



# Design Summary Report (DSR)

The DSR summarizes a basic project information in one document. Use judgment in completing the report since it covers a wide range of items that may not apply to all projects.

This report can be partially completed during the *Preliminary* Design Conference and updated throughout project development. The DSR will be reviewed in detail during the Design Conference.

Note: This Form is a record of the plan development and shall be retained for the life of the project.

---

Highway No.: IH 30

CSJ: 0009-13-194, 195,196

County: Hunt

Length: 12.43 miles

Project No.: \_\_\_\_\_

Limits From: Monty Stratton Pkwy

To: West of FM 513

Is project on National Highway System (NHS)?  Yes  No

If yes, is project  State oversight  Federal oversight

Type of work: Reconstruct and widen existing 4 lanes freeway facility to 6 lanes, reconfigure ramps & widen frontage road to convert to one way operation

Layman's description: The upgrading of a freeway facility.

---

Estimated construction cost: \$1,050,000,000.00

Date of estimate: \_\_\_\_\_

Estimated right of way cost: \$10,000,000.00

Date of estimate: \_\_\_\_\_

## Table of Contents

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
Programming and Funding Data	3
Existing Elements	4
Advanced Project Development Elements	5
Proposed Right of Way & Utility Elements	6
Proposed Geometric Design Elements	7
Proposed Bridge Design Data	9
Proposed Hydraulic Elements	10
Proposed Pavement Structure Elements	13
Proposed Traffic Operations Elements	13
Proposed Miscellaneous Elements	14
Accelerated Construction Procedures	15

<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
Comments and Concurrence	17
Suggested Attendance	18
Suggested Agenda	19
Site Visit	20
Suggested Report Material	21

## Programming and Funding Data

Working Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Authorized Funds: \_\_\_\_\_ STIP Year: \_\_\_\_\_

### Breakdown of Funding Participation

	Preliminary Engineering		Construction		Right of Way		Eligible Utility Relocation	
	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Federal								
State								
County								
City								
<b>Totals</b>								

Sidewalk funded by: TxDOT

Curb and gutter funded by: TxDOT

Storm drain system funded by: TxDOT

Illumination to be maintained by: To be determined

List and describe active Minute Orders and agreements: \_\_\_\_\_

Are advance funding agreements required?  Yes  No

If yes, describe: \_\_\_\_\_

Is unusual financing required?  Yes  No

If yes, explain: \_\_\_\_\_

If program estimate differs from authorized amount, explain overrun/underrun: \_\_\_\_\_

