Rate			35.00%	
	100%					
Safety Project Classification (DCIS P1)			10.00%			
Societal Cost Savings			11.25%			
100%						
Preservation	Bridge Condition	Reduction in Structurally Deficient Deck Area	21.25%	45.00%	60.00%	
		Deck Area Receiving Preventative Maintenance			40.00%	
	100%					
	Pavement Condition	Reduction in Poor Lane Miles (by Ride Score)		55.00%	32.50%	
		Lane Miles Receiving Preventative Maintenance (by Ride Score)			18.75%	
		Reduction in Poor Lane Miles (by Distress Score)			30.00%	
Lane Miles Receiving Preventative Maintenance (by Distress Score)		18.75%				
100%						
100%						
Congestion Reduction (MPO)	Benefit Congestion Index - Auto		20.25%	22.00%		
	Benefit Congestion Index - Truck			19.50%		
	Normalized Congestion Index - Auto			18.25%		
	Normalized Congestion Index - Truck			15.75%		
	Intermodal Connector (MPO)			9.75%		
	Miles of New Connectivity (MPO)			14.75%		
100%						
Effect on Economic Development	Economic Importance	National Highway System (NHS) Route	10.88%	41.25%	58.75%	
		National Highway Freight Network (NHFN)			41.25%	
	100%					
	System Usage	Base ADT		58.75%	62.50%	
		Base Percent Trucks			37.50%	
	100%					
100%						
Effects on the Environment	Right-of-way Requirements		3.38%	66.25%		
	Floodplain Impacts			33.75%		
	100%					
Transportation Choices	Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations		6.38%	57.50%		

		Accesses schools, parks, large employer, multifamily or mixed-use residential, or shopping		35.00%
		Population densities in surrounding area		26.25%
		Access to transit stops		16.25%
		Serves both bicyclists and pedestrians		22.50%
				100%
	Project Included in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (BPP)		42.50%	
		Bike Lanes		41.25%
		Bike Route		32.50%
		Future Transportation Alternative Candidate		26.25%
			100%	100%
Community Support			7.13%	
	Survey Results			47.50%
	Ten Percent (10%) Local Match Commitment			52.50%
			100.00%	100%