Texas Department of Transportation

DSR FORM

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.: 34

CSJ: 0173-06-042, 0173-07-054

County: Hunt

Length: 19 Miles

Project No.: STP 1802(763)MM

Limits From: IH 30 & 3.1 Miles North of FM 2101

To: 3.1 Miles North of FM 2101 & CR 2312

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

If yes, is project ☐ State oversight ☐ Federal oversight

Type of work: Feasibility Study

Layman's description: Feasibility Study for reconstruction of SH 34 from IH 30 to CR 2312 from an existing 2-lane undivided roadway to 5-lane undivided roadway in Hunt County, TX

Estimated construction cost: _____ Date of estimate: NA

Estimated right of way cost: _____ Date of estimate: NA

Table of Contents

Programming and Funding Data

Working Program: 1807 Authorized Funds: _____ STIP Year: 2018

Breakdown of Funding Participation

	Preliminary Engineering		Construction		Right of Way		Eligible Utility Relocation	
	%	$	%	$	%	$	%	$
Federal	80	$743,568.00						
State	20	$185,892.00						
County								
City								
Totals	100	$929,460.00						

Sidewalk funded by: _____

Curb and gutter funded by: _____

Storm drain system funded by: _____

Illumination to be maintained by: _____

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: _____ 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: 2
2. Lane width: 12
3. Shoulder width: varies
4. Median width: NA
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
Mustang Branch (STA 111+20)		228	Bridge				
Mustang Branch (STA 114+57)		160	Bridge				
Caddo Creek (STA738+33)		125	Bridge				
Caddo Creek (STA 754+23)		185	Bridge				
Caddo Creek (STA766+19)		170	Bridge				
Caddo Creek (STA 778+19)		125	Bridge				
Jones Creek (STA 916+95)		220	Bridge				
Jones Creek (STA 923+61)		200	Bridge				
S. Fork Sabin River (STA 941 +61)		190	Bridge				
DD-Outfall (STA 641+45)		125	Bridge Class Culvert				
LL-Outfall (STA 795+69)		180	Bridge Class Culvert				

C. Existing cross drainage culvert data

Station	Number of Barrels	Sizes	Type (shape & material)
137+32	1	3 X 3	
150+03	1	24-inch	
158+35	1	5 X 2	
181+67	1	6 X 3	
190+68	1	4 X 3	
216+31	1	6 X 3	
231+69	1	4 X 3	
241+13	1	24-inch	
251+21	1	3 X 3	
259+46	1	6 X 3	
317+28	1	24-inch	
320+44	2	30-inch	
369+85	1	3 X 2	
391+17	1	4 X 2	
402+06	1	5 X 2	
417+90	1	24-inch	
435+09	1	3 X 2	
453+14	1	5 X 2	
461+72	1	6 X 3	

Station	Number of Barrels	Sizes	Type (shape & material)
481+61	1	6 X 3	
515+51	1	4 X 3	
524+28	1	5 X 2	
540+75	1	10 X 5	
554+54	1	36-inch	
641+45	1	4 X 3	
653+42	2	6 X 3	
729+37	3	5 X 3	
738+33	1	6 X 3	
754+23	1	6 X 3	
766+19	1	6 X 3	
778+19	1	6 X 3	
1078+41	1	9 X 3	
1088+04	1	3 X 3	
1111+20	3	5 X 3	
1154+20	1	6 X 3	

D. Stream Data

1. Will channel work be required? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, linear feet disturbed? TBD 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) TBD

E. Other (e.g., stock pass): TBD

F. ROW Data

1. Existing ROW width: 100'-225'
2. Estimated number of land owners: 497
3. Predominant land use: Varies (residential, Agri)
4. Soil types: TBD

G. Existing constraints

1. Eligible historical structures: No historic structures
2. Schools: 6
3. Parks: No Parks
4. Archeological sites: 3 archaeologic survey sites in the area, 4 historic aged cemeteries (Boyle, Odd Fellows, Mount Bethel, Simmons)
5. Potential hazardous material sites: 42 potential hazardous sites identified within 500' of existing roadway
6. Ecological (wetlands, habitats, etc.): None
7. Airport (notify FAA, FAA Form 7460-1): None
8. Other: 5 Cemeteries (Quinlan, Boyle, Odd Fellows, Mount Bethel, Simmons), 13 places of worship,

