



PUBLIC Meeting SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

District/County: Bryan District/Washington County

Highway/Limits: SH 36 from US 290 to Business SH 36, in Brenham

CSJ: 0186-06-065

Funding: Currently not funded to go to construction - 20% State 80% Federal

Need: The primary needs for the proposed project is to bring SH 36 up to current TxDOT design standards and to increase mobility. Vehicles (especially heavy trucks) travelling at posted speed limits along SH 36 have difficulty reducing speed for vehicles turning onto and off of SH 36 and making turn-offs into/out of adjacent properties. The addition of the frontage roads provides vehicles a safe access/egress lane to adjacent properties without impeding the flow of the highway traffic.

Purpose: The purpose for the project is to relieve congestion and to meet TxDOT current design standards.

Proposed Improvements: The Proposed Action would consist of adding capacity by widening SH 36 to a four lane divided facility from US 290 to Bus 36, a distance of 2.1 miles. This would include four 12 foot wide travel lanes with 10 foot wide outside shoulders and 4 foot wide inside shoulders divided by a typically 40 foot wide depressed grassy median. The 10 foot wide outside shoulders would accommodate bicycles. The project would also include replacing the existing bridge over UPRR, Little Sandy Creek, Benton Drive, and Lounge Road to bring it up to current design standards. Two new bridges would be constructed for northbound and southbound traffic. The proposed project would also include two lane curb and gutter frontage roads with an entrance and exit ramp west of the bridges and a U-turn under the bridge on the west side. The two lane frontage roads would include a 12 foot wide inside lane and a 14 foot wide outside lane that would accommodate bicycles. The proposed project would continue to be drained with open drainage ditches. All of the existing culverts would be extended and provided safety end treatments.

Average Daily Traffic Volume along SH 30

Year:	<u>2014</u>	<u>2033</u>
Avg. Daily Traffic Volume: (vehicles per day)	12,700	19,500

Environmental Document Approval: A Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Document is being prepared for the project.

Notices and Articles:

Brenham Banner and The Bryan Eagle-

Sunday, November 24, 2013

Sunday, December 8, 2013

Notice of the Public Meeting was broadcasted on Brenham radio stations and by message boards located along the project area.

Open House/Public Meeting Date and Place: December 12, 2013 – 5:00-6:00 p.m. at Brenham Elementary School; 1000 West Blue Bell Road; Brenham, Texas.

Attendance: Approximately 59 people signed the registration sheets.

Exhibits: A geometric schematic showing the horizontal alignment.

Comments and Response

Comments from Elected/Local Officials:

Verbal: There were no verbal statements made from elected/local officials at the meeting.

Written: There were two written comments made from elected/local officials at the meeting.

Table 1. Summary of Oral and Written Comments from Elected Officials				
Commenter	Statement	Name	Representing	Comment #
1	Written	Luther Hueske	Washington County Commissioner Pct 2	1
2	Written	Otto H. Hanak	Washington County Sheriff	2

Commenter 1. Has concern that the crossover for Dixie Road seems to far south unless the hill gets cut down. His second concern was for future growth in the area they would need frontage roads the whole length of the project; if not now design for them later.

Response: For the cross-over at Dixie Road, we did receive a few comments on the location. We will evaluate the location as it relates to the vertical alignment of the roadway and make adjustments accordingly.

The existing right-of-way does not allow room for frontage roads unless very expensive retaining walls are built to reduce embankment slopes. The project is not currently funded and has an estimate of around \$18 million for what was shown on the layouts. Adding frontage roads within the existing right-of-way raises the estimate to over \$40 million. The best chance for the project to get funded is to design and ultimately build what is needed for current and projected traffic volumes and the current proposal meets that objective.

Commenter 2. Wrote a letter with displeasure of the ongoing construction at SH 36 and BU 36 intersection project; and that TxDOT failed to involve any local public safety officials in regards to the project.

The letter also mentioned that the meeting held on 12-12-13 was a waste of time for him and for numerous citizens. The letter addressed that even though TxDOT said local officials approved the current ongoing project, the City Manager and a Commissioner were present and both denied supporting the project.

