



**City of Denton**  
**MINUTES**  
**MOBILITY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**OF THE DENTON CITY COUNCIL**

City Hall  
215 E. McKinney Street  
Denton, Texas  
[www.cityofdenton.com](http://www.cityofdenton.com)

---

**Tuesday, February 12, 2019**

**9:00 AM**

**City Council Work Session Room**

---

After determining that a quorum of the Mobility Committee of the Denton City Council was present, the Mobility Committee thereafter convened into an Open Meeting on Tuesday, February 12, 2019 at 9:00 am in the City Council Work Session Room 215 E. McKinney, Denton, Texas.

**Committee Members:** Council Member John Ryan, Council Member Keely Briggs and Council Member Paul Meltzer

**Staff Present:** Mario Canizares, ACM; Pritam Deshmukh, Deputy City Engineer; Tracy Beck, Senior Engineer; Trey Lansford, Deputy City Attorney; Becky Owens, Technician; and Marc Oliphant, Bicycle & Pedestrian Coordinator

**REGULAR MEETING**

**A. MC19-011** Consider approval of the Mobility Committee meeting minutes of January 29, 2019.

CM Ryan motioned to approve, CM Briggs seconded. Approved by vote (3-0)

**B. MC19-012** Receive a report and hold a discussion regarding updates from the Denton County Transportation Authority (DCTA).

Sara Bagheri brought updated DCTA maps and schedules along with the budget document to share with the Committee. She noted there have been some changes to the legislative program with some minor changes to the language. DCTA will hold the Executive Committee meeting today and then be in Austin next week advocating for the change. They are creating a local government company to move the bus drivers into a separate company and implementing positive train control technology. Looking forward to when the new legislation passes, a council member can take that seat to represent the City. She noted the other member cities have their alternate designated as the Assistant City Manager. This would be her recommendation as this would allow whoever is in the management position to sit in on the closed sessions. In these sessions we go over some of the economic development and some of the long term planning for the corridor and she thinks it would be helpful for someone in management to be aware of what is happening on the Lewisville end of things and on the Denton end as well to improve communications. Her thought is this should be someone employed by the city for consistency and to have the information pipelined better. The short term goal is are to increase ridership. Bus ridership increased in the last quarter by reducing fares. Train ridership is down and is one of her discussion topics is how to get this up which inevitably leads to longer term goals of extending the train line and connecting to US Hwy 380. It is her understanding that NTCOG has a long term goal of having transit connectivity in the 380 corridor and Denton is a critical piece of that. That is important, otherwise DCTA may look at extending the train line from Lewisville to Frisco as an alternate point being discussed. Her preference is the Denton to 380 Corridor. The budget document including the strategic plan was left to be shared with the committee for review. She added that she views DCTA is a leveraging organization. Yes, we give them sales tax but they leverage that as federal monies that come to Texas.

CM Briggs asked "Who creates the strategic plan?" Sara Bagheri stated they hire someone to do it and it is then presented to the board for approval. CM Briggs also inquired about recent news articles on DCTA about changes to the contractors. Sara Bagheri commented that is a part of the Local Government Corporation. It is not that the contractors will change. The people will stay the same but rather than them being contractors they will become employees of the Local Government Corporation. A portion of our board will probably be a board of the Local Government Corporation.

Mario Canizares asked the Chair, although we have not had periodic updates in the past from DCTA to the Mobility Committee, how often would you like to have DCTA present. CM Meltzer redirected to Mrs. Bagheri for her guidance. She noted they are pretty busy with the legislative issue and would recommend a monthly report on the board composition. She will extend the invitation to their staff for the next meeting.

**C. MC19-013** Receive a report, hold a discussion and provide staff direction regarding recent developments to establish bicycle lanes on West Hickory Street between Avenue B and Welch Streets.

Pritam Deshmukh provided an update to the previous presentation options on alternatives, viability, feasibility and recommendations from the consultant. Staff went back to review to provide a response to the questions and the committee recommendation of Option 3 which required widening the path into the UNT property to accommodate both bikes and pedestrians or have a separate pedestrian path with the conversion of the existing sidewalk into a bike lane. In the interim staff went through the Traffic Safety Committee with the meeting held on February 4<sup>th</sup>. All of the alternatives were discussed and it was voted unanimously to support Option 2. Option 3 requires the City to take sidewalk or access easement or right-of-way from UNT in order to widen the existing pedestrian path. Staff met with UNT on February 4<sup>th</sup> to discuss this option and they said they would get back to us. On February 6<sup>th</sup>, UNT responded that it is not interested in giving up any property to convert the area into a pedestrian bike facility. At this point, Option 3 is not feasible since UNT (or the south side) is the only area we can widen to in order to accommodate all of the aspects of this plan. The request was shared with David Reynolds UNT's Associate Vice President for Facilities.

