

VIRTUAL/IN-PERSON PUBLIC MEETING PRESENTATION SCRIPT
Collin County FM 546/CR 400 Corridor Study
Collin County, Texas
March 25th, 2021

NARRATION OF SLIDES

SLIDE 1 - Title Slide

Welcome to Collin County's second virtual public meeting for FM 546/CR 400 Corridor Study. In our previous public meeting, we introduced the public to this alignment study for the future reconstruction and realignment of FM 546 and CR 400. The various alignment alternatives previously presented have been further analyzed, and their results will be summarized today in this presentation.

Near the end of this recorded presentation, we will provide direction on how you can share your comments, questions, and concerns with the project team. We appreciate your interest in the FM 546/CR 400 Project. Public input is vital to the planning process and Collin County appreciates your participation.

SLIDE 2 - FM 546/CR 400 Public Meeting

Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, Collin County is hosting this virtual public meeting to give everyone access to project information and allow for public input while limiting the number of attendees at in person gatherings.

Additionally, an in person public meeting is being held at 6PM on March 25, 2021 by appointment only as advertised. The virtual and in-person meetings will present the same project information.

SLIDE 3 - FM 546/CR 400 Agenda

Today's meeting will include a recap of the first public meeting, a review of the alternatives comparison matrix process and results, a discussion of the recommended alternative, and a project schedule. The purpose of this meeting is to receive public comments regarding the FM 546/CR 400 project and the recommended alignment being presented.

SLIDE 4 - FM 546/CR 400 Proposed Improvement

The FM 546/ CR 400 Corridor study is located in central Collin County. The ultimate corridor study begins south of McKinney National Airport in McKinney, Texas. The ultimate alignment will continue in an easterly direction and end at US 380 east of Princeton, Texas.

FM 546/CR 400 corridor study is broken up in two separate phases. The current Phase I study began in spring 2020 and is the focus of this public meeting. The study area is shown in purple, with project limits from Bridgefarmer Road in Lowry Crossing to US 380 east of Princeton.

Phase II of the FM 546/CR 400 corridor study is anticipated to begin in 2021 and is indicated by gray shading. Its limits begin south of the McKinney National Airport and will end at its connection with Phase I just east of Bridgefarmer Road. More information on Phase II will become available in the near future. The remainder of this presentation will focus on Phase I of the project. To date, no construction funding has been identified for either phase of FM 546/CR 400.

SLIDE 5 - FM 546/CR 400 Proposed Improvements

The proposed improvements consist of four 12-foot lanes, two in each direction. Travel-lanes will be divided by a raised concrete median with dedicated left turn lanes where appropriate. The center median allows room to construct one additional lane in each direction, for a total of six lanes in the ultimate condition as warranted by future increases in traffic.

SLIDE 6 - FM 546/CR 400 Proposed Alternatives

In the first public meeting, the following alternatives were introduced to the public for input.

The gray line was from a concept previously outlined in Collin County's thoroughfare plan, as the need for an improvement in the area was recognized based on traffic projections.

Five additional alternative alignments were presented, consisting of partial or complete realignment of FM 546 through the area. They are shown here as blue, teal, yellow, orange and green alignments.

SLIDE 7 - Proposed Developments

Since the first public meeting, the project team has further coordinated with landowners and developers within the project study area. There is currently a large neighborhood development planned for the large red parcel shown in this slide. Subsequently, another landowner has official created a small, large lot family subdivision with four large parcels also shown in red. Also identified is a newly proposed City of Princeton Fire Station that will be developed in the near future just northwest of the Myrick Ln Extension already being constructed by others. These were all taken into consideration when developing our alternatives comparison matrix.

SLIDE 8 - Proposed Alternatives w/Proposed Developments
Here, the same alternatives are shown with the overlapping proposed developments. The alignments shown were further developed by the project team, both horizontal and vertical roadway design, to allow for the detailed development of the comparison matrix criteria data used to score the alignments.

SLIDE 9 - Comparison Matrix Analysis
The matrix focused on five specific categories for comparison of impacts by each alternative. They include Environmental, Engineering and Constructability, Public/Stakeholder Input, Utilities and ROW, and Construction Cost.

SLIDE 10 - Comparison Matrix Analysis Cont'd
The scoring system used for the comparison of alternatives used a scale of 1 to 5, based on the severity of the impact, with 5 having the most impact within each category.

The scores were then added together to obtain a total score for each alternative.

The least impactful alternatives will have the lowest scores and are shaded green. The most impactful alternatives will have the highest scores and are shaded red. Alternatives with moderate impacts are shaded yellow.

