

Aaron Bloxham

From: Jennifer Arnold
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2017 4:43 PM
To: Aaron Bloxham; Michael Quint; Brian Lockley
Subject: FW: Argument Against 380 Bypass Corridor on Bloomdale (CR123)
Importance: High

FYI

Jennifer Arnold | *Planning Manager*
City of McKinney
Phone | 972.547.7415
Email | jarnold@mckinneytexas.org

Please tell us how we're doing by [completing a brief survey](#).

From: Kathy Wright
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2017 4:29 PM
To: Gary Graham <ggraham@mckinneytexas.org>; Jennifer Arnold <jarnold@mckinneytexas.org>
Subject: FW: Argument Against 380 Bypass Corridor on Bloomdale (CR123)
Importance: High

FYI – this came through the Contact-Planning email.

Thank you
Kathy

From: Dan Geiter [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2017 4:22 PM
To: Contact-Planning <Contact-Planning@mckinneytexas.org>
Subject: Argument Against 380 Bypass Corridor on Bloomdale (CR123)

I am unable to attend the meeting this evening (9-Feb-2017) due to prior commitments. However, I would like to make my opinion known to this organization.

I believe placing a 380 bypass option on Bloomdale Rd (CR 123) is a bad option for the following reasons:

1. It will disrupt Tucker Hill, BloomRidge (under construction), Heatherwood, Timber Ridge (under construction), and Robinson Ridge. All neighborhoods that have been constructed in recent years or are currently being built with the knowledge of the council.
2. CR 1461 can be utilized while disrupting a comparative minimum number of families.
3. Constructing a bypass will yield a 6 Lane Arterial (380) and a Limited Access Freeway (Bloomdale). Converting 380 to a Limited access freeway and maintaining the current comprehensive plan will yield a 6 Lane Arterial (380) and a Limited Access Freeway (Bloomdale). Net you end up with the same number of lanes but with major disruptions and devastated land values all north of 380 AND still surrounding the commercial areas of 380.
4. The problems indicated from TDM results at build-out are all on 380 traffic moving E-W with less problems both North & South. This indicates that the primary issue is through-traffic transiting across the community. We all

know the roads will need to be expanded and some roads may transition to limited access but not through new construction which simply shifts a problem from 380 to the residents of neighborhoods north of 380.

5. Most people who have purchased houses looked at published plans and realized that the roads in the surrounding area would be expanded to 6 lane thoroughfares. Limited access bypasses were never a published option (that I know of).
6. Custer has always been declared to be a principal thoroughfare in this region. Why is that road not being considered for expansion to tie into this bypass? Why a whole new road going cross-country on the border of Tucker Hill? Please at least attempt to remain close to original plans before adding major new projects.
7. This type of investigation should have been considered when approving neighborhood construction projects- do not make the residents of these neighborhoods and the current developers pay for what now appears to be a poor planning and approval system.
8. 380 is a major thoroughfare with near freeway speed limits along most of its course. This road should be expanded well before the thought of diverting traffic through existing neighborhoods crosses anyone's mind.
9. People should be able to reasonably expect that 2 lane roads will increase to four and six lane roads and 6 lane roads will increase to limited access freeways. People should not be blindsided by 2 lane roads jumping in size to limited access freeways.
10. Do not break an implied promise made to people who have invested in the area based on 2013, 2004 and other previously published Comprehensive plans.
11. Planning has another option beside massive building projects for this- control the final build-out. There is no law on the books that states that the region needs to be turned into a concrete jungle. While people should expect growth in areas, preserving green space, holding minimum lot sizes, restricting high density housing to control population to match infrastructure is always an option. In my opinion, that might even increase the perceived status of McKinney.

This bypass will alleviate traffic for how long? Why is the DNT connecting up with the Outer loop insufficient? Right now, 380 is the only major road running E-W north of Sam Rayburn Tollway (121). With the Outer Loop, there will be a major bypass for the whole of the McKinney system. If something more local is absolutely required, then please place it on roads that are not bordered by current neighborhoods.

At the end of the day, what the City Council is doing is preserving a known major arterial as status quo and putting a freeway literally in the backyard of hundreds of families. As described in Point 3 above, we will end up with the same number of lanes whether 380 goes to limited access or a bypass is built. Develop the major arterial of 380 first, a road all people could have assumed or predicted to be expanded BEFORE disrupting your citizens lives.