Staff has begun the investigation of the possibility of changing the traffic pattern on Avenue A (one way or dead-end at Hickory) to accommodate on-street parking. This process will take anywhere between two and three months given that we have to coordinate with the businesses first and second DCTA and third we have to look at the feasibility if we have to reroute DCTA traffic to the intersection of Welch and Hickory. This is a very narrow intersection with tight turning radius. If we do anything to change the pattern at Avenue A and Hickory there are implications that we may have to move DCTA busses to Welch and Hickory. Given the direction we go there might be upgrades to Oak and Welch also. This might take two to three months to go through the engineering process, the public engagement piece, and find out exactly from the business owners their use of the loading area of about 10 spaces there currently. Staff needs to understand do they want those back even after going to an angled parking plan. At the high level planning review if we go angled parking it may accommodate 18-20 spaces. If we go with that plan, we have to give back 10 spaces for loading so we are back to adding only 9-10 spaces net gain. Staff would need the support of the businesses to gain all 20 spaces if we go with this plan.

As far as moving forward with one of the alternatives, currently Hickory Street is completing construction this summer. If we pick an alternative, it takes about a month to get on the agenda for City Council and another month for engineering and striping. Being about a two month process we need to be proactive and not wait until the street is complete given the amount of pedestrian and traffic flow in the whole area to leave it unmarked or tabbed and align things appropriately as far as scheduling.

CM Meltzer asked if we stripe it in a particular fashion now and decide to change it later, is that do-able and what would be involved. Pritam Deshmukh confirmed it is possible depending on how extensive but

if it is brand new pavement you have to grind it down which leaves the markings and it would have to be resealed and there are cost implications.

Citizen Kim McKibben a resident and business owner at 1306 W Hickory Street spoke. She was pleased to hear Pritam say something is doable. Frequently what she hears is that we can't do that or it is impossible or it will take too long. We (the businesses there) did receive information this week from the City Atmos will be finished at the end of April and the street re-construction will begin in May with the sidewalks and some of the curbs may need to be repaired or replaced. Do we have two months to figure this out, yes, we do. She continues to believe there are solutions to this so the bicyclist get a bicycle lane and there is adequate parking or parking is found in other places within a 1,000 foot radius to accommodate the businesses. It will take work and we can figure this out. One of the things she is concerned about is the bicycle people have been promised a protected bike lane along W Hickory. She has noticed from Bonnie Brae to where the construction is at some points the bicycle lane ends and signs are still up, there is no protection and there is a three foot strip along the curb for the cyclist. We do need to be sure they are getting what they have petitioned for repeatedly and been quite tenacious about. The sidewalk UNT is saying they don't want to give up any right-of-way is a very wide sidewalk is 8 to 9 feet wide. If the bicycle lane is only 3 to 5 feet wide on the rest of Hickory, she does not understand why that cannot be utilized and a raised part put over the sidewalk that needs to be replaced due to the Atmos construction. You may or may not have noticed the fire hydrants have recently been moved from the curbside back to the inside area. She also stated she found out this project was never cleared with the business owners on Hickory Street prior to it starting or when the bicycle plan was being put together. She does have numbers for the business owners if you would like to speak with them. Her concern is as these things go forward, the community needs to be more involved with conversations with people and not just this is what we are going to do and you can't do anything about it but how do you see this coming out and working from a functional standpoint. As the City transitions into a more multi-model place, we are going to have to work harder yes it is going to take more time and it may take more staff and may take more money. Making it functional is what it is all about.

Citizen Suzanne Rumohr a resident at 1700 Crescent Street lives about a mile from the area in question. She brought forward some additional density of population information as compared to Oak Gateway. According to the OGAP there are 24,000 residents within about 1.8 square miles (she was unsure if this included UNT students) which was about a 1.5 mile radius from the center to each perimeter point. Almost 80% of these residents are younger than 35 years of age. This would be a population density of a little over 12,972 per square mile. In Seattle where the density is about 18,000 people per square mile, they removed 12 parking spots to install a protected bike lane. The sales index increased more than the surrounding area.

On Vellore Street in Toronto where the density is about 13,920 people per square mile, they removed 136 on street spaces to put in a protected bike lane and the transactional sales volume (in lieu of sales tax) increased about 4.45% compared to 2.2 % in a similar area that did not make said changes. Salt Lake City, where the density is only 1,559 per square mile which is way less than this area we are discussing in Denton, converted 6 blocks of angle parking into parallel spots for a net loss of spaces with a protected bike lane and other features to make it look nicer. The sales tax receipts rose 8.8% with 79% of businesses saying that business was good. Sixteen percent of those businesses said business was up or setting records. Downtown Portland which is a big bike city has about 6.3% of people bike to work with a density of about 15,000 per square mile. Davis California has a commuter population of about 16% that bikes and the city wide density is about 6,515. In Boulder Colorado another bike friendly city, just outside of the larger city of Denver, has a density of about 4,351 people per square mile city wide where 9% of people bike to work. She hopes you will consider the similarities in density to Denton.

CM Briggs asked in the other areas studied, was there other significant protected pedestrian infrastructure around it or was it just simply bike lanes put in with regular speeding traffic and no other controls. Ms. Rumohr noted one was noted as a curb protected bike line and others included improvements making it a

more pleasant place to be. She would encourage things like this to be a part of this area also. In most cases they removed parking and put in protected bike lanes.

