



STATION 1: WELCOME & SIGN-IN

Welcome to the Texas Department of Transportation El Paso District’s virtual public meeting for the FM 76 (North Loop Drive) Feasibility Study. FM 76 is locally known as North Loop Drive, but we will refer to the study as FM 76 for the remainder of the presentation. I’m Jennifer Wright and as part of the FM 76 Feasibility Study team, I will guide you through this interactive public meeting.

If you have questions about using this format, please contact Gilysa Garcia at (737) 272-6777 for assistance.

This virtual public meeting has been designed to mirror a traditional public meeting, while giving you a chance to experience this meeting from the comfort and safety of your own home. You will have the opportunity to learn about the proposed project by reviewing several exhibit boards. Opportunities to provide comments will be available throughout this virtual meeting room.

Let’s begin with an orientation of this virtual room format. At the top left of the screen is an orange box with a dropdown menu that provides an outline of the stations in the room. At the top right there is a map of the room. If you do not see a rectangular layout, click the map icon. The numbered stations on this map align with the numbers on the dropdown menu. The blue station numbers highlighted on the map indicate which station you are currently viewing. At any time, you can use this map to move from station to station or orient yourself in the room.

At the bottom of the screen, you will see several icons. The first icon to the left, labeled as the letter “i” will give more information about how to navigate around the room and what the different buttons do. The next icon to the right, shown as a “www” will take you to the TxDOT project website which includes all the materials you will see here today in the meeting. The middle icon shows you a map of the project area and where it is in the region. Next you see plus and minus icons that can be used to zoom in and out, respectively, at any time. We have included a HELP button you may click any time. There is a comment icon in the right bottom corner of the screen. You can leave a comment in any station by clicking this button. Also, there is a pause and play button near the bottom of the screen which allows you to play and pause the narration. Finally, to move forward one station, click the arrow on the right-hand side of the screen. To move backward, click the arrow on the left-hand side of the screen. You can view all stations as many times as you’d like as well as replay any narration as many times as you’d like.

Now let’s look at Station 1, beginning with the boards. First, we have the welcome board; to zoom in on each board simply click the icon that looks like an eye. Once you are finished viewing an item, just press the “X” in the top right-hand corner to exit. You can also click the icon on the right to download the board and view it as a PDF and then print or save it to your device. You will see the same icons for all exhibits and handouts in the room. The second board in this section talks about ending deaths on Texas highways.

November 7, 2000 was the last deathless day on roadways in Texas. That means for nearly 23 years, at least one person has died every single day. We all have a part to play to change that. This message is that reminder – to End the Streak of deaths on Texas highways. We need drivers and passengers to act more responsibly and help us reach our goal of zero deaths by 2050. Texans can play a major role in ending fatal crashes with a few simple driving habits: wear seatbelts, drive the speed limit, put away the phone and other distractions, and never drive under the influence of alcohol or drugs. So please do your part and share this message with your friends and family.

Now, moving down to the table – the first piece of paper on the table is where you sign in for the meeting. Please provide your contact information, so that we can keep you informed as the project progresses. We encourage all visitors to sign in. To do so, just click the pen icon under the box labeled “Sign-In.”



When you are finished viewing the materials at this station either click the arrows on the right-hand side of the screen or select Station 2 from the map at the top right corner of the screen, in order to advance.

STATION 2: STUDY BACKGROUND

As we start this next station remember to click on the eye icon beneath each board as I talk about it to see the additional information presented on each topic.

Station 2 provides a Feasibility Study Process overview board and a board that describes the existing corridor characteristics.

Board 1

The feasibility study conducted a multimodal corridor analysis to develop feasible mobility and safety improvements along the FM 76 corridor. As a result of the feasibility study, TxDOT identified three alternative concepts and recommended improvements that would minimize and/or avoid potential impacts to the human and natural environment where practical.

The feasibility study process typically takes 12 to 18 months and includes 4 phases. The first phase involved defining problems, identifying existing constraints, and analyzing existing and future traffic patterns along the study corridor. The second phase involved developing potential preliminary options and identifying goals and objectives. The third phase involved an alternatives analysis of potential improvement options. The fourth and final phase, which we are now in, includes identifying conceptual alternatives and developing a feasibility study report with short-, mid-, and long-term recommended improvements.

Board 2

The feasibility study is analyzing a segment of FM 76 that is 12.5 miles long. Study limits are from FM 1281 (or Horizon Boulevard) in Socorro to SH 20 (or Alameda Avenue) in Fabens. The FM 76 study corridor's existing roadway configuration begins with a four-lane divided section extending from FM 1281 to Milo Drive, in Socorro. This section has 11-foot-wide paved shoulders and 5-foot-wide sidewalks available on both sides of the corridor.