Or, as stated above, use permitting to restrict the build-out to a level where the infrastructure as planned (with 6 lane major & principal thoroughfares, etc). That could have side-benefits as well by not maximizing every square inch for housing, especially high density housing.

Thank you for your time,
Dan Geiter, P.E.
Citizen of McKinney, TX



Jennifer Arnold

From: Hurlbut, Amanda [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 10:38 AM
To: Jennifer Arnold
Subject: 380 Bypass Concerns

Dear Ms. Arnold,

I am writing to express my concern and opposition to the proposed McKinney 380 bypass highway along Bloomdale road. I was told that you would be sharing public comments with the City Council at the Work Study meeting on February 20th. I've attempted to summarize several of my concerns below (I apologize, this is a very personal matter for me, so it's hard to be brief):

1. First and foremost, I am a new homeowner in the Erwin Farms Phase 1 development. We decided to build a home in this neighborhood in September 2015 after investing much prayer, time, and research into making this decision. We closed on our new home in June 2016. Previously, we lived in McKinney for 13 years, in the Stonebridge Ranch neighborhood. Please trust me when I say that the decision to build in the Erwin Farms development was not taken lightly. We carefully researched the community and transportation plans and knew, that despite being primarily farmland now, that the roads of Wilmeth and Bloomdale would eventually be 4-6 lane high access roads (Similar to Custer road). We **NEVER** anticipated that either would be considered as future limited access freeways with speeds in excess of 60-70 MPH. If we had known this, we would not have chosen to build a house in this neighborhood because we would not want to live that close to a highway (approximately .5 miles). Our neighborhood is close enough to 75 and 380 that we do not want the added traffic noise surrounding us on practically all sides. Additionally, **THE** major selling point in choosing this neighborhood was the location and that it would allow pedestrian access to Erwin Park once phase 3 of our neighborhood is built out. Our family, including our two young girls – ages 6 and 2 – love to be outdoors walking, biking, and exploring. If a highway is built along Bloomdale road, we would completely lose the option to cross Bloomdale to visit Erwin Park. This house is my dream home and my husband and I saved FIVE YEARS in order to be order to customize and purchase the house exactly the way we wanted in the neighborhood we wanted. We considered this house our “forever family” home. I give you this information to let you know the sincerity and concern that I have about Bloomdale becoming a freeway. It is simply not acceptable in raising our family. I am currently not in favor of any bypass freeway and would rather see 380 converted (as I have yet to explain), but if a bypass is considered, I would much prefer to see Laud Howell used as the option for the bypass.
2. Another concern that I have is how the 380 bypass proposal crosses through what the McKinney 2040 Vision plan calls the “scenic” district. I simply do not understand the logic of having a bypass highway cross North or South of Erwin Park, one of McKinney’s primarily “scenic” areas.
3. My husband is currently a teacher and Cross Country/Soccer coach at McKinney North High School. Currently, the Cross Country team trains along the access roads and neighborhoods around McKinney North including, Wilmeth (943), Hardin (1007), and Bloomdale (164) roads. The team runs along Bloomdale primarily because it is safer for the runners at the moment and involves far less traffic. My concern is that the Bloomdale option for the bypass involves the safety of students and specifically, the cross country runners who train so near to the school. McKinney North is already bordered on the East

by I-75 and on the South by 380, which requires that the team head North and West in order to train and maintain the safety of the runners. If the Bloomdale option is built North as a highway, where will these students safely train? Bloomdale as a 6-lane road provides the option of sidewalks (as the Boyd cross country runners have along Lake Forest and Virginia Parkway), but a freeway will not provide that safety feature to pedestrians. McKinney North should not have another highway/freeway built so close to the school, primarily for safety reasons. McKinney North's Cross Country team has repeatedly proven itself as a competitive team that brings notoriety and honor to the City of McKinney, demonstrated by numerous invitations to the State championship meet. Most recently, McKinney North's freshman girls runner, London Culbreath, won the 2016 State Girl's Cross Country title and went on to place 11th in the National Cross Country meet. The Bloomdale option will severely limit this team's ability to effectively train their runners.