Citizen Garret Rumohr a resident at 1700 Crescent voiced his support of Option 2. It fits best with the existing design of the bike lane and most reasonable choice that has been offered. He would like to see a safe way to move through the area that fits with our existing decisions as a city through the bicycle plan and aligns with the current talking points for a multi-model way to move about town. It is also present in our future planning documents, the Denton 2030 Plan. It makes sense to complete the bike network for this segment in this area.

Citizen Patrice Lyke a resident at 1109 Egan Street spoke in support of Option 2 presenting the historical aspect of the bike plan. She was on Planning and Zoning when a big portion of the plan was being vetted. She wanted to take issue with the charge that there was a lack of transparency during the bike plan. First of all it was a two or more year long process. CM Ryan was on the Commission with her when they worked through the bike plan. There was a focus group and again TOMA requires that all of those meetings are open to the public, they are posted and that people know they can come. So even if somebody does not hold your hand to bring you to that meeting that meeting is open to you to come to give input and be part of the process. There were two public meetings. Meetings are different than hearings. There were two public hearings: one at Planning and Zoning and one at City Council. There was two years' worth of time for people to come, give their input and for the plan itself to be moved around to be amended and to be changed to meet the needs of the City of Denton. That includes bike riders, pedestrians, business owners, the City and the engineers who have to engineer this. As somebody that lives a four minute bike ride to Hickory Street or an eleven minute walk she can testify to the density in this area. As the Chair Person for the Oak Gateway Small Area Plan she ran the numbers and has lived in the area for 20 years she stated this area with the proper infrastructure is only going to increase non-vehicular traffic. That is what we need in this area, more people taking alternative transportation routes. Whether it is their feet, two wheels on a bicycle or a long board. One of the things we have not talked about is the air quality. The air quality in the center of Denton can be somewhat deleterious to your health. That is the reason we require an SUP for a drive thru in the core of Denton so you do not have idling traffic waiting in your drive thru. For instance Jack-in-the-Box is grandfathered. We can't do anything with it at the corner of Avenue B and Hickory. But further drive thru in the area have to go through the SUP process. It is air quality. If we want to increase those multi-model transportation options, increase people walking, people biking, decrease the potential for idling cars and the air pollution involved with that, we need to take a look at the quickest option, the cheapest option and the option that we voted on after a two year process in 2012.

CM Ryan commented that he is leaning toward Option 5 because losing 24 parking spaces does not work well in that area. When we replace the sidewalk, what is the difference with the sidewalk being replaced because it is deteriorating and it being used in the future as a bike lane if we were to negotiate further with UNT? He feels like we give up a lot to UNT and they control a lot of the parking in that area. These are 24 spaces they do not have control over that all of our citizens can use, not just students. You get any further in to parking where you start getting ticketed or towed etc.

Pritam Deshmukh shared the amount of space for a bike lane is at a minimum of 6 feet. We have to consider the buffers on either side. Minimum sidewalk width is 5 feet. Considering we require more than what is there today. Yes, we can continue working with UNT to see if we can get a few feet on the other side and have both in the same general area. Portions of the sidewalk are bad not the entire stretch. We would not go back and do anything on the sections of the sidewalk that are not bad. This would be something that eventually happens, not immediately. Yes we can continue to work with UNT to see if that can be a viable option to get more width. Option 5 has the sharrows and additional calming devices built in. He asked CM Ryan to confirm his request is to go with Option 5 as an interim and continue working to get Option 3. CM Ryan further asked if it would be feasible to do what repair we need to do

to the existing sidewalk that would become the bike lane if we are able to negotiate with UNT in the future. Pritam Deshmukh responded to CM Ryan's question about ADA ramps and bike ramps noting they are slightly different but would have to separate the ADA component with respect to the bike versus pedestrian. He further commented ideally that when Option 3 was presented, the bike lane would be slightly lower with a curb between the bike lane and the pedestrian walk way to clearly delineates. If we don't have that there is always a mixing and where most of the safety concerns lie. We can continue exploring that alternative and implement Option 5. CM Ryan provided a reminder that during the previous discussion the committee leaned towards working with UNT to create a sidewalk curving through the trees so we would not have to take any out. Pritam Deshmukh said we did talk with them and they are not interested at this point. CM Meltzer asked Pritam to expand on actual response and CM Briggs also ask to know what the actual ask was or how was the question presented. Pritam Deshmukh noted there was an actual email response from Dave (David Reynolds) to Marc Oliphant that read "I checked, sorry but no interest in UNT giving up more property for bike lanes or new sidewalks on Hickory Street." Marc Oliphant stated he met with UNT staff last week. He briefed them on the comments received from the Mobility Committee and the direction to pursue Option 3. He showed them Option 3 and what it entailed. It was a question, what does UNT think about this? It was not couched as we really want to see this happen come back with a counter offer or something like that. It was take this up your chain and see what it looks like to UNT.

CM Meltzer asked to review the google map for the area. In the display he noted it looked like individual cars parked along the west side off Avenue A / Fry Street although it is marked as a loading zone. He and CM Briggs had the opportunity to meet with the Fry Street businesses last week who clearly acknowledge there are tradeoffs no matter which direction you go here in that there are not enough pieces of pie to slice up. He also heard openness to the idea of diagonal parking even though it presents an obstacle to it being a loading zone. He is unaware if there is any real foundation that it is heavily used as a loading zone. Pritam Deshmukh added that we can check into that further but most of the cars using this parking are marked as delivery vehicles and we are told UNT does enforce this if they are not marked.