The commenter stated that he felt ignored by TxDOT representatives and was not asked for his advice or opinion. He went on to state that he didn't agree with removing an overpass and replacing with a T-intersection.

The commenter asked for reconsideration from TxDOT to look at the clover leaf and US 290 and SH 36 and the 2.2 mile section north of the clover leaf.

Response: The Department appreciated the commenter’s concern and for the safety of the traveling public on the SH 36 corridor. TxDOT held a public meeting regarding the ongoing construction at SH 36/Business 36 intersection in December 2012. After that meeting plans for the intersection were completed.

The meeting held on December 12, 2013 was for the widening of SH 36 between the Cloverleaf with US 290 and Business 36 to provided public input. The commenter’s input and involvement in the development of plans for the currently planned project is valuable and desired. TxDOT will ensure that the Commenter’s office would be notified for all future public involvement opportunities.

Comments from Public:

Written: There were two individual written comment from the public meeting, five written comments submitted after the hearing, and four emailed comments.

Table 1. Summary of Oral and Written Comments				
Commenter	Statement	Name	Representing	Comment #
1	Written	Rhonda Weynand	Self	1
2	Written	Terry W. Wunderlich	Self	2
3	Written	Robert & Donna Sprenger	Self	3
4	Written	Charles & Elizabeth Laughlin	Self	4
5	Written	Larry Embry	Self	5
6	Written	James S. Brown	Self	6
7	Written	Doug Ratchford	Self	7
8	Written	Ricky Boeker	Self	9
9	Written	Allen Rust	Self	10
10	Written	Sally Clinton	Self	11
11	Written	Marie Surovik	Self	12

Commenter 1: We need this!

Response: Comment noted.

Commenter 2: Need a legal U-turn at FM 577 & SH 36, intersection to go north must have no-right on red.

Response: Thanks for your comments. They will be added to the file and considered during design.

Commenter 3: Why couldn’t there be a turning lane on SH 36 at Dixie Rd?

Response: The details of this intersection are still being determined. However, by limiting the left turn maneuvers we can expect crash rates to be lower than traditional intersection (which allow for left turns).

Commenter 4: Designed well to utilize existing ROW.

Response: Comment noted.

Commenter 5: Very informative meeting, SH 36 is in desperate need of being a four lane highway.

Response: Comments noted.

Commenter 6: Commenter is for the project.

Response: Comment noted.

Commenter 7: It is dangerous and outdated, dig up this whole end of town.

Response: Comment noted.

Commenter 8: The accident record on this section of highway has to be way above average along with deaths. We are defiantly in support of the project.

Response: Comment noted.

Commenter 9: Not sure who came up with the plan to replace over pass with a stop light. How can we justify spending millions making something worse.

Response: The project referenced is the SH 36 project at Business 36 which is not the topic of the current meeting. In regards to the intersection project, the engineering behind the project is sound and not doing anything would not be a better alternative. Crash history, turning traffic, traffic growth, alternatives analysis, consistency with corridor, future adaptability, and public review were all factors that were studied for the development of the ongoing construction project.

Commenter 10: Please do not continue with ill-conceived project (SH 36 BS 36 Project). This change will only sever a few people on the north side of town.

Response: The project referenced is the SH 36 project at Business 36 which is not the topic of the current meeting. In regards to the intersection project, the engineering behind the project is sound and not doing anything would not be a better alternative. Crash history, turning traffic, traffic growth, alternatives analysis, consistency with corridor, future adaptability, and public review were all factors that were studied for the development of the ongoing construction project.

Commenter 10: I am undecided about this project. I think it will be safer. We live at the intersection of Dixie and SH 36 and see the accidents happen. People are using the intersection as a turn around which is causing accidents. Also once the road is built people will use Dixie to access FM 577 as a shortcut.

Response: We have noted the accident history at this location. The proposed schematic limits access to Dixie Rd to only a right-in and right-out, which is expected to reduce the overall crash rates.

Summary of How Major Comments/Issues Were Addressed and Recommendation:

All comments have been satisfactorily addressed. Written comments were addressed.