4. I currently travel to Denton multiple times per week for work and I am familiar with 380, the South 288 loop, and the North 288 loop that was built into a highway for ease of access into I-35. My concern is that McKinney is attempting to fix a problem using the bypass highway when the real issue is along 380. In Denton, for example, there is still quite a bit of congestion and traffic along 380, despite having the North and South loops as options. Why? Because there are numerous businesses and commercial developments along 380. I believe that McKinney is using the bypass option as a band-aid, rather than fixing the real issue as the development along 380 continues to grow and expand. My personal belief based on my experience with 380 in Denton County, is that the bypass will do little to relieve the congestion and traffic due to the development that is occurring especially when considering the future businesses along 380 in McKinney (Cosco, proposed Hobby Lobby, etc.) I simply do not see how a bypass will solve the true problem. This is why I am in favor of converting 380 into a limited access highway rather than creating a bypass option.
5. One of the biggest concerns that I have was when watching the meeting on January 23, 2017, where the 380 bypass option was presented to the city council. It appeared as if several of the city council members were in favor of exploring Laud Howell as a feasible option for the bypass rather than Bloomdale which has multiple existing and proposed residential developments. From what I could see, there were two main reasons given that Bloomdale was considered over Laud Howell as the bypass option, both of which I have issues with. The first reason - Laud Howell is further to the North by 1 mile and it was suggested by Gary Graham, Traffic Engineering Manager, that the further north the bypass, the less likely it might be used by commuters. However, later one of the council members discussed how using Laud Howell as the bypass option might be more desirable since it is closer to the planned Collin County Outer Loop and might lend itself to future connections. Why could this option not be explored further as a way to avoid disrupting existing McKinney residential developments? Secondly, Mr. Graham stated that he believed it would be more difficult to gain the support of the cities of Prosper and Celina with the Bloomdale option since Laud Howell runs across existing residential neighborhoods in those two cities. I am EXTREMELY concerned at this statement being used as justification because I believe that the City Council's primary concern should be toward the residents of the City of McKinney. In McKinney, there are more existing residential developments that would be affected if the bypass was constructed along Bloomdale than Laud Howell. In other words, the McKinney City Council needs to take care of OUR city and its residents FIRST before considering what is desirable for other cities.

Thank you again for taking the time to read this lengthy message and I hope that you will share my concerns (as well as the others that I know other communities have sent) with the members of the City Council. If you should have any questions or need additional clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you,

Amanda Hurlbut

Jennifer Arnold

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 10:33 AM
To: info@onemckinney2040.com
Subject: Bypass 380

Hello,

Can you pls add me into the e-mailing list about bypass 380 updates? We are against having a highway on CR123.

Thanks,

Best regards,

Nargiz Karimova

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Jennifer Arnold

From: karin kerby [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 4:48 PM
To: Jennifer Arnold; Travis Ussery
Cc: Gary Graham; Aaron Bloxham; Michael Quint
Subject: Re: proposed McKinney Bypass

Jennifer,

Thank you for this reply.

I was thinking today about a totally different concept - one that perhaps we could speak about? It has to do with taking a huge step back and re-looking at the COMPREHENSIVE plan for the entirety of McKinney - based on the slogan "Unique by Nature". It has to do with rezoning to prevent large tracts of land being turned into dense housing - and creating large areas of open space (not just parks). I lived in one of the most beautiful counties in Virginia - which struggled with this very issue about 20 years ago - and through master planning - was able to better protect and "limit" the rampant growth that comes from unbridled development. The protected areas of the county are restricted to sale in parcels no smaller than 10 acres. The wonderful outcome of that is that traffic in those areas are better managed and the buildout of large freeways is not necessary. The dense housing was restricted to the east side of the county and open space to the rural west (kind of like our North and South).

Unique by Nature should mean something - I'm not getting that feeling with the push to develop, develop, develop.

I'm available by phone if you'd like to speak.

Karin Kerby
[REDACTED]

On Tuesday, February 14, 2017 2:13 PM, Jennifer Arnold <jarnold@mckinneytexas.org> wrote:

Ms. Kerby,

Thank you for your email and feedback regarding the US 380 bypass concept in McKinney. I'm glad you were able to attend the public meeting last week, and your comments below will be packaged and included as part of the public record. Although you may have already received this information, I wanted to let you know that the materials and presentation that were discussed during the meeting are now available online at: <http://mckinneytexas.org/1703/27908/Master-Thoroughfare-Plan>. I think the presentation and FAQs should address many of your comments below, so I hope the information is helpful for you.