**See attached copy of current cost estimate.**

Tentative letting date: 12/31/26

Date of PS&E submission to District Design: \_\_\_\_\_

Should letting date be rescheduled?  Yes  No

If yes, recommended letting date: \_\_\_\_\_

(and notify all affected offices if letting date is changed) \_\_\_\_\_

## Existing Elements

A. Existing typical section

1. No. of traffic lanes: 4

2. Lane width: 12'

3. Shoulder width: 4' In. ; 10' Out.

4. Median width: 43'

5. Curb & gutter:  Yes  No

B. Existing bridge data (including bridge-class culverts)

Stream Name	Structure Number	Structure Length	Structure Type	Date of Construction	Sidewalk Width	Clear Rdwy. Width	Sufficiency Rating
IH 30 EBML	01117-913478	263	Bridges	1/1/2011	N/A	46	98
IH 30 WBML	01117-913462	263	Bridges	1/1/2011	N/A	46	98
SH 34 U-Turn	01117-913465	304	Bridges	1/1/2012	N/A	26	94
SH 34	01117-913463	304	Bridges	1/1/2012	N/A	84	97
SH 34 EAST U-TURN	01117-913466	304	Bridges	1/1/2011	N/A	26	94
IH 30	01117-913155	31	Culverts	1/1/1957	N/A		75.8
US 69	01117-913317	390	Bridges	1/1/1971	N/A	88	92
BUS US 69 U-TURN	01117-913464	270	Bridges	1/1/2010	N/A	28	93
BUSINESS US69	01117-913327	270	Bridges	1/1/1974	6	88	97
IH 30	01117-913120	76	Culverts	1/1/1955	N/A		75.8
DIVISION STREET	01117-913316	280	Bridges	1/1/1971	N/A	40	93.19
IH30 EB	01117-913122	1001	Bridges	1/1/1955	N/A	42	95.69
IH30 WB	01117-913121	1001	Bridges	1/1/1955	N/A	47	96.19
IH30 EB	01117-913328	230	Bridges	1/1/1974	N/A	42	95.9
IH30 WB	01117-913329	230	Bridges	1/1/1974	N/A	42	96.19
LAMAR STREET	01117-913330	370	Bridges	1/1/1974	N/A	40	84.40
IH 30 EB	01117-913097	200	Bridges	1/1/1950	N/A	44	95.90
IH 30 WB	01117-913096	200	Bridges	1/1/1950	N/A	44	84.59
IH 30 N FRTG RD	01117-913331	171	Bridges	1/1/1974	N/A	34	98
IH 30 S FRTG RD	01117-913332	171	Bridges	1/1/1974	N/A	34	97
IH 30 S FRTG RD	01117-913333	91	Bridges	1/1/1974	N/A	34	98
IH 30 EB	01117-913099	100	Bridges	1/1/1950	N/A	44	92
IH 30 WB	01117-913098	100	Bridges	1/1/1950	N/A	43	92
IH 30 N FRTG RD	01117-913334	91	Bridges	1/1/1974	N/A	34	98
IH 30 S FRTG	01117-913283	33	Culverts	1/1/1965	N/A	31	87.90
IH 30 EB	01117-913101	80	Bridges	1/1/1950	N/A	44	91
IH 30 WB	01117-913100	80	Bridges	1/1/1950	N/A	44	91
IH 30 N FRTG	01117-913282	33	Culverts	1/1/1965	N/A	29	89.5
SH24 & SH50	01117-913284	282	Bridges	1/1/1965	N/A	30	58.79
IH30 SFR	01117-913293	100	Bridges	1/1/1967	N/A	26	90.19
IH 30 EB	01117-913103	110	Bridges	1/1/1950	N/A	43	94.40
IH 30 WB	01117-913102	110	Bridges	1/1/1950	N/A	43	94.40
IH 30 N FRTG	01117-913294	100	Bridges	1/1/1967	N/A	26	96.30
IH30 SFR	01117-913296	23	Culverts	1/1/1967	N/A	29	89.5
IH30	01117-913104	24	Culverts	1/1/1950	N/A		69.30

Stream Name	Structure Number	Structure Length	Structure Type	Date of Construction	Sidewalk Width	Clear Rdwy. Width	Sufficiency Rating
IH 30 N FRTG	01117-913295	24	Culverts	1/1/1967	N/A	30	89.5
FM513	01117-913297	310	Bridges	1/1/1967	N/A	26	70.5

C. Existing cross drainage culvert data

Station	Number of Barrels	Sizes	Type (shape & material)
1462+78.85	2	5'x4'	MBC
1484+64.42	2	5'x3'	MBC
1495+23.67	2	6'x6'	MBC
1517+92.23	2	5'x3'	MBC
1532+38.27	1	6'x3'	SBC
1538+75.91	2	5'x2'	MBC
1557+92.91	2	5'x2'	MBC
1590+95.63	2	10'x5'	MBC
1650+07.15	5	10'x10'	MBC
1657+66.79	1	6'x3'	SBC

D. Stream Data

1. Will channel work be required?  Yes  No

If yes, linear feet disturbed? \_\_\_\_\_ permits needed?  Yes  No

2. If bridge shafts must be drilled in channel or stream bed, how will drilling rigs gain access? (e.g., cofferdams, drilling pads, or access roads) \_\_\_\_\_

E. Other (e.g., stock pass): \_\_\_\_\_

F. ROW Data

1. Existing ROW width: 300' Typical  
3. Predominant land use: Agricultural

2. Estimated number of land owners: 358  
4. Soil types: Fine Sandy Loam, Silt Loam, Clay

G. Existing constraints

1. Eligible historical structures: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Schools: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Parks: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Archeological sites: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Potential hazardous material sites: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Ecological (wetlands, habitats, etc.): \_\_\_\_\_
7. Airport (notify FAA, FAA Form 7460-1): \_\_\_\_\_
8. Other: \_\_\_\_\_