The results for each category will be covered in the next several slides, showing the scoring for each alternative and sub-category based on engineering and environmental data and analysis by the project team.

The process utilized follows guidelines set forth by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, or what is know as NEPA.

SLIDE 11 - Environmental
The first category was Environmental. Sub-categories included the number of parcels each alignment impacted, the number of structures displaced, the acres of land and acres of farmland impacted, potential for impacting a cemetery, and the indirect impacts the alternative would have. Indirect impacts include acreage of unusable tracks of land left behind, or impacts to property usage or functionality as part of an alignment damaging a property or properties.

Summarizing environmental sub-category impacts, the Orange alignment (Alternative 4) was least impactful, followed by the

Blue Alignment (Alternative 1). The Yellow Alignment (Alternative 3) scored as the most impactful alternative.

SLIDE 12 - Engineering and Constructability

The next category was Engineering and Constructability. Sub-categories included safety and operation of revised intersections, the engineering design speed of the alignment, driveway impacts, construction sequencing, drainage impacts, and how each alignment impacts the current construction and extension of Myrick Lane.

Summarizing engineering and constructability sub-category impacts, the teal alignment (Alternative 2) was least impactful, followed by the green alignment (Alternative 5). The Yellow Alignment (Alternative 3) was the most impactful alternative.

SLIDE 13 - Public/Stakeholder Input

Sub-Categories for Public and Stakeholder Input included preferences of the general public, bifurcation impacts to properties and farmland, impacts to proposed and planned developments, and input from adjacent local governments.

Summarizing public and stakeholder input sub-category impacts, the teal alignment (Alternative 2), yellow alignment (Alternative 3) and green alignment (alternative 5) were least impactful. The Blue alignment (Alternative 1) was the most impactful.

SLIDE 14 - Utilities and Right-of-Way

Impacts to Utilities and Right-of-Way were also analyzed in our matrix. The sub-categories included land acreage needed for the ROW to construct the proposed facility, along with impacts to electric poles and recently installed utilities on the north side of FM 546 near Lowry Crossing, Texas.

Summarizing utilities and right of way (ROW) sub-categories, the blue alignment (Alternative 1) was the least impactful. The Yellow and Green Alignments (Alternatives 3 & 5) were most impactful.

SLIDE 15 - Cost Analysis

Finally, a cost analysis was included, consisting of comparing conceptual cost estimates for each of the alternatives. The higher the cost of the proposed alignment, the higher the score or impact. The blue alignment (Alternative 1) and the teal alignment (Alternative 2) were least impactful while the yellow and green alignments (alternatives 3 & 5) were most impactful.

SLIDE 16 - Results

The scores of each category were added together to get a final, combined score for each alignment alternative. Based on the combined results of the five categories, the Teal Alignment (Alternative 2) was the least impactful alignment when compared to the other four alternatives.

Please note that the no-build alternative is an option that means nothing will be constructed and no future improvements would be made. This option does not meet the purpose and need of the project and therefore, was not included in the scoring process as a valid alternative. This alternative automatically moves forward as an option in lieu of a recommended alternative moving forward into subsequent stages of project development.

SLIDE 17 - Additional Alternatives

Once the teal alignment (alternative 2) was identified as the least impactful alternative through the alternatives comparison matrix, it was further refined by developing additional alternatives in coordination with property owners and other stakeholders. Three new alternatives were considered to attempt to approve upon the teal alignment (alternative 2) as shown.

SLIDE 18 - Additional Alternatives Cont'd

Alternative 6 was developed as a combination of Alternatives 1 and 4 (or the Blue and Orange Alternatives). The goal of this alignment was to avoid new or planned developments as much as possible.

SLIDE 19 - Additional Alternative Cont'd

Alternative 2-1 is a similar to the Teal Alignment (Alternative 2). The beginning of the alignment, as it departs from existing FM 546, was shifted north slightly to attempt to miss an existing structure and to avoid impacts to the new large lot family development just to the south of the alignment.

SLIDE 20 - Additional Alternative Cont'd

Alternative 6-1 is a combination of new alternatives 6 and 2-1, with smoother horizontal curves proposed. It was developed to avoid impacts to the new large lot family development and to minimize impacts to the newly planned neighborhood development just west of the Myrick Ln Extension.

SLIDE 21 - Updated Matrix - New Alts.

The three new alternatives were analyzed through the same scoring process as the previously proposed alternatives. The data was added to the alternatives comparison matrix using all the same categories and sub-categories. After totaling all the scores for the three new alternatives and comparing them to the previously

developed alternatives, Alternative 6-1 became the least impactful alternative. Based on this analysis, alternative 6-1 is being proposed as the recommended alternative to move forward in the project development process.