I also wanted to let you know that, based on the comments and feedback we've received over the last several days/week, Staff will be discussing regional transportation, the US 380 bypass concept, and its relationship with the ONE McKinney 2040 Comprehensive Plan at the February 20 City Council work session. As a member of the stakeholder group, you will see an email from me within the next few days with additional information about that upcoming Council work session.

Please let me know if you have any other questions or comments.

Thanks,

Jennifer Arnold | *Planning Manager*
City of McKinney
Phone | 972.547.7415
Email | jarnold@mckinneytexas.org

Please tell us how we're doing by [completing a brief survey](#).

From: karin kerby [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2017 8:22 PM
To: Travis Ussery <tussery@mckinneytexas.org>; Jennifer Arnold <jarnold@mckinneytexas.org>
Subject: proposed McKinney Bypass

Thank you for the information session this evening re. the proposed McKinney bypass and all the thought that has gone into the proposal as it stands now. It was very informative and clear.

We just bought our home in the Heatherwood subdivision, and while our property is several blocks from the proposed bypass, we, of course do have concerns on the effect it may have on property values.

BLOOMFIELD/CR123

It was clear why the option to expand 380 to a limited access freeway is not very viable. That we understand. Looking at the footprint of the proposed Bloomdale bypass does make some sense, when you look at the abundance of open land NORTH of CR123. In fact, it seems that the worst impact WILL be on the Heatherwood subdivision, the one just now going in to the west of us and perhaps the new area slated for single family homes just across Lake Forest from Heatherwood. HOWEVER - I assume you would have to purchase all of the land NORTH of CR123/Bloomdale in order to secure your necessary right of way. That said - since it appears there are only 2 or 3 subdivisions that are DIRECTLY impacted by keeping the footprint right along CR123 - **could you not re-align (i.e. curve) the new road Northward, sort of as a "arch" over those 3 subdivisions?** That might soothe some homebuyers (who, arguably have JUST purchased their homes in the last 2 years - so this is quite a shock to their systems!)

So, to repeat and clarify - **IF you use the Bloomdale/CR123 road as your footprint - just purchase that open land NORTH between CR 161 and CR 943 and curve the bypass up a bit to give better clearance and buffer.**

BTW - I come from an area of the country (Northern Virginia) where this is done a lot - and the "buffers" that are ALWAYS put between subdivisions and major highways are engineered "hills" of dirt that are **tall** and landscaped with trees and bushes ...between the homes and the road - very very wide and aesthetically pleasing.

LAUD HOWELL

ANOTHER IDEA, though is one ***I'm surprised you hadn't mentioned (or perhaps even thought of)***. With the **Laud Howell** right of way practically completely wide open and devoid of current development - Oh, My - ***why don't you think of a "planned community" - mixed use, a "DESTINATION" community*** - one that is well planned with that bypass being not only something to take pressure off of 380 - BUT one that leads to this new "destination". There are developers that would LOVE to have that opportunity. It could have a "town center", commercial area, mixed housing (apartments near the town center/ townhouses and single family homes further away).

Two such communities come to mind - that I'm familiar with. One is called the Village at Leesburg (<http://villageatleesburg.com>) - which incorporates really upscale dining/shopping/entertainment with apartments literally above the stores (I think Watters Creek is similar). The other is One Loudoun (<http://www.oneloudoun.com>). We just moved from that area and can attest to the amazing "draw" each of these planned communities have - we lived in the single family homes nearby - but were always going to one of these for our entertainment and dining and shopping.

It just seems that with the **Laud Howell footprint such an "empty canvas"** - instead of being "REACTIVE" to coming up with a plan for a bypass - ***why don't you become "PROACTIVE" and plan something really really spectacular for McKinney!*** Developers would love it - it would better integrate the transportation design into what is useful and palatable to all.

Sorry for the length - but I don't want to just say "not in my back yard" - but rather would like to SUGGEST alternatives!

THANK YOU for your time.