CM Briggs acknowledged this has been a long process and she has been on the Mobility Committee since the initial recommendation. She was part of the committee that made the initial recommendation which she believed to be Option 2. But when that was presented, we did not get the full story and by the time it got to council with the businesses and the parking it clearly had not been vetted at the time. That's when she was in agreement to make it go to Oak Gateway with the understanding there was going to be a complete discussion on parking, traffic, businesses and that a workable solution would come out of that committee. She is not 100% confident that happened. She is not in favor of sharrows or the calm street. She is for the calm street with other options but that alone is not enough. She is still not comfortable with Option 2. She would like to know about: If Option 2 is chosen can we make that Fry Street only business parking with towing enforced; can we do the intersection of Carroll and Hickory because she has very big concerns of funneling a straight bicycle path all the way to that intersection because it is a dangerous intersection to be funneling pedestrians and cyclist into without any upgrades; as we are doing Fry and Hickory Street intersection can we go underground with the utilities to clean up the one or two block area to improve visibility for pedestrians and cyclist. She is surprised the bike community is pushing for Option 2 which for her is an unprotected bike lane. Since she has been in office she has been asked to implement protected bike lanes. Simply throwing paint down on the street is simply not enough. She is confused by the advocating for an option that she has been told since being in office is not enough in and of itself. If she is missing something, she would welcome additional conversation. Her thought with the option with UNT was that it would be a little more protected. Marc Oliphant shared a visual example of what is being proposed in Option 2 as a buffered and maybe a lightly protected bike lane with 2 and 3 ½ feet painted between moving vehicles and the bicycles. We also have the plastic reflective bollards or delineators proposed as part of the plan. There is not a physical barrier that would stop a car but there are some elements of protection there. CM Briggs appreciated that additional information in that it is something but it is not protected as the things she has been requested to start doing for more protection.

She has been to Hickory Street on three occasions and observed cars parked on the left (north) side with large vehicles or trucks stopped in the first lane. It then pushes cars over to the last lane closer to the south side where cars are parked and the bike lane is supposed to be. If we do Option 2, we are going to have to have something better than little plastic sticks in her opinion. She cannot feel comfortable unless there is more separation there. If we are increasing the bicycle traffic, we are increasing the pedestrian traffic as we have been told through studies, then we have to do something more to protect the individuals taking that route.

Pritam Deshmukh added on the protected part, there is an option to add a bolt down curb as part of these delineators. There would need to be some gaps to allow for drainage but this would be a six inch curb between the actual travel lane and the bicycle lane. Bolt down curbs are fairly cheap. An estimate of \$200 for a short section was noted and actual cost implications can be provided. Mario Canizares asked the committee to allow staff to do the cost analysis with the assumption they are manufactured offsite and then bolted in to place. It is something that can be done with a lead time and installed pretty quickly with minimal construction. Pritam Deshmukh added with minimal change in existing configuration.

CM Meltzer is inclined to believe there is a way to do some version of Option 2 in combination with picking up spaces on Avenue A while acknowledging it has a lot of arms and legs to think through. He believes it warrants the extra time and what you are hearing consistently from this committee is trying to find a way meet the legitimately felt needs for parking and straight and safe bike path. He is not convinced yet that we can't do that yet and only doing one at the expense of the other. So the question is what do we do now because it needs to be striped? Is there a path to do some amount of the striping? For instance the center and basically leaving it blank on the south side until we know in fact we can go forward. Pritam Deshmukh explained one of the issues with that, among several, is if we leave that segment unmarked or undefined, vehicles park all the way around the corners. If we leave it unmarked it may create more of a safety hazard with vehicles being parked much closer to the intersections. We do need to delineate the space for parking. CM Meltzer asked what the minimum amount of marking needed to accomplish the safety element. Pritam Deshmukh responded we have done something called a "T" to mark the corners of different spaces or the elbow for the end only space. This is different than the continuous line marking applied on Oak Street. This is better than putting in the whole configuration to allow change to remove parking in the future and put in the bike lane.

CM Briggs asked for clarification on the image displayed where the bicycles are supposed to be after they cross Carroll. Pritam Deshmukh reoriented the image display to show the bike lane ends into a sharrow at Cedar Street. CM Briggs asked to display the bike lane at the intersection of Hickory and Carroll. She witnessed a car parked in the bike lane as she was waiting for the light to change a few days prior. Pritam Deshmukh explained we are planning as part of the new striping plan actually making it better with the installation of a buffer to delineate the bike area. Meaning having a two foot buffer on either side with a six foot bike lane. Currently you have an 8 – 9 feet wide dedicated bike lane that is painted green that almost looks like a car lane. We will delineate it better to define it as a bike lane as it transitions into this area. This will be improved as part of the new striping plan.