The section of the study corridor between Milo Drive in Socorro and the Town of Fabens generally consists of a two-lane undivided roadway, with 3 to 4-foot-wide paved shoulders. There are currently no sidewalks available on either side of the corridor.

The study corridor ends with a two-lane undivided section in the Town of Fabens, with 5-foot-wide sidewalks along either side of Fabens Road, leading up to SH 20.

When you are finished viewing the boards, please advance to Station 3.

STATION 3: ENVIRONMENTAL

As we start this next station remember to click on the eye icon beneath each board as I talk about it to see the additional information presented on each topic.

Station 3 provides a series of constraints map panels that show existing conditions within the environmental constraints study area based on various sources of information.



This boundary indicates a study area and is not proposed roadway right of way. As you can see on the maps, different color coding is used to detail land use and markers to identify wells and other features. For example, parcels shown in orange are commercial, and parcels shown in yellow are residential. Other markers, such as the light blue dots, show the locations of groundwater wells and the purple squares show the locations of places of worship.

Within the more developed sections, most of the land use consists of residential and commercial uses, whereas in the rural areas, the land use mostly consists of orchard and agricultural land uses. These details will help shape the proposed conceptual alternatives as the study develops with the goal of avoiding and minimizing impacts to the human and natural environment.

When you are finished viewing the boards, please advance to Station 4.

STATION 4: TRAFFIC AND SAFETY

As we start this next station remember to click on the eye icon beneath each board as I talk about it to see the additional information presented on each topic.

Station 4 provides a safety analysis board for intersection crashes, and one for segment crashes. It also includes a board for future traffic demand in the study corridor without feasibility study improvements, which is known as the No-Build scenario, and a board for future traffic demand with feasibility study improvements, known as the Build Scenario.

Board 1

A safety analysis was performed for the feasibility study using crash data collected from TxDOT's Crash Records Information System (or CRIS) for a five-year period between 2015 and 2019. The crash data helps to identify overall crash patterns in the study corridor, and flag areas where safety issues may exist.

The map on the left shows the locations in the corridor where there are a higher number of crashes at intersections. These locations are called crash "hotspots". Hotspots can be used to identify locations where potential safety improvements are needed within a study corridor, both at intersections and along roadway segments. The map shows that there are several intersection crash "hot spots" within the corridor, which are located at the intersection of FM 76 (North Loop Drive) with:

- Horizon Boulevard (FM 1281)
- Bauman Road
- Clint-San Elizario (FM 1110)
- and Island Road / Alameda Avenue (SH 20).

The existing intersection safety issues observed within the FM 76 corridor are summarized on the top right:

- 50% of crashes at unsignalized intersections are angle collision crashes
- 60% of all intersection crashes had no median present

Recommended safety improvements to address these intersection safety issues are summarized on the bottom right. These include:

- adding additional dedicated turning lanes
- enhancing signalization
- refreshing and updating the pavement markings
- improving the lighting at intersections
- enhancing signage at intersections and
- installing loons, which allows vehicles to make easier U-turns.



Board 2

The map on the left shows that there are several crash segment "hot spots" within the FM 76 corridor, which are located between:

- Horizon Boulevard (FM 1281) and Clint-San Elizario (FM 1110)
- Webb Road and Porter Rebb Road
- Island Road / Alameda Avenue (SH 20).

The existing segment safety issues observed within the FM 76 corridor are summarized on the top right:

- 75% of all segment crashes occurred at night,
- 70% of all pedestrian and bicycle crashes occurred at locations with no median present
- The majority of crashes occurred where shoulders under six feet were present.

Recommended safety improvements to address these segment safety issues are summarized on the bottom right. These include:

- installing a milled edgeline
- installing a milled centerline
- installing reflective pavement markings
- improving lighting
- installing a raised median and
- Improving signage.

Board 3

The feasibility study analyzed future traffic conditions in 2045, to estimate travel demand and roadway capacity needed along the FM 76 corridor. This preliminary analysis is called the No Build Scenario, where future travel demand is evaluated against the existing roadway conditions.

One of the indicators of roadway capacity is the level of service during peak hours, which tracks how efficiently traffic volume is moved through intersections during the hours of the day when traffic volume on roads is at its highest.

Level of service A through C represents traffic ranging from free-flow conditions to stable flow conditions causing minor traffic flow disruptions. Level of service D represents unstable traffic flow conditions with significantly reduced travel speeds. Level of service E represents noticeable traffic congestion with travel demand approaching or at roadway capacity and level of service F represents severe traffic congestion with travel demand exceeding roadway capacity causing stop-and-go traffic flow conditions.