Sincerely,

Karin Kerby



The material in this e-mail is intended only for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, privileged, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that the unauthorized review, use, disclosure, duplication, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by return email and destroy all electronic and paper copies of the original message and any attachments immediately. Please note that neither City of McKinney nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses and it is your responsibility to scan attachments (if any). Thank You.

Jennifer Arnold

From: Kathy Wright
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 2:47 PM
To: Gary Graham; Jennifer Arnold
Subject: FW: bypass on Bloomdale, CR 123

No questions just comments

From: Ben Silver [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 5:47 PM
To: Contact-Planning <Contact-Planning@mckinneytexas.org>
Subject: bypass on Bloomdale, CR 123

As an attendee at the meeting last night I felt that the public didn't get an opportunity to discuss the issue. Breaking us up into groups was a mechanism so no one could get whole picture and not to have a mud-slinging session. As a new homeowner on Grove Cove Dr in Heatherwood you can imagine that I am not in favor of the bypass being in my backyard. I spoke to few council members who agreed that Laud Howell was a better alternative due to the less disruption to the landscape and displacement of people. Bloomdale is only 1.9 miles from 380 and Laud Howell approximately 5.5 miles away. At 70 miles an hour that distance is not too great, approximately 3 minutes.

As far as the commercial development coming in the Northwest of McKinney. The developer can split the property like was done at the shops of Legacy and still have a viable development. They should welcome the freeway to help bring people and establishments to the area to have great access.

Also if the plan was in place since 2004 and updated regularly why was Heatherwood Phase 3 and 4 approved to build, Erwin Farms be allowed to develop as well as Megatel Bloomdale which also runs against Bloomdale? It sounds like the City wanted to increase the tax base and felt it was so many years in the future for the bypass they could get away with building and say everything is still up in the air.

I would like to propose a wait on a decision until the election takes place in May. With 4 new council members coming on the outgoing members are not representing the people of McKinney and have no vested interest in the decision that will be a burden for years to come. You would not install a Supreme Court justice with a lame duck president and the same holds true here.

Also I don't know if this means anything but the 635 construction cause homes close to the highway to have foundation problems and a lawsuit was filed with the homeowners winning a sizeable settlement, so a precedent has been set and you may have the same issue here with the homes being so close to the highway.

PLEASE review your plans again to consider another alternative that makes sense for ALL the residents of McKinney. McKinney is Unique by Nature not Unique by Highway!!!!

Thanks
Ben Silver

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Jennifer Arnold

From: Tricia Standish [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 10:39 AM
To: info@onemckinney2040.com
Subject: 380 bypass

Please send me information regarding the proposed 380 bypass. If this happens it will all but take my ENTIRE 380 property at 8700 W University—including the building. The City already took the front part by Eminent Domain in the early 1990's, the first time 380 was widened. If this goes through you will have taken it all. This is my one and only investment!

I do hope that you will come up with an alternative plan that does NOT impact those already developed 380 frontage properties, which are actually situated on the north side of 380 between CR 852 and Custer Road. Perhaps a better plan would be to have the new freeway come from north to south on the EAST side of the Walnut Grove Lake, rather than the west side, and join 380 at that point, rather than joining it at CR 852.

Alternatively, if you go ahead with the proposed plan it would be a huge source of City tax revenue to have the Commercial Restrictions that are presently imposed on Walnut Grove #1, and run with the land, declared void, so that the whole block of Walnut Grove#1, which lies on the north side of State Hwy 380 and east of Custer road with 380 to its south and CR 853 to its north, could be developed as a commercial block. I always thought it should have been anyway—highest and best use.

FYI those Restrictions have been consistently (and are presently being) violated over the years, including the one against commercial operations.

Please let me know.

Sincerely,

Patricia Standish

Jennifer Arnold

From: zack hansen [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 9:59 PM
To: info@onemckinney2040.com
Subject: US 380 Bypass Concept

Hello,

I would like to be informed about any new information concerning the 380 bypass concept and/or any upcoming public outreach events. I live in the Heatherwood neighborhood and 100% OPPOSE the concept for the 380 Bypass on Bloomdale road.