H. Highway-railroad (RR) grade crossings

1. Owner of RR:  UP RR  BNSF RR  KCS RR  Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  2. Type of RR crossing surface material:  concrete  rubber  wood
  3. Type of warning devices:  passive  cantilever flashing lights  lights and gates  mast signals
  4. Do opportunities exist for consolidating or closing RR crossings?  Yes  No
  5. Is there a highway-RR grade crossing adjacent (i.e., within about 500 ft (152 m)) to a signalized highway intersection?  Yes  No  
If yes, responsible office for determining the need for preemption: \_\_\_\_\_
- I. Has crash analysis been performed?  Yes  No

## Advanced Project Development Elements

### A. Surveying

1. Is planimetric needed?  Yes  No
2. Status of aerial photography:  complete  in progress  not started  not proposed
3. Status of field surveys:  complete  in progress  not started
4. Has vertical and horizontal control been established on the ground?  Yes  No
5. Additional elements to be surveyed (drainage channels, intersecting streets, etc.): \_\_\_\_\_
6. Is existing ROW staking required?  Yes  No  
Status:  complete  in progress  not started Responsible office: TxDOT Paris Dist
7. Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

### B. Schematic development

1. Is a geometric schematic required?  Yes  No If yes, responsible office: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Is a signing schematic required?  Yes  No
3. Schematic status:  
a. Percent complete: 60 % b. Approval authority:  FHWA  DES  District  
c. Need preliminary schematic by: \_\_\_\_\_ d. Need approved schematic by: 12/31/23 e. Approval date: \_\_\_\_\_
4. What type of 3D model will be developed? (Choose all that apply)  
 Basic Corridor Model  Automated Machine Guidance Model  Visualization Model
5. Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

### C. Environmental Commitments & Issues

1. Anticipated type of environmental document required:  CE  EA  EIS
2. Office responsible for preparing environmental document: TxDOT Paris Dist
3. Has environmental document been approved?  Yes  No Status: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Public meetings:  proposed  not proposed  scheduled  held  MAPO  
Date(s): \_\_\_\_\_
5. Public hearing:  scheduled  opp. afforded  held  not required Date: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Environmental commitments  
a. Noise: \_\_\_\_\_  
b. Air quality: \_\_\_\_\_  
c. Wetlands/Section 404 Permit: \_\_\_\_\_  
1. Individual permit required? \_\_\_\_\_  
2. Nationwide permit required? \_\_\_\_\_  
d. Water quality: \_\_\_\_\_  
e. Coast Guard: \_\_\_\_\_  
f. Natural resources: \_\_\_\_\_  
1. Vegetation: \_\_\_\_\_  
2. Endangered Species: \_\_\_\_\_  
3. Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
g. Cultural resources \_\_\_\_\_  
1. Archeology: \_\_\_\_\_  
2. Historical: \_\_\_\_\_  
h. Social, economic, environmental justice: \_\_\_\_\_  
i. 4f, 6f: \_\_\_\_\_  
j. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
7. Are hazardous materials issues anticipated?  Yes  No
8. Environmental Issues Permits Commitments Sheet (EPIC) completed?  Yes  No
9. Office(s) responsible for fulfilling commitments: TxDOT Paris District
10. Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

## Proposed Right of Way & Utility Elements

**A. Right of way elements**

1. Usual ROW width: 300
2. Additional ROW needed to accommodate design features (side slopes, sound walls, etc.)  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Have adjacent property owners been identified?  Yes  No
4. Is additional ROW required?  Yes  No
5. How many parcels will be involved in ROW acquisition? 125
6. Are easements required (drainage or construction)?  Yes  No
7. Is control of access needed?  Yes  No
8. Have ROW map/plats/descriptions been prepared for parcels?  Yes  No
9. Is relocation assistance required?  Yes  No
  - a. Number of residences: \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Number of businesses: \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Other improvements: \_\_\_\_\_
10. Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**B. Major utility facilities**

1. Preliminary utility inventory

Utility	Type	Describe potential conflict
AT&T	FIBER OPTIC TELEPHONE	CROSSINGS @ MONTY STRATTON PKWY, W OF SH 34, W OF US 69, @ BUS US 69, E OF DIVISION ST
PEOPLES COMMS	FIBER OPTIC	CROSSING W OF SH 34
CITY OF GREENVILLE	WASTEWATER	CROSSINGS @ MONTY STRATTON PKWY, W & E OF SH 34, W OF US 69, E OF BUS US 69, W&E OF DIV ST
CITY OF GREENVILLE	WATER	CROSSING E OF SH 34, W OF US 69, E OF BUS US 69, E OF DIVISION ST
ATMOS	GAS	CROSSING W OF DIVISION ST
GREENVILLE UTILITY	ELECTRICAL	CROSSING BETWEEN BUS US 69 AND DIVISION ST