SLIDE 22 - Recommended Alignment

As was stated at the beginning of this presentation, the project study limits extend from Bridgefarmer road eastward, meeting back up with US 380 east of Princeton, TX. There are several sections of the overall alignment that are being developed and constructed by the City of Princeton or private developers as shown in dark purple on the screen and called out to be developed by others. The light purple segments shown are connections Collin County is advancing to complete the alignment as part of this planning study; making it a continuous, new thoroughfare. No alignment alternatives were developed for the eastern section where the alignment turns north near Dove Hill Trail. The alignment in this section is based on design speed and the horizontal curve needed to meet our 50 mph design speed for the facility and connects the two controlling segments to the west and north that are being developed by others.

In conclusion of the alternatives section of the agenda, Collin County is asking for your input or comments on both the process used to identify the recommended alternative, and the recommended alternative as proposed. Again, public and stakeholder input is a valuable part of the corridor planning process and we thank you for your time and input. The following slides will cover the remaining project schedule and all the various ways you can give feedback to the project development team.

SLIDE 23 - Schedule - Phase I

Below are the next steps for the FM 546/CR 400 Corridor Study. The public comment period for this public meeting shall continue through April 9, 2021. All comments will need to be submitted to the County by or on this date. The recommended alternative will then be proposed for approval by the Collin County commissioner's court in late April/Early May. The technically approved alignment will continue into the preliminary design phase, which is anticipated to begin in Summer 2021. The ROW Acquisition is estimated to begin in Fall/Winter of 2021. Final design is estimated to begin in Winter 2021. Construction funding has currently not been identified for this corridor, but if funding becomes available construction could begin as early as February of 2022. But, as of this time, no construction schedule is currently planned.

SLIDE 24 - FM 546/CR 400 Public Comments

Collin County is committed to continuing its effort to gain public feedback regarding this project. Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, the process of obtaining public feedback has been altered, but all comments will be given full consideration. There are five different ways in which you can leave a comment, question, or voice a concern with the project team.

- The **first method** is via the virtual public meeting website. The link is provided along with a scan code that takes you directly to the website on your mobile device using your camera. Once on the website, click on the tab labeled "Overview" and scroll to the "Interactive Project Location Map". This map allows you to zoom into areas of concern, or your property, and then click on "Add point" in the upper right corner of the map. Once you have selected "Add point" you can click anywhere on the map and a comment box will come up for you to type in your comments. Click "Post with Comment" in the bottom right of the pop-up box to submit your comment with the location information to the project team. Additionally, you can select the "Learn More" tab and scroll to the bottom of the page to the Comment Section to submit additional comments to the project team.
- The **second method** is to send an email to leigh@piacommunications.com.
- The **third method** is through US mail. Please mail your comments to "FM 546/CR 400 Study" at PO BOX 570, Allen, Texas 75013.
- The **fourth method** is to make a verbal or written comment in person if you previously set up an appointment for our in-person public meeting. It is occurring this evening, Thursday, March 25th by appointment only at the Princeton High School cafeteria area.
- The **fifth method** is to leave a verbal comment by calling 817-381-2473 and leave a voice message with your comment. Please limit all voice mails to 3 minutes in length

Again, for you comments to be considered by the project team, please be sure to submit your comments on or before April 9th, 2021.

SLIDE 25 - FM 546/CR 400 Project Manager

If you have any general questions or concerns regarding the project, please contact BGE's Project Manager, Brian Reinhardt, during regular business hours. Brian can be reached via the telephone number or email address shown on the slide.

Alternatively, you can contact Collin County's Project Manager, Tracy Homfeld, via the telephone number or the email address shown on the slide.

SLIDE 26 - FM 546/CR 400 Summary

As a summary of today's presentation, Collin County is developing a feasible alignment for FM 546 and CR 400 to improve overall mobility in central Collin County and improve safety within the corridor.

The roadway improvements consist of a proposed four-lane urban roadway section with two lanes in each direction. The road would be designed to allow a future third lane in each direction to be constructed to the inside median. The project team has selected a recommended alignment and is asking for the public's input on this alignment or the process used to select it. The period for public comment is open now and shall continue through April the 9th. There are five separate ways to comment during that period as presented.

All project information can be found online at bit.ly/FM546. We appreciate your participation in this meeting and thank you for being a part of the planning process. This concludes the project presentation, have a great day and good-bye.