H. Highway-railroad (RR) grade crossings

1. Owner of RR: ☐ UP RR ☐ BNSF RR ☐ KCS RR ☐ Other: NA

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 opportunites 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.):
   Survey not included in this scope.
6. Is existing ROW staking required? ☐ Yes ☒ No
   Status: ☐ complete ☐ in progress ☒ not started Responsible office: _____
7. Comments: Conceptual layouts based information available from aerial and TNRIS data

B. Schematic development

1. Is a geometric schematic required? ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, responsible office: This is a feasibility study
2. Is a signing schematic required? ☐ Yes ☒ No
3. Schematic status:
   a. Percent complete: 0 % b. Approval authority: ☐ FHWA ☐ DES ☐ District
   c. Need preliminary schematic by: _____ d. Need approved schematic by: _____ 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: Detailed design will be conducted during schematic and PSE stage

C. Environmental Commitments & Issues

1. Anticipated type of environmental document required: ☐ CE ☐ EA ☐ EIS
2. Office responsible for preparing environmental document: Blanton & Associates
3. Has environmental document been approved? ☐ Yes ☐ No Status: _____
4. Public meetings: ☒ proposed ☐ not proposed ☐ scheduled ☒ held ☐ MAPO
   Date(s): Feasibility - August 21, 2018 & Aug 30, 2018 and June 18, 2019 & June 20, 2019
5. Public hearing: ☐ scheduled ☐ opp. afforded ☐ held ☐ not required Date: TBD
6. Environmental commitments
   a. Noise: TBD
   b. Air quality: TBD
   c. Wetlands/Section 404 Permit: TBD
      1. Individual permit required? TBD
      2. Nationwide permit required? TBD
   d. Water quality: TBD
   e. Coast Guard: TBD
   f. Natural resources: TBD
      1. Vegetation: TBD
      2. Endangered Species: TBD
      3. Other: TBD
   g. Cultural resources TBD
      1. Archeology: TBD
      2. Historical: TBD
   h. Social, economic, environmental justice: TBD
   i. 4f, 6f: TBD
   j. Other: TBD
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: _____
10. Comments: _____

Proposed Right of Way & Utility Elements

A. Right of way elements

1. Usual ROW width: 100'-225'
2. Additional ROW needed to accommodate design features (side slopes, sound walls, etc.)
   Additional ROW identified at a general level in feasibility study to be 15' on both sides of the alignment.
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? _____
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: 20
   b. Number of businesses: 4
   c. Other improvements: _____
10. Comments: _____

B. Major utility facilities

1. Preliminary utility inventory

Utility	Type	Describe potential conflict
Atmos	Gas	TBD
Charter Commun	Fiber, Cable TV, Communicaiton	TBD
Cumby Telephone	Telephone	TBD
Delek Crude	Crude Oil	TBD
Energy Transfer	Oil & Gas	TBD
Explorer Pipeline	Oil & Gas Pipe Line	TBD
Farmers Electric	Electric	TBD
Oncor	Electric	TBD
Zayo	Fiber	TBD
ONE Ok	Pipeline	TBD

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: Utility owners and existing utility base map will be prepared as this is for a feasibility study

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)
SH 34 (Greenville)	26,000 (2018)		37,000 (2045)
SH 34 (Quinlan)	19,000 (2018)		26,000 (2045)
SH 34 (Southern Portion)	6,000 (2018)		9,000 (2045)

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 Guidelines				
Design Elements	**Minimum**	**Desirable**	**Figure/Table**	**Existing Value**	**Proposed Value**
Design speed	40	70	Table 4-2	65	70
Maximum horizontal curvature	5230		Table 2-4		
Maximum superelevation rate	4%		Page 2-13		
K value - sag	64		Page 2-6		
K value - crest	44		Page 2-5		
Maximum grade	7%		Page 2-11		
Minimum grade	0.5%		Page 2-27		
Other:					