2. Have utility conflicts been determined?  Yes  No
  3. Has Subsurface Utility Engineering been requested or performed to locate utilities?  Yes  No
  4. Have utility agreements been prepared through district ROW office?  Yes  No
- Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Proposed Geometric Design Elements

*Note: Design features listed in tables may not apply to every project.*

Functional classification (select one):

- freeway   
  arterial   
  major collector   
  minor collector   
  local

Highway type (select one):

- urban freeway   
  urban frontage road   
  rural freeway   
  rural frontage road   
  rural multilane  
 rural two-lane   
  suburban roadway   
  urban street   
  bike/pedestrian trail

Proposed work (select one):   
 4R/new construction   
 3R   
 2R   
 Terrain (choose all that apply):   
 level   
 rolling

### A. Traffic

Street	Existing ADT	ADT (letting year)	ADT (design year)
Interstate Highway 30	49,474 (2021)		

Unless TxDOT-TPP provides this data, submit five-year and twenty-year forecasts of average daily traffic volumes including traffic loadings by axle load spectrum or vehicle classifications as defined by the FHWA on existing and proposed roads and streets within or affected by the facility.

### B. Design criteria

Design Elements	Design Guidelines			Existing Value	Proposed Value
	Minimum	Desirable	Figure/Table		
Design speed	50 mph	70 mph	RDM Table 3-17	55	70
Maximum horizontal curvature	R = 2040'	R = 3390'	Table 2-4	R = 2083'	R = 2150'
Maximum superelevation rate	6%	6%		6%	6%
K value - sag	96	181	Figure 2-7		
K value - crest	84	247	Figure 2-6		
Maximum grade	4.00%	3.00%	Table 2-9		
Minimum grade	0.30%	0.50%	Page 2-37		
Other:					

### C. Roadside features (See attached typical sections.)

Roadside Feature	Unit	Value	Comments
Border	width	15'	Table 3-1
Sidewalk Location:	width	5'	Table 3-1
Cross slope - sidewalk	%	2 %	Page 7-24
Ditch front slope - usual	ratio	6H:1V	Table 2-15
Ditch front slop - maximum	ratio	4H:1V	Table 2-15
Ditch back slope - usual	ratio	4H:1V	Table 2-15
Ditch back slope - maximum	ratio	3H:1V	Table 2-15
Maximum fill height before retaining wall	height		
Clear zone	width	30'	RDM - Table 2-12
Other:			

## Proposed Geometric Design Elements (continued)

D. Roadway surface features (See attached typical sections.)

Roadway Feature		Dimension	Comments
Thru Lanes	Proposed	6-12' LN	
	Ultimate		
Other Longitudinal elements	Bike Lane (on-street)		
	Shared-use curb lane		
	Parking		
	Bridge width		
	Curb offset		
Shoulders (ML)	Inside	10'	Table 3-18
	Outside	10'	Table 3-18
Median	Raised	N/A	
	Flush	N/A	
	Depressed	N/A	
	Opening spacing	-	
	Opening width	-	
Speed Change Lanes	Lane width	-	
	Storage length	-	
	Taper length	-	
	Shoulders	-	
Cross Slopes	Thru lanes	2.50%	RDM - PG 2-47
	Shoulders	2.50%	RDM - PG 2-47
Structure clearances	Horizontal	30'	RDM - Table 2-12
	Vertical	18' 6"	RDM - Table 2-11

In order to accommodate OS/OW loads on frequently permitted routes, design consideration for vertical clearance on new structures should not be limited to other vertical clearances along the route. Even though it may take a generation or longer to increase vertical clearance throughout a frequently permitted route, progression toward that goal has to be considered for each new structure in conversation with the permit office and maintenance personnel.