The map on the left shows the future level of service for stop sign-controlled intersections during the peak afternoon hour, while the map on the right shows the future level of service for traffic-signal controlled intersections during the peak afternoon hour.

The 2045 intersection analysis indicates that, if we do not improve the corridor, the majority of stop sign-controlled intersections between FM 1281 (Horizon Boulevard) and FM 1110 (Clint - San Elizario) are projected to operate with level of service F due to excessive delays and traffic queues during the peak afternoon hour, while the following signalized intersections in the study limits are forecasted to operate at level of service F with excessive delays:

- FM 76 and FM 1281
- FM 76 and Bauman Road
- FM 76 and Clint Cut-Off Road



The remaining intersections in Fabens are expected to operate at level of service C or better.

Board 4

The feasibility study also analyzed the capacity of potential build alternatives to meet estimated travel demand in 2045. This analysis is called the Build Scenario, and it estimates how well the recommended corridor improvements will meet future travel demand along the FM 76 corridor.

The recommended alternative has three different roadway configurations along three different segments of the corridor:

- Four travel lanes with a raised median between Horizon Boulevard and Clint San Elizario
- Two travel lanes with a Two Way Left Turn lane between Clint San Elizario and Fabens Road
- Two travel lanes between Fabens Road and Alameda Ave

In addition, the recommended alternative adds 2 new traffic signals to the FM 76 corridor, at the intersection of FM 76/Sudan Drive; and at FM 76/Worsham Road/Wellettka Road, increasing the total number of traffic signals along the FM 76 corridor from 6 to 8.

The map on the left shows the future level of service for stop sign-controlled intersections during the peak afternoon hour, while the map on the right shows the future level of service for traffic-signal controlled intersections during the peak afternoon hour.

- The Build Scenario shows an improved level of service at the majority of the stop sign-controlled intersections, with only 2 intersections operating at a level of service E or F, compared to 20 intersections in the No-Build Scenario.
- The Build Scenario also shows an improved level of service at the signalized intersections, with an 86% reduction in the queues and delays observed in the No-Build Scenario.

When you are finished viewing the boards, please advance to Station 5.

STATION 5: SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS OUTREACH

As we start this next station remember to click on the eye icon beneath each board as I talk about it to see the additional information presented on each topic.

Station 5 provides a board that summarizes stakeholder and public outreach and a board that summarizes stakeholder and public input.

Board 1

The Feasibility Study solicited input from stakeholders and local groups through large group stakeholder advisory meetings, public meetings, and one-on-one meetings.

One on one meetings were held throughout the course of the study with the with the organizations shown on the exhibit:

- The first large group stakeholder advisory meeting was held on July 20th, 2022, and reviewed the purpose of the Feasibility Study, corridor limits, existing conditions, and phases for a Feasibility Study. Stakeholders provided input on early data collection, concerns and corridor needs.
- The second large group stakeholder advisory meeting was held on September 27th, 2022, and reviewed feedback from the previous stakeholder meeting, in addition to presenting updates on data collection, traffic safety and travel demand analysis. Existing ROW, utilities and land use constraints were also reviewed, and stakeholders were asked to provide input.

- The first public meeting was held on February 28, 2023, and presented existing and future traffic conditions, roll plots containing right of way and utility information, and environmental constraints maps. Public input was gathered on the study corridor's challenges and needs.
- The third large group stakeholder advisory meeting was held on June 6th, 2023, and presented the Level 1 Screening matrix, and draft typical sections. Stakeholders provided feedback on the typical sections as well as the goals that informed the Level 1 Screening.
- The fourth large group stakeholder advisory meeting was held on October 18th, 2023, and presented the level 2 screening, and three corridor concept alternatives screening results. Stakeholders provided feedback on the corridor concept alternatives.
- The second and final Public Meeting is happening now and will gather input on the concept alternative and improvements recommended in the Feasibility Study Report, which will be finalized in March of 2024.
- The large group stakeholder advisory meetings and public meeting included attendance by representatives of the local and regional communities.

Board 2

Stakeholder input and public comments were compiled throughout the feasibility study and are summarized on this public comment map. The comments are categorized as shown in the map legend below:

- Locations with Safety, Traffic & Lighting concerns are identified by the dark orange circles on the map; note that this is the top comment category
- Locations with Connectivity, Easement, Freight or proposed roadway extension concerns are shown by dark grey circles on the map; note that this is the second most popular comment category
- Locations with Drainage, Water & Maintenance Concerns are shown by the aqua circles on the map
- Locations with Roadway Capacity, Fire station, or Development Right of Way concerns are shown by the navy circles on the map
- And locations with multimodal concerns are shown by the dark green circle on the map
- Specific comment details are displayed in the orange callout boxes on the comment map.
- In addition, the locations of future land developments shared by stakeholders are identified by the larger light green circles on the map.