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

Roadside Feature	Unit	Value	Comments
Border	width	15	Table 3-5
Sidewalk Location:	width	TBD	Page 2-36
Cross slope - sidewalk	%	TBD	Page 6-16
Ditch front slope -usual	ratio	1V : 6H	Page 2-43
Ditch front slop - maximum	ratio	1V: 3H	Page 2-43
Ditch back slope - usual	ratio	1V: 4H	Page 2-44
Ditch back slope - maximum	ratio	1V: 4H	Page 2-44
Maximum fill height before retaining wall	height	5	Table 8-11
Clear zone	width	30	Table 2-12
Other:			

Proposed Geometric Design Elements (continued)

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

Roadway Feature		Dimension	Comments
Thru Lanes	**Proposed**	12'	Table 3-12 RDW
	Ultimate	12'	Table 3-12 RDW
Other Longitudinal elements	**Bike Lane (on-street)**	NA	
	Shared-use curb lane	NA	
	Parking	NA	
	Bridge width	87'	Table 3-1
	Curb offset	2', 1' (min)	Table 3-1
Shoulders (ML)	**Inside**	4'	Table 3-1
	Outside	10'	Table 3-1
Median	**Raised**	NA	
	Flush	NA	
	Depressed	48'	
	Opening spacing	NA	
	Opening width	NA	
Speed Change Lanes	**Lane width**	11'-12'	Table 3-1
	Storage length	200'	TBD (Local Reqs)
	Taper length	100'	TBD (Local Reqs)
	Shoulders	NA	
Cross Slopes	**Thru lanes**	2%	Table 2-31
	Shoulders	10% max	Table 2-32
Structure clearances	**Horizontal**	Varies	See Table 2-11
	Vertical	16.5'	Table 3-1

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	NA	NA	Table 3-12
Maximum horizontal curve	NA	NA	Table 2-4
Maximum grade	NA	NA	Table 2-11
Minimum grade	NA	NA	Table 2-27
Proper number of lanes	NA	NA	4 (Thru Lanes)
Lane width	NA	NA	Table 3-12 RDM
Inside shoulder	NA	NA	Table 3-1
Outside shoulder	NA	NA	Table 3-1
Other:	NA	NA	NA

F. Are design exceptions/waivers required? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, what design elements? Existing roadway profile was created based on TNRIS LiDAR data. Proposed roadway profile was created to match existing roadwy CLand should be compared against topographic survey during schematics and PS&E.

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 form 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	
Freeways (main lanes)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Culverts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Yes
Bridges	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Yes
Principal arterials	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Culverts	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	Yes
Small bridges	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	Yes
Major river crossings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	Yes
Minor arterials and collectors (including frontage roads)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Culverts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Yes
Small bridges	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Yes
Major river crossings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Yes
Local roads and streets (off-system projects)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Culverts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Yes
Small bridges	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Yes
Storm drain systems						
Interstate and controlled access highways (main lanes)						Yes
inlets and drain pipe	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Yes
inlets for depressed roadways	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Yes
Other highways and frontage						
inlets and drain pipe	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Yes
inlets for depressed roadways	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Yes
Other:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

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)?

Yes

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):

Rational method to be used compute peak flows and Malcom method to compute hydrographs

D. Safety end treatment proposed

Parallel drainage structures: TTBD during design stage

Cross drainage structures: TBD during design stage

E. Will outfall channels be provided? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, by whom? TBD during design stage

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

If yes, by whom? TBD during design stage

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

If yes, by whom? TBD during design stage

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

If yes, who? TBD during design stage

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?

TBD during design stage

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?

XPSWMM, HECRAS

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: Asphalt

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: TBD during design stage

D. Proposed pavement structure **(See attached typical sections.)**
Describe thickness and material type of each layer.

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

Proposed Traffic Operations Elements

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

If yes, responsible office: Will be developed during schematic and PS&E stages

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: Will be determined during design

E. Is continuous lighting proposed? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, is illumination warranted? ☐ Yes ☐ No Resp. office for developing plans: Will be determined during design

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_{50} (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
- ☐ Bride 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 land 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: _____

	INVITED (name)	**ATTENDED** (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

Site Visit

Planning Stage site analysis of land, location, and possible environmental impacts can improve scope development and reduce key feature(s) oversight. Documents and media files gathered during a site visit by subject matter experts can aid preliminary design and project estimate development.

Site Visit Date(s)	Name	Company/Organization	Role

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)