When selecting lane widths, horizontal and vertical clearances, pavement designs and turning radii at intersections consideration should be given to whether the facility is already a permitted or possibly permitted as an oversize and overweight (OS/OW) load route. The District Permit Office, Area Engineer's Office or the District's Maintenance Records could provide useful information in making this determination. To accommodate the overheight loads increased vertical clearance could be considered, as well as consider the option to design the facility carrying the OS/OW loads to go over the other facilities. Providing increased lane widths and performing evaluations of the pavement designs using the "Modified Texas Triaxial Design Method" will ensure accommodation of wide and overweight loads and help with deterioration of pavements and save on the system's maintenance costs.

E. Connecting roadways (See attached typical sections.)

Design Element	Ramps	Direct Connectors	Crossroads
Design speed	50 mph Urban/ 60 mph Rural	40 mph Urban/ 60 mph Rural	35 mph
Maximum horizontal curve	Rural: 11,100' NC, RDM Table 2-4	Rural: 11,100' NC, RDM Table 2-4	510' NC, RDM Table 2-3
Maximum grade			7
Minimum grade	0.5		0.30
Proper number of lanes	1	1	2 to 6
Lane width	14'	14'	12'
Inside shoulder	4'	4'	
Outside shoulder	6'	10'	
Other: Future Sidewalk			4' Buffer + 6' berm provided

F. Are design exceptions/waivers required?  Yes  No

If yes, what design elements? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Proposed Bridge Design Data

A. Design data for structures

Structure Number	Structure Location	Clearance		Clear Rdwy. width	Length	Over-pass OR under-pass	Foundation type	Super-structure type	Sub-structure type
		Horiz.	Vert.						
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									

Structure Number (repeat from above)	Railroad crossing? (Yes/No)	Type of Existing Rail	Type of Proposed Rail	Proposed approach treatment	Turn-arounds provided? (width)	Retaining walls proposed? (type)	Bridge widening (describe existing & proposed)	Are bridge design exceptions/ waivers required? if yes, for what design elements?
								1
								2
								3
								4
								5
								6

B. Bridge widths are for:  proposed number of lanes  ultimate number of lanes

C. Are bridge widths controlled by traffic handling?  Yes  No

## Proposed Hydraulic Elements

### A. TxDOT design frequency

**Notes:**

Table shown below is in the TxDOT Hydraulic Design Manual.

Shaded boxes denote recommended design frequencies.

When multiple design frequencies are given, select a frequency by checking a box ().

Federal law requires interstate highways to be provided with protection from the 50-year flood event, and facilities such as underpasses and depressed roadways where no overflow relief is available should be designed for the 50-year event.

Functional Classification and Structure Type						Check 100-yr Flood?
	2	5	10	25	50	
<b>Freeways (main lanes)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Culverts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
Bridges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<b>Principal arterials</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Culverts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
Small bridges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
Major river crossings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<b>Minor arterials and collectors (including frontage roads)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Culverts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
Small bridges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
Major river crossings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<b>Local roads and streets (off-system projects)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Culverts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
Small bridges	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<b>Storm drain systems</b>						
Interstate and controlled access highways (main lanes)						Yes
inlets and drain pipe	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
inlets for depressed roadways	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
Other highways and frontage						
inlets and drain pipe	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
inlets for depressed roadways	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<b>Other:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

## Proposed Hydraulic Elements (continued)

B. If design frequency is other than TxDOT guidelines, where it is to be used and the reason (e.g., to use in designing off system facilities or to comply with FEMA requirements)?

\_\_\_\_\_

C. Comments on special hydrologic considerations (e.g., Basin is regulated by reservoirs, unit hydrograph and routing techniques in HEC-HMS used in lieu of regression equations):

\_\_\_\_\_

D. Safety end treatment proposed

Parallel drainage structures: \_\_\_\_\_

Cross drainage structures: \_\_\_\_\_

E. Will outfall channels be provided?  Yes  No

If yes, by whom? \_\_\_\_\_

F. Will outfall channels be maintained by others?  Yes  No

If yes, by whom? \_\_\_\_\_

G. Will others have to approve hydraulic design?  Yes  No

If yes, by whom? \_\_\_\_\_

H. Will others participate in funding hydraulic structures (e.g., joint ditch agreements with railroads)?  Yes  No

If yes, who? \_\_\_\_\_

I. For storm drain design, is there potential for future development that may redirect flows normally away from the project back to the project?

Yes  No

If yes, will the actual "modified" contributing drainage area be used if known or will an estimate of a 150' wide area be used instead when the actual modification is not known?