When you are finished viewing the boards, please advance to Station 6.

STATION 6: ALTERNATIVES

As we start this next station remember to click on the eye icon beneath each board as I talk about it to see the additional information presented on each topic.

Station 6 provides 3 boards that summarize the three different conceptual alternatives for the study corridor, analyzing the pros and cons of each one, before finally identifying the recommended alternative concept.

Board 1

Alternative 1 has three different typical sections along three different segments of the corridor:

- Segment 1, from Horizon Blvd to Clint San Elizario, has 4 travel lanes divided by a two-way-left-turn-lane in the middle of the corridor. It also has 10 ft shoulders on either side of the corridor.
- Segment 2, from Clint San Elizario to 5th St, has 2 travel lanes divided by two-way-left-turn-lane in the middle of the corridor, and it also has 10 ft shoulders on either side of the corridor.
- Segment 3, from 5th St to Alameda Ave, has 2 travel lanes and separate bicycle and pedestrian facilities, with sidewalks and buffered bike lanes on either side of the corridor, and lighting in Fabens.

The PROs of alternative concept 1 include:

- Improved roadway mobility
- Moderate safety and traffic improvements
- Moderate access management improvements
- Improved emergency management
- Lower environmental and right of way impacts

The CONS of alternative concept 1 include:

- Minimal accommodations for bicycle and pedestrian facilities

Board 2

Alternative 2 has three different typical sections along three different segments of the corridor:

- Segment 1, from Horizon Blvd to Clint San Elizario, has 4 travel lanes divided by a raised median with lighting in the middle of the corridor. It has a shared use path along the northeast side of the corridor and an 8 ft shoulder on the southwest side of the corridor.
- Segment 2, from Clint San Elizario to 5th St, has 2 travel lanes bordered by 12 ft shoulders on either side of the corridor. It also has a shared use path along the northeast side of the corridor.
- Segment 3, from 5th St to Alameda Ave, has 2 travel lanes and separate bicycle and pedestrian facilities, with sidewalks and buffered bike lanes on both sides of the corridor, and lighting in Fabens.

The PROs of alternative concept 2 include:

- Improved roadway mobility
- Greater safety and traffic improvements
- Greater access management improvements
- Greater accommodations for bicycle and pedestrian facilities

The CONS of alternative concept 2 include:

- Moderate environmental and right of way impacts
- Lower emergency management improvement results compared to other alternatives

Board 3

Alternative 3 has three different typical sections along three different segments of the corridor:

- Segment 1, from Horizon Blvd to Clint San Elizario, has 4 travel lanes divided by a raised median with lighting in the middle of the corridor. It has a shared use path along the northeast side of the corridor and a sidewalk on the southwest side of the corridor.
- Segment 2, from Clint San Elizario to 5th St, has 2 travel lanes divided by two-way-left-turn-lane in the middle of the corridor, and 10 foot shoulders on either side of the corridor. It also has a shared use path along the northeast side of the corridor.
- Segment 3, from 5th St to Alameda Ave, has 2 travel lanes and separate bicycle and pedestrian facilities, with sidewalks and buffered bike lanes on either side of the corridor, and lighting in Fabens.

The PROs of alternative 3 include:

- Improved roadway mobility
- Greater safety and traffic improvements
- The greatest access management improvements compared with other alternatives
- Greater accommodations for bicycle and pedestrian facilities



- Moderate emergency management improvements

The CONS of alternative concept 3 include:

- Moderate environmental and right of way impacts

Alternative 3 offers the greatest benefits compared to the other alternatives and is the recommended alternative for implementation.

When you are finished viewing the boards, please advance to Station 7.

STATION 7: PLOTS

Station 7 contains a roll plot map of the study corridor, that shows the recommended corridor concept alternative 3, along with 3D rendering images of recommended intersection improvements.