CM Ryan asked as part of the option of closing off Avenue if we had looked at making it just a one way heading south. Pritam Deshmukh shared three options we are looking at. Closing is one option but not the best option because it prevents access and there is no flow of traffic for the businesses. There is very little traffic going south bound on Avenue A other than the DCTA bus route. At the planning level the best alternative is to make the Avenue A segment one way on the north bound side. Mulberry would remain two way. Modifications would be made to the intersection area and angled parking would be added on the west side to match the existing parking on the east side. We are leaning in this direction but have not gotten into the depth of the plan. CM Ryan noted we talked about Sycamore last week having a pedestrian bike path all the way down to the train station. If you did a one way in the other direction we could easily add a bike lane that could get you over to Welch and we can figure out what to do between

Welch and Sycamore. That would give an alternative to using only Hickory to connect to the downtown area on the bike path and help alleviate the amount of bike traffic you have going through the busy intersection of Carroll and Hickory. Sycamore and Carroll is still a signalized intersection but is not as vehicle heavy. Pritam Deshmukh added that at Welch, as part of the Sycamore project, we are putting in a road diet which will have bike lanes. So on either side of Welch we will have bike lanes that connect to Sycamore and then connect to Hickory. This will be safer than going through the Avenue A area because there are solid waste and other issues over the years and will be a better route for bikers to be on Welch.

CM Briggs heard from some businesses if we were to close off Avenue A or not allow a right turn because that allows traffic to keep moving a little more as a cut through rather than waiting. There is a potential for traffic at Welch and Hickory to get pretty backed up. If there is not an option for that traffic to flow it could be consistently blocked. Pritam Deshmukh commented that this is why he said this is only at the planning level. We do not know the details, we will have the analysis, we will look at what the volumes are, how the signals are functioning, what needs to be changed if we reroute traffic. We have to vet all three options to come up with the right or most suitable option.

CM Ryan requested to bring up Option 5 on the screen for one last look before making a recommendation. CM Meltzer noted he did not feel a sharrow was really doing anything for the cyclist. CM Ryan further commented he understood that concern but we have an issue of not enough land to keep the parking. This being a 20 mph zone, he would definitely recommend that we go past Welch before going back up to the 30 mph speed limit versus the current Avenue A change point. In the downtown area we have the same thing with lack of right-of way and have to use sharrows which is not a good thing. Again he is looking at Option 5 with continuing negotiations with UNT to add a walking path and turn the existing sidewalk into a bike lane. He would like to continue to have discussions about the Avenue A options but does not feel that closure is a good choice. CM Briggs thinks we should do Option 5 but not with sharrows. It is a really good upgrade to have with all of the pedestrian walkability we need down there with the students. She would recommend that you take the opportunity to go and sit in this area for a bit amount of time to see what all we need. She would be comfortable with Option 2 if you could find her 20 spaces for cars because she did meet with more than one business down there. There are several that maybe not in the daytime but at nighttime which we have not talked about, depend on that parking for their establishments. There is a safety issue at night time where people do not feel comfortable walking around in the area and a car is a better way to get to that area and get out if they are not feeling safe. She is still not 100% comfortable but understands where we are going and the need for the protected bike lane. She is in favor no matter what of a protected lane. Somehow it has to be divided. She is not so concerned about cost and she knows this is often heard to go with the cheaper option. That is not what we are here to do. We are here to make sure that safety is priority and that the businesses don't suffer because of a decision that we have made.

CM Meltzer summarized what he is hearing is the enhancements for pedestrian use, very consistent with Oak Gateway also generally enhancing the usability of this part of town in a multi-model way. So we like the pedestrian part of Option 5. He is also hearing support for hearing how far we can get in finding spaces in Avenue A while seeing if we can get the first option we looked for. He is hearing some doubt whether UNT fully understood the meandering path sidewalk. He volunteered to participate in a subsequent meeting with UNT. We want to protect for the probable outcome of Option 2 with additional spaces found somewhere. Although it is not utterly conclusive there is stuff to explore that is important. We don't want to make the kind of decision that will stick around for 5 years that might be deleterious to someone. He is expecting we will stripe the existing parking with the corners, investigate the options on Avenue A and talk to the university on Option 3 and move forward on the pedestrian enhancements. Pritam Deshmukh asked to clarify the intent is to move forward with striping it back to its current configuration with minimal parking marks and move forward with finding more spaces either on Avenue A or somewhere else and work with UNT to see if we can move forward with Option 3 plus the pedestrian aspects of Option 5. CM Briggs stated if we are doing striping she would prefer to put the

parking in on the side with the businesses and not do any striping on the side nearest UNT. This is her preference so that we get the parking on the one side and the lane separation and then we can figure out the other side where all of the improvements are going to be made. CM Meltzer clarified there was no question about the parking on the north side but on the south side preferred the minimal markings versus leaving it totally blank due to the safety concerns. The committee was in agreement with this plan.

A concern about the available meeting time today that we might need to entertain an additional meeting.

An additional question was raised by CM Meltzer the sequence of meetings in going to Traffic Safety after getting guidance from Mobility Committee. Since Traffic Safety is an advisory body it would make more sense to go to them first and bring that guidance as input to Mobility Committee rather than if you don't like what dad says go ask mom. Mario Canizares made a statement in response. The reason why this information was brought to you all at the last meeting which was a special call meeting. The original intent of that meeting on January 29 was to do a tour of the square and scooter share because of the issues we were trying to bring forward. It was after the Oak Gateway presentation the request was made to bring this item back to the Mobility Committee at the special call meeting so we added a third item to the agenda. You may not know but the Traffic Safety Commission meets the first Monday of every month. So the sequence got out of order.