\_\_\_\_\_

J. Will pump stations be required?  Yes  No

If yes, approximate locations? \_\_\_\_\_

K. Is this an evacuation route where roadway elevation is critical?  Yes  No

If yes, explain? \_\_\_\_\_

L. Is the design of any special drainage facility required?  Yes  No

If yes, explain? \_\_\_\_\_

M. Which hydraulic programs will be required for analysis? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

N. Are flood insurance study streams within project limits?  Yes  No

If yes, which streams and what type of map is designated (e.g., Flood Hazard and Boundary Map)?

\_\_\_\_\_

## Proposed Hydraulic Elements (continued)

O. Informal FEMA coordination should always be initiated early in project development to identify any pertinent issues such as the availability or loss of the accumulative 1-foot rise to previous development. Has the informal FEMA coordination revealed any special issues that may require formal coordination (e.g., such as a no remaining rise or the presence of a designated floodway)?

Yes  No

P. Is there any existing development in the floodplain that may be impacted at any stage by changes (no matter how small) brought about by the project, regardless of whether the project meets FEMA standards?

Yes  No

## Proposed Pavement Structure Elements

A. Describe existing pavement: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Is existing roadway load zoned?  Yes  No

Limits From: \_\_\_\_\_

To: \_\_\_\_\_

C. Has pavement design been prepared?  Yes  No      Been approved?  Yes  No

Responsible office: \_\_\_\_\_

D. Proposed pavement structure (**See attached typical sections.**)

Describe thickness and material type of each layer.

Pavement Structure Element	Roadway	Shoulder
Widen existing		
Main lanes		
Frontage roads		
Direct connectors		
Ramps		
Detours		
Crossroads		
Other:		

## Proposed Traffic Operations Elements

A. Are signing, delineation, and pavement markings to be included in construction plans?  Yes  No

If yes, responsible office: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Is signalization proposed?  Yes  No

If yes, are traffic signals warranted?  Yes  No      Resp. office for developing plans: \_\_\_\_\_

C. Is there a highway-railroad grade crossing adjacent (i.e., within about 500 ft. (152 m)) to a signalized highway intersection?

Yes  No      If yes, responsible office for determining the need for pre-emption: \_\_\_\_\_

D. Is safety lighting proposed?  Yes  No

If yes, is illumination warranted?  Yes  No      Resp. office for developing plans: \_\_\_\_\_

E. Is continuous lighting proposed?  Yes  No

If yes, is illumination warranted?  Yes  No      Resp. office for developing plans: \_\_\_\_\_

F. Are Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) items proposed?  Yes  No

If yes, are proposed ITS items included in the regional ITS plan?  Yes  No

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

## Proposed Miscellaneous Elements

### A. Geotechnical exploration

1. Roadway

Is geotechnical investigation needed?  Yes  No

Is geotechnical investigation available?  Yes  No If yes, explain: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Bridges (list bridges requiring foundation exploration)

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Walls (list retaining walls or noise walls requiring foundation exploration)

\_\_\_\_\_

4. Storm drains

\_\_\_\_\_

5. Miscellaneous (e.g., overhead sign bridges, high mast illumination)

\_\_\_\_\_

6. Office responsible for geotechnical exploration (borings): \_\_\_\_\_

7. Is a D<sub>50</sub> (grain size determination) for scour analysis on the proposed structure at the stream crossing required from the lab?

Yes  No

### B. Sequence of construction (Outline probable stages. **See attached typical sections.**)

1. Stage I: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Stage II: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Additional stages: \_\_\_\_\_

C. Will median openings require approval by others?  Yes  No If yes, by whom? \_\_\_\_\_

D. Are requirements satisfied for the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) and the Texas Accessibility Standards (TAS)?

Yes  No Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

E. Are railroad agreements needed?  Yes  No If yes, where? \_\_\_\_\_

F. Are airway/highway clearance permits required?  Yes  No

1. For roadway: \_\_\_\_\_

2. For other (e.g., high mast illumination): \_\_\_\_\_

G. What type of erosion control is proposed?

1. Fills: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Is a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SW3P) proposed?  Yes  No Required?  Yes  No

3. Other: \_\_\_\_\_

H. Does the project require a Value Engineering Study?  Yes  No

I. Is a Safety Review Committee (or multi-discipline team) review required?  Yes  No

J. Does design address requirements of environmental permits and environmental concerns?  Yes  No

K. Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

## Accelerated Construction Procedures

### A. Are accelerated contracting procedures required?

(The following types of projects will require the use of accelerated construction contract provisions. Check all that apply to this project.)