Thanks,

Zack Hansen

Jennifer Arnold

From: Kathy Wright
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 9:19 AM
To: Gary Graham; Jennifer Arnold
Subject: FW: 380 By-pass Planning

FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: Heather Heard [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2017 6:14 PM
To: Contact-Planning <Contact-Planning@mckinneytexas.org>
Subject: 380 By-pass Planning

Please add my name and email address to whatever list is used to communicate these meetings. I just found out about tonight's meeting and can not attend due to prior commitments. Our family is opposed to fast moving roadways in the middle of the family neighborhoods that we live in. 380 was the highway by-pass if you want to call it. The city has created this accident laden mess by allowing business entrances and multiple stop lights to hinder traffic progression. We are already adversely effected by the commercial "big trucks" using 1461 and Lake Forrest as a bypass and not obeying traffic signs and laws.

Please protect the neighborhoods and keep the traffic on 380 as originally designed.

Heather Heard
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Jennifer Arnold

From: Gary Graham
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2017 9:02 PM
To: Mike Bell
Cc: Jennifer Arnold
Subject: RE: City of McKinney - US 380 By-Pass

Mr. Bell,

Thank you for your input, we will include your comments as part of the public record.

Gary Graham, PE, PTOE

CIP & Transportation Engineering Manager
City of McKinney
(972) 547-7438
ggraham@mckinneytexas.org

Please tell us how we're doing by [completing a brief survey](#).

From: Mike Bell [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:34 AM
To: Gary Graham <ggraham@mckinneytexas.org>
Cc: Mike Bell [REDACTED]
Subject: City of McKinney - US 380 By-Pass

Gentlemen, as a residence of Walnut Grove I would request you consider brining the bypass back onto US 380 at the Stonebridge Drive intersection. It has yet to be fully developed but the are already plans for the intersection and traffic lights. This would be less invasive to all concerned since the land is presently undeveloped. I know the land is considered a future high dollar development and that means special interests groups will not wish to have a bypass run through it. It is hard believe a few hundred feet east or west would have much impact on the traffic but it could save the devastating impact the bypass would have to existing residents, homes, and land values.

It has also been suggested by a resident to hurry the expansion of Custer Rd and with the widening of Bloomsdale and Wilmet Rd should alleviate traffic off of US380.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Regards, mbell
[REDACTED]

Mike Bell
"Taking Care of Business"

From: Travis Owens <Travis.Owens@txdot.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 4:59 PM
To: Mike Bell
Cc: Dan Perge; Michelle Raglon
Subject: RE: US 380 By-Pass - McKinney

Good Afternoon Mr. Bell,

TxDOT is planning a feasibility study along the US 380 corridor in Collin County which is anticipated to be complete in early 2019. This study will compare route alternatives based on engineering, environmental, and public involvement. This study has not begun and alternative routes have not been proposed at this point. TxDOT will involve the general public and municipalities throughout the feasibility study through stakeholder and public meetings. The study performed and presented by the City of McKinney is not related to the TxDOT feasibility study.

TxDOT has received the study that was performed and presented by the City of McKinney regarding the routes in question. For any questions regarding the City of McKinney presentation or study, please contact Gary Graham at 972-547-7438 or ggraham@mckinneytexas.org.

If you would like to be added to the US 380 corridor TxDOT feasibility study mailing list, please let me know.

If you have any questions regarding the TxDOT feasibility study along the US 380 corridor, please feel free to contact me as I will be the project manager for the project.

Thank you,
Travis
TxDOT US 380 Project Manager

Travis Owens, P.E.
Advance Project Development
TxDOT Dallas District
travis.owens@txdot.gov
214-320-6625

From: Mike Bell [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 4:08 PM
To: Dan Perge; Travis Owens
Cc: Mike Bell
Subject: US 380 By-Pass - McKinney

Gentlemen, as a residence of Walnut Grove I would request you consider brining the bypass back onto US 380 at the Stonebridge Drive intersection. It has yet to be fully developed but

the are already plans for the intersection and traffic lights. This would be less invasive to all concerned since the land is presently undeveloped. I know the land is considered a future high dollar development and that means special interests groups will not wish to have a bypass run through it. It is hard believe a few hundred feet east or west would have much impact on the traffic but it could save the devastating impact the bypass would have to existing residents, homes, and land values.

I am also struggling with why McKinney will not go along with the other cities along US380 and agree to widening it. I am contacting the City of McKinney folks about that concern.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards, mbell



Mike Bell
"Taking Care of Business"



#EndTheStreakTX