**D. MC19-014** Receive a report and hold a discussion regarding the plans for short-term (interim) improvements to FM 428 (Sherman Drive) and Loop 288 and long term improvements along FM 428 north of Loop 288.

Pritam Deshmukh noted there are two steps. There is a lot of development going on in this particular area. Anything south of the loop is already approved and under construction. CM Briggs asked if there was a reason why the traffic study the city initiated on this section is not shared in the back-up. Pritam Deshmukh responded that it can be shared and will be provided in follow-up. He continued to say this is one of the fastest growing areas in the city and highlighted by name with points on the aerial map several developments by name. The Sherman corridor north of the loop as well as portion coming into the city has gained a lot of attention due to the new added traffic. Currently the two access roads are TxDOT stop controlled intersections. One of the major concerns is during peak hours people cannot use the turn lanes or get off the loop and make the left turn out. This interchange does not function well and is already warranted for a traffic signal. We will go through a formal analysis and present to TxDOT for their approval. The City has an interim short term project that will realign lanes and add capacity under the bridge. The City is planning on widening the area under the bridge to add turn lanes and better align the through lanes in the north bound direction. We are planning to add more capacity, review the intersections for warrants, conduct a warrant analysis and move ahead with the signal design component. The cost for signaling these intersections was not included in the short term improvements as it was just a capacity enhancement project. Staff will come forward to council at some point to add the signals in the near future.

CM Briggs asked about the speed limit in the area on Sherman Drive at Poinsettia and it was estimated to be 40 or 45 mph. She highlighted the new apartment complex being built along with a housing addition connecting onto Poinsettia. Turning left from Poinsettia is a hard thing to do during certain times of the day. She asked if having a light at the Loop intersection could help control that traffic so they can easily get out on the left turn. Pritam Deshmukh stated having a signal creates a gap sending traffic in platoons. Meaning a group of cars moving at the same time but when it turns red, the cars will stop and provide gaps. We can definitely look into this intersection to study if a signal is required or if an acceleration lane would be required on the south bound side. There are different alternatives or options that can be looked at. It was also confirmed lights would be added on both sides of the Loop so it would function like any other interchange off of I-35. CM Briggs highlighted we have this same issue on the north side with

people getting out from Hartlee Field and turning left during certain times of the day. Will a light at this intersection help alleviate that or will there need to be some other traffic mechanism further down the way. Pritam Deshmukh responded that might be a combination as we do not know what kind of traffic we get from Hartlee Field. It could be a combination of providing a signal here but also looking into specific upgrades needed at Hartley Field. Similar to Poinsettia we would need to study it. We have not gotten to a point where there are localized intersections being studied. This is a short, small transportation project that was approved and we are moving forward with design and implementation as an interim solution but we have looked at long term numbers and this will be the next part of what I am going to present for the future as things develop for our need in this area.

Pritam Deshmukh moved forward with long term information. We have conducted a study for this whole area and have worked closely with Planning Department to gather the land use information. This particular area has a lot of interest and people are coming in with plans for developing. We wanted to understand what it would take in order for this area to actually have the right transportation facilities. A map was shown and referenced to show all of the arterials required to support it. This is high level study looks at this entire area being developed with residential and some commercial mix. We worked with Planning on what type of mix there would be. Reference was made to the frontage road linkage between Sherman and Locust. These will make it safer for people on Stuart to get in and out with right turns as opposed to connecting directly to the Loop. A table was referenced and it was further noted north of Long Road at FM 428 we currently need four lanes but need to reserve right-of-way for six because as the development comes in we will have to widen it to 6 lane facility. Again this is a high level study that does not get into the details of what will work at a specific intersection. The highlighted road connections will either be 4 lane or 6 lane secondary or primary arterials. This study can be shared with the committee members as well as the public. We had an ISR that was submitted to council in January which talked about this study with a presentation.

CM Briggs asked if John Polster would be discussing the outer loop in his presentation of the next agenda item. He responded no, he would not. She further asked if he had any information that he could share and how that would affect what was displayed on the map being presented today. John Polster responded the COG 10 year funding plan includes \$50 million in Denton County for the outer loop that was established in 2018. Sometime within that time frame COG is expecting to move forward both them and the County with some improvements, study or work on the outer loop that rhymes with \$50 million. It is in the both the City and County thoroughfare plans and there are funds available to establish that corridor environmentally which is what is needed to protect the corridor and begin to actually plan for some portion of it being developed. It is in a short term window for highway years. Pritam Deshmukh also pointed out FM 428 between the Loop and outer loop is a TxDOT facility. We have started discussion with John as well as TxDOT to see if we can move forward with some of the environmental and schematic for this particular segment. Then we will have a better idea for the long term to have the schematic and start securing the right-of-way as these developments come in. In the short term we can come up with solutions internally for the city to widen certain segments, especially closer to the city and then phase the project appropriately. John Polster added that if we stick to relatively traditional design criteria, there is a good chance TxDOT will be willing to step up and do the funding of the project. If you go to more exotic types of traffic movement, they will let you do it but at the end of the day they will want you to take it off system. CM Briggs asked about roundabouts for instance. John Polster replied exactly. CM Briggs asked to clarify the future intent is to have FM 428 as a 4 lane divided highway. Pritam Deshmukh responded, there are several things we are looking at as options. If we look at how this particular feeder road feeds into the long term big picture as part of our mobility plan considerations, this is a limited access freeway, the Loop in this area is a limited access freeway and US 380 coming into the city will be connecting as part of one of the alternatives being looked at. We may look at having this as a spur which would also be limited access from the outer loop to the Loop. There are a lot of things going on but we want to make sure in the interim we have some widening and a middle turn lanes so people can easily get in and out from some of the cross streets. This will be phased slowly depending on how the