- Interstate or freeway project with lane closures during one or more phases of construction
- Bridge closure (either as the entire project or a portion of a larger project)
- Road closure
- Added Capacity projects
- Non-freeway with ADT > 10,000 and lane closures during one or more phases of construction
- Provides access to a nearby school, emergency services (hospital, fire, etc.), or major traffic generator
- Project affects access to adjacent businesses
- Other (Projects that are time critical such as traffic signal work at high accident locations)

Explain: \_\_\_\_\_

- None of the above (Acceleration provisions are not required)

Type of work: \_\_\_\_\_

### B. Is an exception request to DES needed? Yes No

(Note: If the project meets any of the above criteria and accelerated contract provisions are not utilized, Design Division approval will be required. Request for approval to not utilize accelerated contract provisions should be submitted in advance of PS&E submission for letting. )

Request submitted: \_\_\_\_\_

Approval received: \_\_\_\_\_

### C. What type of accelerated contract procedure will be used?

(Check the accelerated contract provision(s) to be used on this project.)

- Calendar Day Definition for Working Day
- Incentive Using Contract Administrative Cost
- Increased Liquidated Damages
- Milestones with Incentives/Disincentives
- Substantial Completion Incentives/Disincentives
- Lane Rental Disincentive
- A+B Provisions

### D. What technique will be used to calculate road user costs?

- FREQ, CORSIM or HCS models
- PASSER models
- Manual techniques
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### E. Who will perform road user costs calculations?

- consultant
- interagency agreement
- district

## **APPENDIX**

## Comments and Concurrence

District Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Title \_\_\_\_\_

Design Division Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Title \_\_\_\_\_

FHWA Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Title \_\_\_\_\_

**Note:** Concurrence with this report does not imply approval of any design exceptions or waivers referred to herein.

## Suggested Attendance

Date of conference: \_\_\_\_\_

Location of conference: \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>INVITED</b> (name)	<b>ATTENDED</b> (name)
TxDOT district and area office staff		
advanced project dev. engineer		
area engineer		
area maintenance supervisor		
bicycle coordinator		
bridge engineer		
construction engineer		
dir. of trans. planning & dev.		
district engineer		
district design engineer		
environmental coordinator		
landscape architect		
maintenance engineer		
pavement engineer		
planner		
programming & sched. mgr.		
railroad coordinator		
right of way administrator		
utility coordinator		
traffic engineer		
TxDOT division offices		
FHWA		
bicycle groups		
city and county		
consultants		
environmental resource agencies		
federal transit authority		
MPO director or staff		
transit operators		
trucking industry		
utility companies		
others (e.g., chamber of commerce)		
1)		
2)		
3)		

## Suggested Agenda

**Prior to the Preliminary Design Conference, experienced district representatives from traffic operations, design, construction and maintenance should visit the site together to review existing conditions.**

### Background

- existing elements
- funding
- surveys, studies, and data
- agreements and permits
- problematic features
- Feasibility Study or Major Investment Study Findings

### Project Scope

#### Corridor issues

- mobility & transportation
- operations & maintenance
- planned/funded projects

#### Environmental issues

#### Multimodal issues

#### Alternatives

#### Schematics

#### Public Involvement Plan

- stakeholders
- public meeting and public hearing

### Environmental Documents and Commitments made

### Detailed Design Criteria

#### Project development criteria

- Level of Service
- control of access
- geometric design
- hydraulic design
- bridge design
- pavement design
- traffic operations design
- landscape and aesthetic design
- constructibility

#### Right of Way

- new ROW required
- easements required
- utility adjustments
- control of access

#### Maintenance

#### Permits, agreements, and coordination with:

- outside entities
- Federal, State, City, or County
- railroads



## Suggested Report Material

Consider attaching the following to this report:

PURPOSE AND NEED STATEMENT

\*

DRAFT ALTERNATIVES SCREENING AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

\*

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

\*

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE

\*

DESCRIPTION OF KEY STAFF ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

\*

AGREEMENTS REACHED BETWEEN CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

\*

ATTACHMENTS

Conference minutes or notes

Typical Sections

Page 3 of Form 1002

Location Map (optional)