Alternative 3 has three different typical sections with three different footprints along three different segments of the corridor:

- Segment 1 is shown by the dotted red line from Horizon Blvd to Clint San Elizario. It has 4 travel lanes divided by a raised median with lighting in the middle of the corridor. It has a shared use path along the northeast side of the corridor and a sidewalk on the southwest side of the corridor, or a shoulder with guard rail, depending on the local context. The overall proposed footprint width for this section is 87 ft.
- Segment 2 is shown by the dotted orange line from Clint San Elizario to 5th St. It has 2 travel lanes divided by two-way-left-turn-lane in the middle of the corridor, and 10 foot shoulders on either side of the corridor. It also has a shared use path along the northeast side of the corridor. The overall proposed footprint width for this section is 75 ft.
- Segment 3 is shown by the dotted blue line from 5th St to Alameda Ave. It has 2 travel lanes and separate bicycle and pedestrian facilities, with a sidewalk and on-street buffered bike lane on either side of the corridor, and lighting in Fabens. The overall proposed footprint width for this section is 56 ft.

The current footprint of the corridor is shown by the light cyan color, and ranges from 50 ft to 135 ft.

In addition, 3D intersection renderings are shown at the following intersections, in accordance with stakeholder input requests:

- FM 76 and Horizon Blvd
- FM 76 and Bauman Rd
- FM 76 and Clint Cut-off Rd
- FM 76 and Clint San-Elizario
- FM 76 and 5th St
- FM 76 and Fabens Rd

When you are finished viewing the roll plot, please advance to Station 8.

STATION 8: NEXT STEPS/TIMELINE

As we start this next station remember to click on the eye icon beneath each board as I talk about it to see the additional information presented on each topic.

Station 8 contains a board summarizing draft feasibility report recommendations and estimated costs, and next steps.



Board 1

The FM 76 draft feasibility study report is currently under development, and includes a list of short-, mid-, and long-term recommended improvements based on Corridor Concept Alternative 3.

Short-term improvements are recommended for implementation within a five-year timeframe, while midterm recommendations fall within a 5-10 year timeframe, and long-term recommendations are recommended for implementation beyond a 10 year period.

Short-term recommendations include improvements that are generally lower-cost and quicker to implement, from a planning and programming perspective. These include items such as:

- Adding right-turn lanes at non-signalized intersections
- Refreshing crosswalk painting
- Adding flashing chevrons at sharp curves
- Refreshing paint along center and shoulder strips
- Adding emergency vehicle amenities at all signalized intersections

Mid-term recommendations include the development and implementation of plans and improvements that may be more time and cost intensive, from a planning and programming perspective. These include items such as:

- Conducting right of way acquisition
- Developing Plans, Specifications and Estimates
- Beginning the environmental process
- Adding Bus Route 84 stops on FM 76
 - Sudan Dr, Liahona Dr, Barnhart Dr, Bauman Rd, Welletka Dr, Richardson Rd, Ranch Viejo Dr, and Estate Dr
- Installing fiber optic cables and pull boxes for traffic communications
- Adding new traffic signals
 - Sudan Dr and Worsham/Welletka Dr

Long-term recommendations include the implementation of improvements that are generally the more time and cost intensive, from a planning and programming perspective. These include items such as:

- Completing construction of the recommended corridor concept alternative 3
- Adding lighting improvements
- Adding pedestrian refuge areas in medians
- Completing connections to the TransVista Traffic Management Center
- Upgrading Existing Route 84 Bus Stops to include Transit Shelters and Benches
- And Extend Bus Route 84 along FM 76 as corridor develops

The total estimated cost for short-, mid-, and long-term recommended improvements for the FM 76 Feasibility Study is approximately 150 Million dollars.

The feasibility study is the first step in the corridor planning, programming, and implementation process.

The second step would be the environmental process and schematic design stage.

The third step would include the development of final designs, as well as the acquisition of right-of-way, and utility adjustments.

The fourth and final step would be the construction of improvement projects.

It should be noted that advancement through these steps is dependent on the outcomes of the previous steps, and the availability of funding. It should also be noted that depending on the scope, the study recommendations could be broken in several different projects that extend over a longer period of time.

When you are finished viewing the draft feasibility study recommendations and next steps, please advance to Station 9.



STATION 9: PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS

This is the final station of the virtual public meeting. The board provides directions for submitting comments.

Station 9 contains a board summarizing the different ways to share input on the FM 76 feasibility study.

Virtual meeting participants can leave a comment by downloading the comment card from the FM 76 (North Loop Drive) Feasibility Study webpage at www.txdot.gov, using keyword search "FM 76 North Loop Drive Feasibility Study" or by email at NorthLoopFeasibilityStudy@icf.com. A comment form may also be mailed to the address shown here.

Comments must be received or postmarked by Wednesday, February 21, 2024. Responses to comments received will be available online at www.txdot.gov once they have been prepared.

We thank you for taking the time to participate in this virtual public meeting. This concludes the virtual public meeting.