development comes in. In the interim and at a minimum we are adding a turn lane and moving forward will phase and widen the street. CM Briggs inquired about the timeline. Pritam Deshmukh said there is not a timeline at this point but we will be bringing it to council soon. John Polster added if TxDOT believes there is additional development coming into this corridor, they will probably lean toward a 6 lane facility as opposed to a 4 lane because they have had experiences where they have allowed communities to talk them into a 4 lane divided and then come in and get it developed later and have all kinds of mobility and access issues. TxDOT will probably be pushing for the 6 lane if they are going to participate.

Citizen Walter McGovern a resident at 3110 Hartlee Field Road spoke in support of this item. The biggest concern for both he and his wife is safety. They moved from Valley View where they had a 60 acre horse ranch and now have a 6 acre ranch in Denton. They both do a lot of traveling with a large trailers. They either come from I-35 on the Loop or from Aubrey on FM 428. Making the left turn coming from Aubrey he has to make a complete stop to be sure there is no one coming over the hill before he can make that turn. Coming in from I-35 on the Loop he has to wait and at times be pretty audacious about the timing to make the left onto FM428 to then turn right on to Hartlee Field Road. His biggest concern is safety. From what he has heard today possibly going to the four lane road and adding the stop lights would be great.

Citizen Richard Wells a resident at 3830 Warschun Road spoke. On FM 428 TxDOT owns 150 feet of right-of-way. For a 6 lane it would require about 250 feet. So there is a whole lot of right-of-way that will have to be purchased. He asked if we could show an overlay to display the city limits. There was a problem with the GIS maps due to recent updates and technical difficulties. The city limits run kind of odd or irregular out there and we are proposing these roads here and some of us may not be within the city limits which means you have to work with the County and other folks and that would be a bit of a concern. It concerns him as he was looking at things on line before the meeting. He does not mentally do a good overlay and he is worried that some of the long term proposed roads may not be within the city which means you would have to deal with the County and a bunch of other folks. With regard to the short term plan, it is a nice idea at the bridge but according to the Denton Mobility Plan for bicycles and pedestrians 2014 this is a major bicycle route. If you start doing all the roads and turn lanes in this area you pretty much kill the bicycle route through there. It was not talked about in the presentation or discussion and he would ask this be a consideration. Although he doesn't ride a bicycle, in all of the plans by the NTCOG, County and City, that is the only north east bicycle artery (it is considered in the Denton plans a major artery) that goes from Hercules all the way out to Aubrey. He is concerned if you do all that work at the bridge you are killing the bicycle lanes. The 2014 study already shows the level of service in the mornings is level F which means it is already pretty jammed up and speaks to the safety concerns already discussed. If you look at the map previously displayed, those proposed roadways go thr areas with high water shed scores on Milam and Clear Creek. Denton County Greenbelt Plan adopted that and talks about it and your plan is crossing that in about 7 places going through some very sensitive areas for Denton County. He would ask that we consider this very carefully when you start building the roads across those water sheds. TxDOT and NTCOG have had major discussions about crossing the Greenbelt because of the historic bridge there and what it is used for. One of the proposals was to take it from 6 lanes to 4 lanes to cross the Greenbelt and then go back up to 6 lanes which sounds kind of strange. He made a reference to the number of students that attend the school out there and the traffic is already very heavy. He closed asking us to look at the proposed City Limits and acknowledged the ETJ, the wet lands, the flood plains and associated reports and also the bicycle thing as a lot of people currently use that.

CM Ryan asked we continue with the current plan and looked forward to an additional Mobility Committee update later this year. CM Briggs appreciated the citizen's comments about the use of the horse trailers. During her neighborhood meeting, no one lived on any acreage less than 2 and several of them had trailers for horses and cattle. Like Mr. Polster said a roundabout in that area might not be the best idea for large vehicles. She was also glad the Greenbelt access was brought up as the US 380 access

has been blocked off for a really long time and this is an important access point. She would like to make sure the bike lane and access is protected no matter what kind of growth we have in this area. She requested a hard date for the installation of the signal lights at the intersections of FM 428 and the Loop or at least a better time frame for the upgrades so she could share a report with her constituents. CM Meltzer did not want to vary too far from the agenda item but he is increasingly interested in how far we are or are not drifting from the Denton 2030 Plan in terms of the intended look for the City in 2030. This is premised on the pace of growth in this particular corridor. We may have to recheck against what the intended look of this area was because it is an important natural and rural part and some areas are more guided to infill development and some areas are not so we end up with a balanced picture. There will probably be more conversations coming regarding the look of development in that corridor area.

John Polster asked if the committee would like to see FM 428 on the report they prepare for next month. Committee members responded yes.

**E. MC19-015** Receive a report and hold a discussion regarding Texas Department of Transportation On-System projects in the Denton area to include the 35 Express Project.

John Polster started with the bad news. TxDOT did terminate their contract with MCM on FM 2181. TxDOT is looking at having a maintenance contract done to take and resurface some of the more difficult parts of the road that are deteriorating because of the construction. The bonding company is Berkshire Hathaway and they are challenging the termination so this can take anywhere from 9 to 12 months before you see anything happen on FM 2181 other than what is happening right now. We have one closure that the bonding company is paying the sub so they can continue the improvement at Ranchman to get that back open in about 20 days. MCM has been terminated and TxDOT is going to be arguing with the bonding company but they will not be allowed back on the project. It will go fallow for a period of time.

377 or Fort Worth Drive has already begun construction. They have started clearing the right-of-way. There are a few issues with utilities that need to be addressed but they are minor as far as timing goes.

The I-35 Brinker Mayhill 288 Project contractor has told TxDOT they will be switching traffic to the new bridge on March 9<sup>th</sup>. Last week when he passed through there he didn't think there was any way they were going to make it but today when he drove through it was looking pretty close. If they make that time frame, all of the traffic that is on I-35 will be moved to the upper deck and then they will do the remaining part of the project. Once they get the traffic up on the top deck, they will be able to open a temporary connection from Brinker across I-35 to the development on the west side.

Mario Canizares asked how much information about FM 2181 should be released to the public to help soften the blow and be proactive in the communications. John Polster responded the only thing he will change going forward on the report is the contract is terminated and the TxDOT area office is going to be contracting with a maintenance contract to keep FM 2181 viable as a roadway.

CM Briggs asked about the loop because it is moving along but it is just the frontage, correct. John Polster responded that was incorrect. They are clearing a controlled access freeway that is about 350 feet. They are acquiring all the right-of-way for the entire facility. Right now they have an ear mark on enough money to do the north bound frontage road. We have some time between now and then to find some additional funds as the minimum where we will start. CM Briggs clarified for those listening this is for the inner loop not the outer loop being Loop 288.

CM Ryan noted on 377 Roselawn would be opening up after the sanitary sewer move was completed. He asked if that was true because the railroad bridge is going in on that side and it is so close between the tracks and Roselawn. Would it remain closed until the new bridge is in? John Polster replied that

Roselawn will be open once the sanitary sewer line gets moved. The work they are doing with the UP at that area is within the UP right-of-way.

## **F. Staff Reports:**

### **1. Matrix**

#6 – As it was decided today, we will get monthly updates from DCTA. We will remove this item from the matrix and it will be an agenda item going forward.

#7 – Square Walking Tour – We are planning on putting an ISR in the Friday packet for what we have done and discussed during the tour. We will remove this item from the matrix.

The other items will be brought to the committee one after another as agenda items.

#5 – We are looking at options for removing the medians in the top section. This would address most of the concerns and based on the level difference in the two streets. We are currently looking at taking the median out. CM Ryan was of the understanding that someone from staff would be attending the Forrestridge HOA meeting on February 25<sup>th</sup>. Pritam Deshmukh was not aware of that but acknowledged that would be a good discussion. CM Ryan further noted the HOA paid to for reinstalling irrigation and electric to that median about two years ago.

CM Briggs requested to add an item for our Department of Mobility. To consider adding a goal or adopting a goal that has been adopted by other cities known as Vision Zero. She would like to see a work session on what this is and what we need to do to do it.

CM Meltzer also requested follow-up via email to understand what the concept is for the road going along beside the Service Center. This came up in a Town Hall meeting. Tracy Beck can provide additional information from the meeting. Pritam Deshmukh asked for confirmation this is for the Ruddell realignment and noted there is a public meeting on that item next Monday.

#1 – The Small Area Plan has been completed and will be removed from the matrix.

**Adjournment: 10:43 AM**

### **CONCLUDING ITEMS**

Under Section 551.042 of the Texas Open Meetings Act, respond to inquiries from the Public Utilities Board or the public with specific factual information or recitation of policy, or accept a proposal to place the matter on the agenda for an upcoming meeting AND Under Section 551.0415 of the Texas Open Meetings Act, provide reports about items of community interest regarding which no action will be taken, to include: expressions of thanks, congratulations, or condolence; information regarding holiday schedules; an honorary or salutary recognition of a public official, public employee, or other citizen; a reminder about an upcoming event organized or sponsored by the governing body; information regarding a social, ceremonial, or community event organized or sponsored by an entity other than the governing body that was attended or is scheduled to be attended by a member of the governing body or an official or employee of the municipality; or an announcement involving an imminent threat to the public health and safety of people in the municipality that has arisen after the posting of the agenda

APPROVED



---

Council Member Paul Meltzer  
Chair



---

Becky Owens  
Administrative Assistant